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Welcome

In Judy Barsalou’s words:
I am a representative of the Ford Foundation for the Middle East and Africa, from our office based in Cairo. I am so glad to see you this evening. I hope you caught the amazing sunset and hope you enjoy your time in Cairo. You are in the right place at the right time. Egypt and the Arab regions have traditions of charitable giving that go back over 1,000 years. Recent local philanthropy efforts to plan giving more strategically to address social justice issues are well underway.

The Ford Foundation in Cairo
- Made its first grant in Egypt in 1952
- Celebrated 50th anniversary last year
- Have had offices in eight countries in the region since 1952
- Have had the regional office located in Cairo since 1976 when we left Beirut
- Started making grants in the region to help young governments with planning, to fund education, basic health, and increasingly have moved into rural development issues
- Were one of the first funders of the human rights movement in the Arab region
- Over last 25-30 years, funding has focused on human rights, cultural identity and artistic expression issues, HIV/AIDS, sexuality, governance and civil society
- Have been here so long that we have developed wonderful relationships that allow us to work on sensitive issues

Two nights ago there was an explosion in the market not far from here, in downtown Cairo. I want to reassure you that things are very much under control and that this was a very unusual event in the city. There is no indication of further problems like this occurring any time soon. We have made sure that we are taking every precaution possible. There is a letter in your packet with emergency phone numbers, a map to our office, and a list of shopping locations that are even better alternatives to the market. Let us know if you need anything.

Welcome to Cairo.

Hopes for the Convening

In Chris Harris’ words.
I am a senior program officer at the Ford Foundation in New York. I have two words for you – we’re here. Welcome. I am absolutely delighted to see everyone. This has been two years in the making. I want to remind us that this is a convening, not a conference. We’re not coming to hear from experts, sit passively, and take it in. We are here to work. This convening is for people who share an interest in the topic: Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace. Just the fact that the bombing occurred where we are is an important reminder of the “peace” part of this topic. The peace was disturbed.

My role tonight is like the body at an Irish wake – I will say more tomorrow. I want to thank Judy Barsalou and her staff.
I urge you to get to know each other this evening and throughout the next few days. Look around at the incredible resources in this room – every continent is represented, there are unbelievable sets of experience. Most of us don’t know everybody; many of us only know one or two people. Do not be shy – take the time to get to know people, who they are and what they do. One of the most important things we will do over next few days is get to know each other.

“A Ritual to Read to Each Other” by William Stafford

If you don’t know the kind of person I am
and I don’t know the kind of person you are
a pattern that others made may prevail in the world
and following the wrong god home we may miss our star…

Poverty, Social Marginalization and Development Challenges in Egypt

Presentation

Judy Barsalou gave an introduction and interviewed the three speakers.

We wanted to give you an introduction to some of the issues that we focus on at the Ford Foundation in Egypt, which speak more broadly to development and social challenges that are common in other parts of the world as well. Three of the most interesting women in all of Egypt, who have at one time been grantees of the Ford Foundation, are our guests for this evening. The focus issues of this conversation are poverty, social marginalization, and development in Egypt. What challenges do these issues pose and to philanthropy?

Three Presenters:
- Dr. Hania Sholkamy, Social Research Center, American University in Cairo (HS)
- Dr. Ghada Barsoum, Population Council, Cairo (GB)
- Dr. Reem Saad, Social Research, Cairo (RS)

What is the social contract from the state towards the average citizen?

HS: We are basically a welfare state – whether dysfunctional or functional – with provisions on social spending, which now comprises 54% of public spending. The state perceives its role as a provider through food subsidies, energy subsidies, free education, health, pensions, etc., but most of these services are dysfunctional – university programs have huge leakages. It is not really a question of what are the items of the social contract, but how is the contract implemented? People are clinging to the social contract and want the state to play a big role.

Given the size of state spending on subsidies, can you talk about what this implies in terms of targeting or not the people who need the most, and what that creates in terms of a political dynamic to change the system from one who targets the middle class to one that targets the neediest?

HS: It’s a huge challenge because the state says we need better targeting and the notion of a liberal state motivates our government – it is not just a political problem, but is a problem of violent competitions between the very poor, the near poor, the poor, the middle classes – there isn’t a will to share – the problem with public transfer and services is always access, not impact – it’s viewed as a transfer, an entitlement (e.g. I am entitled to school even if it is not a valuable place) – no one would consider renegotiation for terms of engagement, so there would be resentment about increasing services to rural Egypt (1 in 3 are poor in the north, versus 1 in 20 who are poor in the rural south) and this is a real challenge

There has been significant improvement in education and literacy among women in Egypt, but not comparable rises in employment. Can you tell us more?
GB: More than 70% of working age women are out of the labor force in Egypt. Young, educated women are five times as likely as educated men to be unemployed. Among 127 countries compared by WEF, Egypt ranked 120th in terms of women’s participation in the labor force. Why? What I know is that there is crowding – there are more job seekers than jobs. Crowding leads to discrimination against job seekers who are seen as temporary job seekers (women), rather than permanent (men). Jobs available to women are primarily in the informal economy. These are “bad jobs” (term introduced by the World Bank) that are generally low paying with no prospects, no benefits, no stability, and no job security. A culture that looks at unwed women’s virginity as sacred is not conducive for young women to join labor market. These problematic settings make women not willing or discouraged from joining labor markets.

How adequate is the education system for preparing women for joining the workforce?
GB: During the socialist era Egypt had guaranteed employment (I get a degree, I get a job). Education was geared toward credentials. Now we have jobs for which credentials are no longer enough. More young people are getting credentialed than are getting into the labor market. There is a mismatch of demand and supply.

Why is government employment still so prized and how long are people willing to sit out of the market to wait for employment, women in particular?
GB: Guaranteed employment is not there anymore. No one is guaranteed a job after graduation as it once was. Problem is that young, educated women are clinging to the hope of getting a job in the government because the private sector doesn’t provide enough salaries, is not a good environment for women to be alone in, there is no maternity pay, no maternity leave – all of that is there in the public sector. The public sector is highly valued. There is a fear that if one gets registered in the private sector it will limit one’s chances for a job in the public sector.

Rural Egypt is not the same as it was 20 years ago – how have poverty and social dynamics changed in rural Egypt?
RS: 57% of the Egyptian population lives in rural areas, a conservative estimate is that 25% of the rural population is poor, versus 10% of the urban population. That figure rises to 50% if we include the near poor. The poor are especially concentrated in rural upper Egypt (66% of the extreme poor in Egypt live there). The average land holding in Egypt for agriculture is 2.2 feddans (almost an acre). What is new? Over the past 20 years there have been changes in the country as a whole and in rural areas in particular. Economic liberalization has affected farmers dramatically; these transformations are adverse to poor and small landholders.

Three main changes in the condition of rural population concerning poverty:
1. In 1997, a new law liberalizing the agricultural market was implemented. It affected almost one million rural families with dramatic consequences because it deprived security these families had enjoyed for almost four decades. Rent became subject to market forces, contracts were not registered, and owners could throw out tenants anytime. These changes resulted in tenants having no interest in investing in the land like they had before when they used natural fertilizer which has long term benefits. Now they need chemical fertilizers to get large productivity of crops so that they can pay rent. We are witnessing the long-term impact of this act since it was implemented in 97 – farmers are facing much higher prices or joining the landless ranks or migrating to cities.
2. While agriculture remains a defining feature of rural areas, its importance as a primary occupation is declining, largely because of the limited size of agricultural land and competition over land. There is a problem of land fragmentation – there is not enough land for people who want to practice farming so there is a growing part-time farmer population. There is a diminishing role of agricultural cooperatives and a total absence of safety nets now.
3. There is a growing problem of rural unemployment. Most work other than farm work is not located in villages, so requires travel of significant distances, which affects women in particular.

What produces the disparity of access to resources between urban and rural populations?
RS: Part of the reason is the difference between rural resistance and urban resistance, or the prospect thereof. Governments take rural people for granted because they have not shown that they are capable of causing trouble for the government. I don’t celebrate the idea of everyday forms of resistance. It is spectacular forms of resistance that have been more effective in making governments listen. This is only one reason. For example, the agricultural land law implemented in ’97 had a pretext that was to liberalize the market partly because of Islamic law, but the same reasons apply for rented apartments in cities. But there are two differences – in rented apartments the situation between owners and tenants are not polarized along class lines as it is with agricultural land. Renters tend to be poor and land owners tend to be rich – most members of parliament are urban renters, not rural tenants – government thinks they can quell revolt in the rural areas. The urban bias would be enough to explain this disparity.

Some rural communities have stopped waiting for the government to provide them with basic infrastructure and they have taken charge of their situation, building their own infrastructures. Can you describe what that looks like? What does that mean when they try to go back to the government?

RS: First, “self-help projects” mostly occur in rural communities and come under nice headlines of participation. Of course, people are to be congratulated for working together. People get together and collect money to build a post office or a school. These are things they should not be doing because they should be universally provided. A number of the villages do this and the more they can help themselves in this way the more they feel bitter. Perhaps the peoples’ work should be matched with government funding rather than one village getting money because it doesn’t have a school, and another getting nothing because they already have a school.

HS: Addressing the lack of infrastructure in the poorest villages, mostly in upper Egypt, 4.9 million are ultra poor. Sharoo (sp?), funded by USAID, was set up to deal with sewage, schools, etc. We overlook the articulation of interest between elites, state employees – the political process does not involve local elites. Pipes that have run through Sharoo would have provided everyone with pipes, schools, sewers, so slipping back to the right to services ignores the fact that the supply will not correct the disparities – a plan has to be coupled with looking at people’s entitlement.

Is philanthropy letting the government of Egypt off the hook? Are we trying to substitute responsibilities of the government?

GB: I don’t know. It’s tough to answer. We know that politicians are trying to look at problems of poverty. I am part of the mechanisms of donor aid and the government. I am part of an intervention we have been trying to scale up in partnership with a government body. The process is to institutionalize this intervention that was started by four villages and is now in fifty villages. We’ve shown that the concept works. In a meeting with high ranking officials who we were hoping would take up the intervention to implement everywhere, a high ranking official said “we are with you” but that is not a role – what is next? Something we grapple a lot with is “what is your role”? “Capacity building” has become offensive, so we use “capacity development.” Is aid getting the government off the hook? What is expected from the government in terms of partnership aid? Do donors allow government to do what they want to do with funds? We like to think of government entities as partners, but are they really?

RS: This question should also be asked and practiced alongside another question: what is the nature of the social contract with the state? This issue has to be resolved first with an internal, not nationalistic, debate. The problem is that the state is trying to wiggle out of duties. Once this discussion gets going on the right track, other things may fall into place and we may be able to...
address them in a more practical way. I don’t see that philanthropy would have a role to play in the discussion itself. We need to have a clear sense of what entitlements are. What worries me is that government would want to exploit philanthropy or use it for things not on the agenda of philanthropists. There are always nice things philanthropy can do, especially experimental/pilot projects, but not to take the place of government.

- HS: Development aid has done all the harm already – we should differentiate between philanthropy and development because it was an opportunistic set of relationships that created the notion of community development and civil society that was playing into the gaps and failures of the state, playing against people, whether on the side of the state or on the side of industry or for political reasons. This is not a happy scene if you are negotiating basic entitlements through a litany of disempowering relationships between people and the providers of services. Must be notion of what you can buy and what is not up for sale. There is an interesting condition for philanthropy to work, which is scale. When the scale is big enough or when there are enough alliances, then the impact of philanthropy can transcend current opportunism of philanthropic institutions in Egypt. One of our biggest philanthropic institutions, Sharia (sp?), is larger than the state. The state can be nasty to small NGOs, but that institution is much more powerful than the state. It includes donations to mosques. What do mean by who is philanthropy? And the relationships with the state and people? It is wonderful when people can innovate through philanthropy.

Questions and Answers

Do you think that philanthropy too often ignores lessons of the social sciences? Would the world be better off if institutional anthropologists were assigned to study the bizarre practices of philanthropists?

- HS: Any role for anthropologists is wonderful. I’m a social scientist and I really think that we are experiencing some pathologies in our understanding of the state that are born out of social science. One is crisis mode, that we have to solve it – one of the most useful ideas from social science is living with conflict and change. We have overcome that notion that we have to identify problems, solve problems, and then identify other problems. Social sciences may be the answer because they are up for revamping.

- GB: They go against one another. In grad school they tell you have to look at complexities of the issue. You write a paper with arguments. A donor asks you to put what should be done into oversimplified bullets. I am scared of the term “best practices” and of putting that information in bullets. It’s true you need to understand complexity and to figure out what to do, especially in the field of implementing programs.

Can you comment on what you think accounts for the lack of resistance in rural areas compared with urban?

- RS: Difficult question. I don’t know. For a while we had been trying to look at, to seek (as researchers sympathetic to peasants) everyday forms of resistance. But I am especially not happy and in fact angry. I don’t know if it’s in the nature of rural society. An interesting development in the last three years is an unprecedented level of rural unrest and protest. My explanation, maybe controversial, of that recent level is related to a growing rural middle class. Most of this resistance has been related to lifestyle issues, e.g. riots against phone towers, drinking water, pedestrian bridges, and very little that concerns classical agricultural concerns. Something about not just rising aspirations of mobility, but also growing erosion of boundaries between city and country – this is getting more gray and also more clear. I keep thinking about this question – I consider myself a “sub activist” on farmer’s rights and hesitate to say something that would not be complimentary to them.

Has anything changed in terms of the gender dimensions of protest in the context of this unprecedented number of protests and strikes in the last four years?
RS: The mobile towers protest had a lot of participation from rural women, which is new.
GB: This is true – I have been comparing this to Iran and we have been saying it is difficult to account for what is not happening. In Iran there are riots on the street all the time by different groups. Here it was not happening, but now it is. There are more young, educated, middle class women, a new population that is ready to go out there. We need to study this more and now that it is happening, we can.

Considering Arab human rights in Beirut, if you look twenty years ahead and things develop in a gradual way here as they have, what will Egypt look like?

- HS: The 1952 revolution in Egypt, although used as proxy for the rights of poor people, was a middle class revolution. It has been tremendously successful in terms of social credentials – people in power do not descend from aristocracies, but are middle class. We are becoming a middle class society, if not in fact then in fiction, with dominant aspirations/desires/conservatism that are middle class. The Muslim Brothers are an urban middle class movement and distance themselves from values of diversity. In 20 years we will be urban middle class society figuring out tensions and frustrations – there will be slum dwellers and marginalized rural people, but that will be under the carpet. The urban middle class ethos is very strong.
- RS: If we do not do something very quickly about the environment and natural resource issues, we will be in a very sorry state in 20 years.
- GB: In Egypt’s sense of time, 20 years is nothing – I don’t think much will change. We will still be talking about how to reach the poor and women’s limited participation. If the economic depression continues, things will get worse. If we have more women working, there will be less poverty, but the focus is always on decreasing poverty, not on increasing women’s employment - these are always looked at separately.

Lately in Turkey a lot of discussion around gender issues have shifted from training/awareness/rights of women to making men more aware and changing their views. Where is Egypt on that point?

- HS: My field is global women’s empowerment project – one clear issue here in Egypt is that you’re talking about feminist politics that are transformative, not performative – you say more women should work, but if men take paternity leave that is really transformative because that levels the playing field. That kind of view and aspect of transformation are not here.
- GB: We are not there yet – discourse of development has moved from “women and development” to “gender and development” – so that is in the literature, but I don’t see a focus on men – sexual harassment is one of most debated issues in Egypt, because the focus is on the woman as victim (she was provocative)

Philanthropy has long roots in this region going back before the 18th and 19th centuries when civil society was funded. All educational institutions before Mohammed Ali were funded by civil society – why not make philanthropy more strategic?

- HS: Regardless of historically what states looked like, if you have philanthropy at the scale where civic responsibilities are taken on and therefore the state is big enough to provide for everyone, it requires money coming from somewhere. Philanthropy is rich people – discussion of how to make the money, who owns the resources to permit you to make enough capital was the conversation. It is true that philanthropy has been more successful than public initiatives in some cases, but it is not a conversation we can avoid and recreate the earlier situation because the situation is different now.
- RS: A specific thing happening now in Egypt is a debate about corporate social responsibility and what it contains. Deals between government and businessmen legitimizes the government line that we cannot do anything without returns. It has become a kind of currency to be a philanthropist of this type.
GB: Thank you for this reminder that 200 years ago we didn’t need so much government intervention, but the harm has been done. To undo that would probably take another 200 years. We are moving from a centralized state and a social contract is being negotiated - “I’ll give you more space.” A lot has to be done regarding regulations and there is a need for the domineering parent to let go a little bit.
Monday, 25 February 2009

Welcome, Who’s Here and How We’re Connected

Christopher Harris explained that Judy Barsalou could not be here this morning but will join us on and off throughout the meeting. He introduced himself and extended a welcome to Cairo and to this convening to those who have just arrived. He is happy to see everyone….knowing many people have come long distances. Chris invited Marianne Hughes to the podium.

Who is here and how are we connected?

Marianne opened by saying it is great to see faces connected to the names we’ve gotten to know. She imagines all are curious about who else is here. Showed the introductory slide show.

Barry Knight presented the Cairo Network – the results of the network-mapping process done before the convening. “It is my job in life to plague you with surveys and do statistical analysis of surveys and today is not exception. We did a survey to try to work out the connections between all of you in the room. This is a convening not a conference and what happens as a result of it lies in your hands. This means you need to interconnect with one another…form a powerful global network.

So we surveyed the connections between you before the start of the convening, and we will do it again after to see how those connections have changed. This is an experiment in social network analysis.”

Barry presented the results of the survey.

Some characteristics of the network.

- Number of people = 95
- Number of potential relationships between you – 4,465
- Density = .16 meaning that 16% of the potential connections exist and 84% remain to be made. So one of your jobs as a person is to meet everyone else and make a connection. Then we expect the density of connections to increase when we redo the survey.

Nature of interconnections

It’s not just about to whom you are connected, but is that connection reciprocated and what is the strength of the connection. We’ve combined those measures to give a concept of centrality. Centrality is the distribution of relationships plus who is well connected and less well connected

Barry presented a histogram of centrality and it is uneven.

Increasing connections

Relative entropy – 0.66 – this is a measure of the inequality within the group, which is too bloody high! We have to reduce it…that’s our job.

How do we do this?

The longest distance between anyone is 4 inches
The average longest distance is 2.9

What is the sociometric star?!

Christopher Harris!
Start Ups

Introductions
Marianne invited everyone to introduce themselves at tables and assured people that there will be more opportunities later on to get into deeper conversations.

Desired Outcomes and Agenda
Marianne presented today’s agenda. We will try to stay as tight as we can. There will be breaks. One of the most important things we’ll be doing over the next few days is building community with one another by strengthening our connections.

Norms and Ground Rules
Marianne reviewed the proposed ground rules for the convening.

- Listen quietly and with curiosity.
- Be respectful of all points of view.
- Speak clearly and be aware that English is not everyone’s first language.
- Let others know when you don’t want something you are saying to be written down, videotaped or shared with others.
- Take shared responsibility for the success of our time together
- Be fully engaged! Let us know if there is something you need in order to participate fully.
- Come back from breaks on time.
- Keep mobiles/PDAs off or on silent during sessions.
- Have fun!

Purpose of the Gathering

In Christopher Harris’s Words:
Good morning and welcome again to Cairo. Allow me to extend my thanks to so many of you who traveled far to be here with us in this ancient and remarkable city. My name is Christopher Harris and I am a Senior Program Officer on Philanthropy at the Ford Foundation in New York. It has been my great pleasure to chair for the past year and a half the Working Group on Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace—the group that organized this gathering. This group of volunteers first convened in September 2007, has met many times and worked very hard since then to address key issues for our work and to put together the design and content of the next few days.

Before I proceed, I would like to ask members of the Working Group to stand and be recognized.

- Akwasi Aidoo (Trust Africa) (who was called away at the past minute and cannot be with us—“presenté”)
- Lisa Jordan (Ford Foundation)
- Avila Kilmurray (Community Foundation for Northern Ireland)
- Barry Knight (CENTRIS, UK)
- Vanita Mukherjee (Ford Foundation, New Delhi)
- Stephen Pittam (Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust)
- Ana Maria Enriquez (Ford Foundation)
- Albert Ruesga (Greater New Orleans Foundation)
- Maya Wiley (Center for Social Inclusion)
- Karen Zelermeyer (Funders for Lesbian and Gay Issues)

I would like to recognize Ford Foundation colleagues Karin Krslovic and Monique Ekmekjian, as well as the staff of the Interaction Institute for Social Change (Boston and Belfast) who have assisted the
Working Group in numerous ways and are serving in a staffing role for this convening. We have all spoken with our two community organizers Nancy Cunningham and Juliette Majot.

I would also like to thank publicly my colleagues at the Ford Foundation office here in Cairo who, despite their own very demanding workload, have been exceedingly gracious with their time, labor and good counsel as we organized this meeting. If they could stand we can show our appreciation.

Before we get underway with the real work together, I have been asked to say a few words about the nature of this meeting, what the Ford Foundation’s plans are, and what the larger expectation are about any outcomes of this convening. So let me quickly pose and try to answer five questions:

Why Ford?
Why this topic?
Why us?
Why this meeting?
How might we move forward?

1. Why Ford?

The Ford Foundation has a history of supporting philanthropy as a generic public good. Philanthropy is the source of funding for civil society groups that cannot or should not rely on the public sector or the private sector for support. This is especially the case for those groups that work to address injustices caused by one or both of those sectors. So Ford has supported work on the enabling legal environment, on research, on training for philanthropy in different parts of the world.

Ford also supports philanthropy for the instrumental and more explicit purpose of ensuring resources for social justice and peace. That means working to encourage more foundations to support the difficult work of changing the structural arrangements or deeply embedded practices that cause and maintain injustice, marginalization and violence. It is this purpose that links everyone in this room.

We have employed three strategies at Ford to try to increase the number of foundations and the quality of support for social justice and peace. The first had to do with expanding the pool of funders—meaning reaching out to foundations that could be funding such work and helping them do so. In some cases it meant helping to start a new foundation where there was a need and demand—especially autonomous foundations in the Global South—to help reduce the dependency (and implicit agenda setting) by institutions in the North (including Ford). There are several such foundations here this morning.

The second strategy was to assist and strengthen select, existing social justice and peace foundations—but emphasize networks of funds—because research shows us that having a learning network can make a huge difference. So we have funded key networks of social justice and peace foundations—and those networks are all represented here this morning.

The third strategy has to do with supporting a more rigorous and critical literature about this work—to serve as a guide and resource to interested practitioners as well as to drive criteria and standards for what we mean by doing this work. In this effort, so far we have had only minor successes.

There remains at Ford a strong commitment to helping develop a more robust and critical literature about this work and to supporting the development of tools and new platforms for learning about philanthropy for social justice and peace. Of course, Ford will not (nor should not) do such work alone and that is why there are several colleague foundations here who in there own ways will be involved in future work.
So to answer the first question—Why Ford?—the Ford Foundation’s interest in this convening is a combination of prior work, concern with some of the results, the critical need for partners and how we together can begin to identify and then build the capacities that we need to have more philanthropy for social justice and peace.

2. Why this topic?

The role that most philanthropic institutions play around the world—whether local family funds or community foundations in the U.S., corporate foundations in Latin America, European trusts or Islamic waqfs—is support for direct services of some kind—food, shelter, culture, and sport. Our purpose here is not to criticize such work for it is necessary in many places—our purpose is to push for an increase in the very small percentage of philanthropic resources that are deployed to address the causes of the need for such services and to improve the effectiveness of those funds.

Instead of saying philanthropy for “social justice and peace,” let me try to name our end game—what we all want.

Our ultimate concern in our respective contexts (stressed as important in the interviews) is the:

- eventual enjoyment of peace and physical security;
- economic and environmental justice;
- equal political participation and protection under law;
- equitable access to the design and use of all public services;
- cultural self-determination and respect for our multiple identities—all this supported by an accountable state and based on the fundamental values of fairness, rights and sustainability.

That is our focus—whether the terms “social justice” and “peace” are helpful in your setting or not—is unimportant. What is important is having substantially more foundation resources directed to those ends and deployed effectively.

Our intermediate concern is directing more philanthropic resources to support efforts to attain those ends. And we know that there are structural arrangements and hidden practices in each of our contexts that cause and maintain injustice which must be identified, analyzed and people mobilized with appropriate skills and resources to change them. Foundations need to support more such work. That usually goes beyond service delivery.

And our immediate concern is how do we best construct and support an infrastructure whose purpose is to help philanthropy (and all of us) do such work and do it well?

That is why we are here.

This is not a “conference” where “experts” talk. Nor is this a “training session” about how to raise money or have good Board governance. This is a convening of peers who are working in our own ways toward these larger ends. We have a few days to get to know each other and discuss tough, complex issues in a relatively safe space and begin working together in new ways.

In all honesty, this convening emerged out of frustration of spending many hours in meetings with other foundations who expressed a desire to work on issues of injustice or peace—but only to find that they were not interested in the more difficult and sometimes controversial efforts to look at structural arrangements or the favored versus marginalized groups in communities. Also, many of us have encountered similar frustration in trying to find the kind of support that we need—research from...
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university centers on social justice and peace, centers on practice that teach how to mobilize resources or work with boards to these ends, training and seminars that show how to construct grantmaking programs that deal with structural injustice or how to fund work that supports justice and reconciliation in formerly violent communities. Disappointingly, there are virtually no such centers that either understand what we need or who are willing to do the work.

3. Why us?

One only has to glance at the list of participants to feel at the same time both a profound excitement and a deep humility – excitement because there is much impressive work represented, and humility because of the nature of the various struggles that require such work. The Working Group wrestled with the difficult task of determining who should be invited to this meeting. We employed a variety of criteria but the fundamental threshold was a commitment to social justice and peace—one shared value is, as the American writer Maya Angelou reminds us, “From the tender whispers to the painful screams, we hear the same voices.” And then our work in philanthropy attempts to end the reasons for those voices—whispers or screams.

The Washington Post (the major newspaper in that city) used to have a radio advertisement that always ended, “The Washington Post—if you don’t get it; you don’t get it.” You get it. And you represent important institutions, networks and kinds of work,

Key institutions that have or can have an influence on the larger field include foundations like: Atlantic Philanthropies, the Gates, Tides and King Badouin foundations, the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, the Fondazione Venezia and the Sabanci Vakif, among others—and they are here.

The networks—

International Initiative to Strengthen Philanthropy (IISP) which was launched in 2005 to strengthen the capacity and sustainability of local foundations in the Global South & East, diminish their dependence on funding from the North and increase resource flows for work on social justice is represented here.

Foundations for Peace for the unique and critically important work on peace and reconciliation that they do in their respective societies—that very few others will take on. They find great value in providing support to each other, given the difficult and sometimes dangerous conditions in which they work. They are here.

The International Network of Women’s Funds (in the Global South and East) has become a formidable actress on the global stage of philanthropy and their experience and accomplishments, especially on the topics of building constituencies and mobilizing resources, offer the rest of us extremely important lessons—and challenge the dominant conception—of mobilizing resources. There are here.

There are other networks represented here—those that focus on human rights, on sexual, racial, caste or cultural identity. We saw Barry’s network mapping. We have also invited key activists and important supporting organizations—across a variety of purposes. There are other key resources (e.g., GrantCraft) and networks (e.g., Women’s Funding Network) not formally represented, but who have members present.

We have 100 people, but we could have easily invited 200 or more. This is a core, but by no means an exclusive group. We all have important allies who easily could have been included here—but for want of space. The point is that we are here and we share a commitment to social justice and peace, but we also share a sense of frustration and even anger at the state of affairs in organized philanthropy—given the
needs. We also have a responsibility—given the assets that we represent. In this room we collectively represent over $52 billion. If we remove Gates, Ford and Atlantic there is still $10 billion in philanthropic resources here.

4. Why this meeting?

Let me be as clear as possible. I see three interrelated reasons for this convening. The first reason for this gathering is to bring like-minded, but sometimes isolated people together who are committed to using philanthropic resources for social justice and peace to become aware that we are part of something larger—and to encourage the development of personal and professional connections. To build a movement.

As I mentioned earlier, we all share some frustrations. Despite the strengths of the individual and several networks of foundations present and their impressive accomplishments,

- none operate at the scale that we would wish,
- none have the menu of skills and knowledge that we seek,
- none represent the size and power of the social movements for which we strive

So that leads us to the next two reasons for this convening. The second reason is to explore together some key issues that represent gaps or weakness in the practice of our work—not to solve them here, but to have honest, critical and rigorous conversations about the current state of that work. Focused conversations allow us to get to know each other better; begin to see our differences as well as our similarities, identify useful resources that may not be universally accessible, and to bring to the surface topics that groups of us may want to tackle in greater depth and seriousness after we depart.

For example, I know that Ana Criquillon of the Central American Women’s Fund is frustrated by her inability to spend more time and energy on understanding social impact analysis (so does Luc Tayart de Borms but he may not call it that). I know that Albert Ruesga of the Greater New Orleans Foundation is passionate about communication strategies—and how few of us understand how important they are (so does Bisi Adeleye of the African Women’s Development Fund, but they haven’t had a chance to talk about it). I know that Eliezer Ya’ari (sadly not here because his visa was refused) is anxious to have deeper and serious conversations about how this work should address the global financial crisis—(so does Drummond Pike from Tides, but they don’t know that yet about each other). They do now.

We have tried to design this convening so that you have time (if constrained), relevant activities and opportunity to find one another. We have also designed the agenda based on some key topics that we believe are lacking. So we will use as organizers of our time:

- An analysis of state of the field,
- A conversation about what philanthropy for social justice and peace means to you,
- How to think about structural transformation versus helping an individual
- How does one develop grantmaking strategies to address larger structural injustice?
- How do we assess the social impact that we wish to achieve—when what we want is social justice and peace?
- How do we engage constituencies and each other to build a larger movement and construct a supportive infrastructure?

That last item is the basis of the third reason to hold this gathering. If this work is to move forward in the way that we want, to focus on the issues that we identify as critical, and to maintain an integrity and quality that we demand—then we must do it. What emerges from the multiple frustrations are two learnings—one, that philanthropy for social justice and peace is an “emerging field” with serious knowledge shortcomings and we should think about the next decade of its development—a ten-year time
frame, and second, that the only way forward that is reliable and ensures that we get what we need—is that we do it ourselves. In other words, new work must be demand-driven and led by small groups of people who are sitting in this room. Not everybody here will take on a task, but if Ana wants to see substantial work on social impact analysis with tools and training available in ten years, then she will have to find a half dozen committed colleagues who are willing to work together to devise what the key next steps are—and take them.

The Ford Foundation will not take those steps nor will the Working Group. Ana and her colleagues must choose to do that work for it to move forward. We and others can help, but they must drive the efforts.

**My Vision**

The image that I want to leave with you is that of a field—whose parts are becoming more self-aware and that has the possibility, if the work is done right—to become something far more powerful in the future than our individual networks. Imagine in ten to twenty years a real infrastructure for philanthropy that supports social justice and peace.

There would be a virtual Center on Social Impact Analysis that links the Institute for Development Studies in the UK, Shatil in Israel with the Universidad Centro Americano and Addis Ababa, Sabanci, Jawaharlal Nehru and McGill universities. Together they provide tools, publications and regional training opportunities.

In ten years there is a network of centers on resource mobilization for social justice including ones in Los Angeles and Jackson Mississippi for the U.S. (with links to the Grassroots Institute for Fundraising Training (GIFT) and the Foundation Center); one in Cartagena, Colombia for Latin America; in Nairobi and Dakar for Africa; in Beirut for the Levant; in Mumbai and Jakarta for South and East Asia, among others.

In ten years there will be an International Center on the Practice of Grantmaking for Social Transformation based jointly in Accra, Brussels, Mexico City and Mumbai (with the King Badouin and Dalit Foundations, and the African Women’s Development Fund on their Boards) where practitioners can find a growing body of literature in several languages on-line, and training across an increasingly large curriculum that can be used by the Gerhart Center here in Cairo as well as the Council on Foundations, the European Foundation Centre, the Arab Foundations Forum and the Asia Pacific Philanthropic Consortium.

In ten years four universities in different countries have endowed chairs in Structural Injustice and Its Transformation and are providing a new literature available to foundation practitioners. Their work includes, among others, critical studies about indigenous peoples and the appropriate role of philanthropy.

In ten years there is a Joint Center on Philanthropy for Peace and Reconciliation based in Belfast, Johannesburg, Jerusalem and Colombo that fosters dialogues, relevant scholarship and training of practitioners. They offer national and regional associations of grantmakers well-researched case studies and practitioner faculty to educate mainstream foundations in this work.

In ten years the current Working Group will have evolved to a twenty person advisory/steering committee that supports connections through internet, virtual reality and occasional regional meetings. They have planned and designed a “Cairo plus 10” meeting with 250 participants from around the globe for February 2019. Nat Williams and Betty Murungi would be co-chairs at that time.
In other words in ten years there is a **field** of philanthropy for social justice and peace with an **accepted body of knowledge and practice**, and a **supporting infrastructure**. There will also be a collection of fifty foundations globally that fund the infrastructure because they understand the nature of the investment and the powerful social impact that it provides both directly in communities by improved practice and by engaging increasingly more foundations. They are convinced of this argument by the joint research of Ana Maria Enriquez, Lenka Setkova and Dina Sherif who developed a case paper and supporting analysis that shows the return on investment in social justice and peace work.

That is the hope and the challenge. That is our hope and one that **only we** together can build.

5. **How might we do this?**

Obviously I have slid into the fifth question—how might we move forward? What, if anything, will come **depends on the people present**. Let’s say that Ana Criquillion does organize a group that meets via telephone and internet, has shared their ideas widely and encouraged rigorous critique, and after 18 months has a solid and critical idea for a gathering of some of the world’s best analysts on social impact analysis—and its relevance for work on philanthropy for social justice and peace. Modest funding is needed for the next step. Ford or one of the other larger foundations here might well support that effort and one that follows. In fact, several funders have signaled their willingness to consider requests for such help, of course within their regular institutional policies. (E.g., Ford does not fund in Uzbekistan). Atlantic Philanthropies, the King Badouin, Tides, McConnell, and Ford foundations, among others can be approached where there is an intersection of priorities to support some new work of quality.

Over time several similar efforts might take root and grow to more complex and substantive projects. Perhaps there is a pilot effort to establish a network of scholars on social impact analysis for foundations. Some of the larger foundations present (or absent) might support such work. Perhaps several U.S. participants work over the next two years with meetings, planning and outreach to lay the groundwork for a small center on structural racism and effective foundation approaches related to it. Again, over time, that small center might grow—with funding by several foundations—to provide analysis, tools and training for foundation staff on funding work related to structural racism.

Regionally, I could imagine that TrustAfrica and the African Women’s Development Fund decide with their colleagues to hold a regional meeting of African participants one or two years after this meeting to follow up and consider new work in Africa. There could easily be such a meeting in the U.S. jointly sponsored by Ford, Atlantic, Kellogg, Tides and Gates, hosted by the Greater New Orleans or the Hill Snowden foundations. Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, the Community Foundation for Northern Ireland, Fondazione Venezia and King Badouin Foundations might use the EFC as a platform to move parts of this agenda ahead. The International Network of Women’s Funds might well take the lead on a joint substantive venture with the Sabanci Vakif. The Arab Foundations Forum may support a planning effort to identify their priorities across these topics. The Dalit Foundation might well partner with the National Foundation for India and the India Foundation for the Arts and others for a regional meeting.

This will **not** be a large, centralized jointly-funded initiative led by the big international foundations. This is an **invitation** to consider new work. It is an **opportunity** to find like-minded colleagues and move needed work forward.

It will be in these ways that we—**we**—can move this work forward and establish what can become the groundwork for a larger movement within philanthropy, and an infrastructure that supports the funding of social justice and peace by locale, by region and globally. **We have the potential to give birth to something new.**
Seamus Heaney, the famous Irish poet (Nobel 1995) wrote *The Cure at Troy* in which he has the chorus say,

```
Human beings suffer,
They torture one another,
The get hurt and get hard.
No poem or play or song
Can fully right a wrong
Inflicted and endured.
```

```
The innocent in jails
Beat on their bars together.
A hunger-striker’s father
Stands in the graveyard dumb.
The police widow in veils
Faints at the funeral home.
```

```
History says, *Don’t hope*
*On this side of the grave.*
But then, once in a lifetime
The longed-for tidal wave
Of justice can rise up,
And hope and history rhyme.
```

```
So hope for a great sea-change
On the far side of revenge.
Believe that a further shore
Is reachable from here.
Believe in miracles
And cures and healing wells.
```

```
Call miracle self-healing;
The utter, self-revealing
Double-take of feeling.
If there’s fire on the mountain
Or lightning and storm
And a god speaks from the sky
```

```
That means someone is hearing
The outcry and the birth-cry
Of new life at its term.
```

This is our chance to work and create lightning—to give birth to something new. *Thank you.*

**State of the Field**

Christopher Harris then introduced the session on the State of the Field, as follows *(in his words):*

At this point, I would like to shift gears from opening remarks to rolling up our sleeves and getting right to work on a brief but important exercise. I have shared with you my own vision of what the field and its infrastructure could look like in ten years. So if we want to strengthen the quality of funding for social justice and peace – and increase that funding, we need an infrastructure that supports such work. But
what is the state of the field today? How much money supports social justice and peace? What kinds of supporting institutions exist?

We need fundamental and rigorous data and analysis — How much funding of this sort currently exists? What are the related trends? Who is doing relevant research?

We need literature and tools — How does one analyze injustice in ways that identify hidden patterns of behavior and legal/economic/political structures that cause or maintain injustice? How does one design a grantmaking strategy that supports work to change these arrangements? How do I know about the social impact that I am trying to have?

We need training and education — How can I mobilize more resources for this sort of work? How can I best help to organize my colleagues to increase our impact?


And how many associations have some form of even partial emphasis on social justice?

How many research centers on philanthropy currently operate? The slide shows in dark pink those locations with 5 or more. In the US, there are easily 60-70 (well more than 5). How many research centers have an explicit focus on social justice and peace — by whatever name? Despite the considerable density of centers, almost none have such a focus.

Data about funding? One example of a baseline study of funding is the report Social Justice Grantmaking, produced by the Foundation Center (US) in 2005 and soon to be followed by a new edition in the next few months. While some people disagree with the definition of social justice in the report, it is the first serious effort to attempt to name the issue and count the money. Brad smith, the new president of the Foundation Center, and the chair of the group that oversaw the first report, will be here with us shortly.

Where else have there been similar studies? Examples are hard to find but the pattern is clear. While there is a growing number of organizations that offer support to “mainstream philanthropy,” there are very few resources available to offer help in the several key areas that all of us would identify.

Who knows better about what resources exist or go lacking in various regions than the people in this room? In a few minutes, we will ask you to break into small groups and identify what is available and what is needed by region to support philanthropy for social justice and peace. The following people will “host” these conversations:

Africa: Betty Murungi
Europe: Lenka Setkova and Filiz Bikmen
US/Canada: Aaron Dorfman, Kelly Brown, Sara Gould, and Drummond Pike
Middle East: Barbara Ibrahim
Asia: Vanita Mukherjee and Santosh Samal
Latin America: Amalia Fischer

We then broke into groups by region. At each table, groups were asked to:
   1. Identify the resources in your region
      a. Data and analysis — the nature of funding
b. Literature and tool development  
c. Training and education  
d. Organizing  

2. Note special opportunities that exist in your region  
3. Identify, if you can, key capacities needed – and prioritize them  

Latin America  
1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region?  
   - Philanthropy is still seen as a complement to the State, not a substitute for it  
   - In the work of supporting victims of conflict we have seen a lot of learning between countries  
   - Women Funds almost exclusively lead the Philanthropy for Social Justice work  
   - Local community foundations are doing some of this Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace work  
   - Brazil is a good example of the state of the field in the whole region, the philanthropic model is fully traditional and Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace work is relegated to small, local and not yet interconnected work  
2. What is the nature of funding  
   - No strong way to coordinate efforts, not even within a given country, never mind regionally  
   - Church based philanthropy in Central America has had a Social Justice effect that is worth exploring  
3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?  
   - There are philanthropy convenings to which those philanthropies focused on Social Justice are invited, but they don’t have their own space  
   - AWID did a report on the lack of resources supporting social justice work focused on women, could a similar report be done for the field of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace as a whole?  
4. What gaps exist?  
   - Little information as to who is doing this work and who is supporting it  
   - The Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace work happening in local communities needs to be interconnected  
   - We need stronger connections between this work and the Latin American Diaspora  
   - We should interview the leaders who have pioneered the field in order to better systematize lessons learned  
   - We need to have a conversation that is specifically focused on racism even within the Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace work, specially regarding indigenous people  

Middle East  
1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region?  
   - Incredible dynamism in the emerging field of philanthropy. Areas of interest include education, training, children, women, poverty – and dearth of attention to human rights, good governance, etc. Re. Israel – social justice philanthropy is very new. Diaspora philanthropy traditionally ignores Arab citizens of Israel. The term “philanthropy” doesn’t exist in Arabic. High lack of understanding about social justice philanthropy  
2. What is the nature of funding  
   - In the region, a long history of charity but not of social justice philanthropy. Arab citizens/organizations will give for orphanages, women, school building, etc., but it’s hard to convince them to give on the issue of social justice. Easier to get funds and support for visible work (hospitals, schools, etc.) – but nothing to address the underlying issues. Funding for arts and culture is difficult to access as it’s not seen as a priority.  
3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?
The Arab Foundations Forum has been established with aims around cooperation, skill-sharing and networking.

4. What gaps exist?
   - Pieces of the infrastructure are missing including – no one has a model; issue of scale. Just starting to look at issues such as impact, training, etc.

5. Summary
   - Dynamic, young, emerging social justice philanthropy – politically complex context.

Asia

1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region?
   - One table had only participants from India and Mongolia so focused on these two countries.
   - The field needs to address the question: How do we change the mindsets of people? Of people in Philanthropy, and of people generally?

2. What is the nature of funding
   - Mongolia: extremely limited to a very few indigenous foundations and funding is mostly charitable/direct services.
   - India – several indigenous funders, many private trusts with limited grantmaking strategies, many need tax shelter for wealthy; temples with large resources for grantmaking.

3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?
   - Basically limited to folks attending the convening and certainly in Mongolia

4. What gaps exist?
   - Mongolia – no tax incentives for donations, unfavorable legal framework for NGOs and foundations, no social middle class. All work funded through foreign funders. Very difficult to register NGOs as foundations. All social justice work given under guise of charitable. Dangerous to be activist – social change work in Mongolia.
   - India: social justice work seen as “risky.” Much safer to fund services. Gap is resources to even identify what funding is available and is being given in India.
   - There is money, not always enough, and the money that is there generally is directed toward charitable giving, direct service work, and state patrimony.
   - Corporate money is growing in amount, but this is not accompanied by growth in corporate understanding of, or responsibility for, social justice and peace.
   - While overt conflict and violence is recognized by donors as an issues requiring support, the more insidious discrimination against ethnic minorities and indigenous people is not “seen”, and not addressed, nor is what might be described as a “lack of peace”.
   - The structural nature of oppression – the essence of oppression – needs to be re-examined and understood in the field of SJP.
   - The rights discussion has not served to enrich the ownership of responsibility, either by civil society, or the state. This needs to be better understood in the field of SJP.
   - Social contracts have failed, having been inadequately negotiated, and/or disfunctional due to the state excusing itself from responsibility and accountability, or civil society excusing itself from responsibility and accountability. There are two sides to this equation. This needs to be better understood in the field of SJP.
   - There is lack of alignment of practice to purpose in the field of SJP. We deviate from what we represent. We need to remember Gandhi, “Means towards ends matter”.
   - Communication strategies are lacking. We need to use globalized communications to our own ends.
   - The field is missing self reflection and learning – understanding WHY we believe what we believe, and not presuming that we know what each other -- South and North, thinks, and why.
   - The issue of equity is not adequately addressed in the field.
There is a lack of understanding of the paradox of continuing poverty accompanying democracy. The provision of majoritarian rule has been mismanaged, and this needs to be further assessed.

Globalization has led to creating middle class aspirations without fulfilling them. This is not adequately assessed in SJP.

Under globalization, gaps in the field are not restricted to local contextual concerns. We need honest and forthright learning from each other South and North, to find a way to leverage outcomes and impact larger groups.

In Nepal, there almost a complete absence of civil society operating in autonomous space. The educated leave, or are politically aligned, or are associated with donors.

Autonomous space is necessary for social justice.

Africa

1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region?
   - Few actors – Trust Africa and Women’s funds
   - Developing and broadening
   - Understood as human rights. Security and peace – global security
   - Foundations depend on external support
   - Role of International NGOs – they came with resources and crowd out voices of local civil society and they get all the resources.
   - In Southern region, important networks have emerged re. advocacy on human rights
   - Philanthropic intervention in Africa is young (came with neo-liberal movement of the 1980s) and strengthened civil society organizations and now they have waned.

2. What is the nature of funding
   - Project related, short term, based on external priorities
   - Private foundations and international NGOs set the agendas according to what’s fashionable
   - INGOs – the resources follows their agendas, not locations
   - Most of the funding comes from the West. When there are local trouble spots, they shy away from these trouble spots and social justice issues.
   - The funding is connected to certain kinds of political behaviors
   - Funding is secured for advocacy but not sustained (e.g., S. Africa)
   - The image becomes, “If your governments not accountable, how would you be able to be accountable over this money?”
   - Focus on impact assessment not suited for social justice

3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?
   - Conflict transformation funding comes from Nordic organizations
   - Bilateral support (from governments, some from research centers)

4. What gaps exist?
   - African Union has motion but no action
   - Global war on terror has affected civic engagement
   - Long term and core support (operational funding)
   - Failure to address structural causes of violence and prevention
   - Need more support for marginalized (refugees, indigenous groups, LGBT)
   - Support to social movements, esp. women’s movements.
   - No attention to the rule of shadow economies, international business and international governments in the conflicts
   - Affected by global economic regulations that affect commitments around reduction of poverty
   - Bogged down in trying to connect for survival of organization
   - Not coordinated within the continent
   - Research centers are quiet around these issues
- What spaces, tools exist to bring in another generation of leaders?
- Close gap between civil and economic rights
- Socio-economic justice and social economic development as it applies to health
- Structural reasons for Africa’s health issues are because there is no connection between development issues, health issues and justice issues.
- Gap caused by the fact that support for the work is directed towards the outcomes and not the causes
  1. Need to bring together the activists and the policy makers and direct resources there (informed public policy helps to deal with these issues).
- Building health and education infrastructures and prevention issues – this will ensure social justice issues are reinforced.
- Lack of support to sustain institution building – more towards programs (like aid programs to governments, not for social transformation)
- Research institutions are weak and non-existent
- Sourcing funds for Africans by Africans is non-existent
- Philanthropy needs to go beyond businesses (they are not interested in human rights work)
- We need to find ways to become sustainable and marketable.

**US/Canada**

1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region?
   - Networks exist but no big tent institutions for Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace
   - Dissonance between staff and Philanthropic Institutions/Foundations re. social justice framework
   - Infrastructure is an oxymoron because revolution will not be funded and philanthropy is the belly of the beast.
   - How do we influence what we can?
2. What is the nature of funding
   - Tension between public and private foundations
   - Philanthropy is late and reactive in terms of social justice
   - Need to build opposition voice/movement
3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?
   - Informal networks
   - Some more Social Justice people in foundations, but not enough
   - People fund social justice but don’t identify that way.
   - Shared values but not shared strategies
4. What gaps exist?
   - No systemic effort for interconnected campaign of infiltration and transformation of foundations coupled with accountability to on-the-ground social justice movements
   - Little funding for Native issues and Native people at foundations
   - Deep discussions of social justice values – shared and divergent
   - No reflective, connective big tent on our side
   - NNG used to be connector
5. Other:
   - Elite governance – boards of directors. How do we change the governance? Alliance for justice? How do we square the circle? Philanthropy comes from elites. How to approach ROI arguments?
   - Trends: declining role of intermediary (e.g., the United Ways of the world)
     - Counter trend: it takes greater professionalism
   - Social justice shouldn’t be limited to 501( c ) 3 activity.
   - Shadows falling over the field – bad economy, environmental degradation
   - Pressure on funders to demonstrate impact
- Community foundations can’t really be ‘neutral’
- Social justice $S$ not strategically deployed, not coordinated. People wanting to claim credit.
- Increasing pressure by governments to define what matters: pressure to show concrete outcomes.

**Europe**

1. How would you describe the state of the field in your region? AND What is the nature of funding?
   - There isn’t a lot of funding
   - The European Union is a key player in Turkey (and beyond) and does use a social justice lens (if not explicitly)
   - Donor coordination/grantmaking as a new practice
     - More training on best practices would be helpful
     - More exchanges across countries within the region would be helpful
   - The meaning and definition of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace is important. A shared definition would be useful.
     - It is needed for clarifying the work we do together
     - There is a danger of diluting the meaning of it when the term is used differently in different places.
     - We need to dig beyond the term. Sometimes it is best if it’s not called that…we can sometimes get the work done more readily by calling it something else.
   - Is there a “region” in Europe? *(not everyone agrees on this question)*
     - Not yet, although we are moving in that direction
     - There are many things happening – it would be good to lift them up
     - The network of European Foundations is working on the question of capacity on a practical level
   - Power of private foundations…they are not democratic organizations.

2. What is the nature of funding
   - See above

3. What supports, if any, exist for this work?
   - See above

4. What gaps exist?
   - How we use our endowments – the fact they are not being used and the dynamics around this needs to be addressed, including organizational decision making, role of boards, etc.
   - Many foundations are not involved
   - There is an absence of philanthropy in some places (e.g., Ireland), although what there is could be considered social justice
   - Networks – such as around immigration – there is some collaboration but it is not clear what is intended or what the actual impacts are. There is an absence of an explicit social justice focus.
   - European Union funding – some has social justice focus but it could be more explicit and specific. Most of us don’t engage and influence that. There are subtleties to the question of when to engage with the state and when not to, and it varies a lot from country to country
   - Funds are available for social change…philanthropic organizations need to get engaged in making this happen and in determining how those funds are used locally.
   - More citizen involvement is needed
   - Need to amplify unheard voices – those that are not currently engaged
   - There is a lack of support, not a lack of funding, in some places
**What Does Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace Mean to You?**

**Albert Ruesga**

Albert opened the session by referring to the interviews conducted by Nancy Cunningham and Juliette Majot on issues relating to social justice funding. He conducted a very unscientific analysis of the data in response to the question, “What is social justice philanthropy?”

The good news is that the participants agree on at least one thing: that social justice philanthropy needs to solve a certain problem – which is variously described as disenfranchisement, marginalization, poverty, lack of self determination, or inequality. The problem exists not just for individuals but for classes of people – typically characterized by such things as race, gender, ethnicity, caste, or socioeconomic class, among others.

That’s about all the participants agree on.

There are no less than nine substantially different frameworks that participants use to understand the social justice philanthropy work that they do. Each of these frameworks has a substantial literature of its own. Some are connected to others in thought and practice but not necessarily.

Albert gave each of these frameworks a name.

- Justice and fairness – of ancient pedigree
- Social contract theory – of more recent vintage
- Human rights framework
- Etiological or root cause framework
- Distributive justice model
- Empowerment model
- Pure legality or proceduralism
- Re-valuation model
- Creative capitalism model

Participants differed along other key dimensions, as well:

- Strategies and tactics
- Values that they most want their work to bring about
- Proximal or near term objectives

Participants fundamentally agree on the ultimate or long-term goal – a world free from poverty and other kinds of want in which all people have dignity and participate in the decision making that most affects their lives. Even within this broad agreement there were some interesting variations.

There were also some interesting gaps or silences (or issues mentioned less frequently than might be expected) in how participants talk about what Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace means to them:

- Globalization
- Environmental degradation
- Consumerism
- Peace
- Little explicit discussion of values

Albert introduced three speakers and invited them to come up one at a time to talk about what Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace means to them.
Betty Murungi
Betty stated that she is speaking from the perspective of working for an activist fund…a fund that is part of the African feminist movement.

Social justice philanthropy is about three key things: challenging and dismantling and destroying:
- discrimination and patriarchy – especially militarism.
- the status quo that continues to subordinate large sections of our societies, especially women, sexual minorities, and others.
- cultural economic and social discriminations that marginalized communities suffer from.

Social justice philanthropy is also about:
- Building anew, creating societies of quality and justice.
- Building new liberal frameworks that provide safeguards within the law.
- Respecting the agency and voice of the communities that we seek to support in this work.
- Amplifying the voices of those communities – women, people living on the margins of society.
- Building bridges of collaboration b/w regions, continents, diverse disciplines.

Social justice philanthropy is also about supporting the work that communities do to transform conflicts – not imposing agendas on those communities. Conflict transformation work is about enabling communities to set their own agenda about what that would look like. It might be reparations, political participation/inclusion of women where they are ordinarily excluded, giving priority to their own priorities…whatever it is, it is not about funders imposing their own agenda onto these communities.

Mirna Cunningham
Mirna talked about what she first learned upon joining the Global Fund for Women: to listen to women and give grants based on what women want in their communities. She feels that this is very much related to her struggle as an indigenous woman…the struggle for self-determination. Learning to respect self-determination is at the core of social justice philanthropy. Mirna described that she and her colleagues identify four key things about social justice philanthropy:
- Human rights – individual and political. Must recognize rights and create possibilities for diverse groups to exercise their rights.
- Linking – social justice cannot be advanced without linking the efforts and initiatives of different groups. This is how we can build social movements to exercise human rights.
- Philanthropy means we have to build a certain relationship with donors, grantees, and staff at foundations and institutions. These three important groups must share common values. They must value what each brings to the process of social justice. They must value the grant but also the time and efforts of the staff. Building a network for social justice means bringing these interests together.
- Shared responsibility – for creating opportunities for all of us to make a difference. Asking for resources to go to the local people who are making changes and linking them with other groups.

Aaron Dorfman
Aaron began by reporting that in the United States, 93% of foundations do not show substantial commitment to social justice in their grantmaking – and that a significant barrier to social justice work in the United States is lack of adequate funding.

NCRP’s official definition of social justice philanthropy: Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace is the practice of making contributions to nonprofit organizations that work for structural change and increase the opportunity of those who are less well off politically, economically, and socially. NCRP finds that the term “social justice” does not work with all funders. It is sometimes better to talk in other terms such as seeking funding for advocacy, community organizing, and civic engagement. This is what they do. They
believe that holding people accountable is critical so they do some counting and have found the following:

- 11% of grant dollars in the United States meet the NCRP definition of social justice philanthropy. This hasn’t changed much in the last two years. A new report from NCRP calls on grantmakers to devote at least 25% of their grant dollars to advocacy, community organizing, and civic engagement.
- The good news is that NCRP can identify 56 foundations in the US that meet or exceed that 25% threshold already. The bad news is that this is out of a sample of 809 so it’s only 7%. 93% do not make the mark (see above)

An important question is how to get more grantmakers to recognize the benefits of funding for social justice and how this relates to what they want to accomplish in the world. To this end, NCRP is working on documenting the tremendous impacts and return on investment of social justice funding. They have found that $157 to $1 is the return in quantifiable benefits to communities of funding advocacy, community organizing, and civic engagement.

NCRP is also working to make the connection that it is irresponsible of grantmakers who say they care about certain things to not be funding systemic change, including advocacy, community organizing and civic engagement.

**Structural Transformation**

**Design of the Session**

Maya Wiley described what the session was designed to do. When the Working Group was struggling with the meaning of social justice philanthropy...all coming from different contexts, different types of work....the one thing that was immediately resonant with everyone on the Working Group is that it’s about structural transformation.

Given that, the group recognized that they needed to go out to find out what others working in the field think – doing grantmaking, research, advocacy – what do we as a field think? Is it structural transformation and do we think about what that means in the same way? Do we have a shared language for thinking and talking about that?

Last summer and early fall, CSI and Barry conducted a survey and had some telephone conversations. We will share some of what we learned from these efforts. Maya will also share some about her work at the Center for Social Inclusion. And you all will do some work.

Maya invited the participants to take a moment individually to answer the following question, and then to talk in pairs about their answers.

What do you believe is the most important thing to do to bring about lasting change? It might be something you are working on, others are working on, or work you believe needs to be done. Answer this question as an advocate, not as a funder.

**Survey Results**

Barry Knight presented the results from the survey. Because statistics are the meaning of life (!), we thought we might find the answer to the meaning of Philanthropy for Social Justice through a statistical survey. Centris in UK and Center for Social Inclusion collaborated with the Working Group to design and implement the survey. They sent an email survey and got 217 responses from NGOs, philanthropists, academics, business and government representatives. It was not a random sample. We were looking at
whether people were showing Social Justice in their A) attitudes and B) behaviors and the relationship between the two.

What we found was surprising. The respondents split into four groups. Three of those groups displayed some element of structural thinking in how they were addressing social problems and the fourth didn’t. We called the fourth group the Individualistic perspective. These are the folks – 20% - that think people can be helped by pulling themselves up by their bootstraps.

The other three displayed three types of structural thinking –
1. Political
2. Inequality in distribution of resources…manifesting in poverty
3. Systems failure

There was a lot of variability in how people were approaching these questions. Asked if they could do one thing and only one thing…most respondents chose three out of twelve options: make government enforce human rights, improve educational outcomes or get people to see systemic or structural solutions are required and the interrelationships between them.

Those with an individualistic perspective mostly saw education as the route out of society’s problems. The others mostly chose the human rights or systemic routes. Men tend to be overly represented in the individualistic perspective. Women tend to be among the structural thinkers. People in philanthropies and NGOs tend to have a structural approach while people in government and business do not.

This suggests we need an attitudinal shift among people who hold power in government and business. Because these people are not like us.

Maya added that one major thing missing from the survey is that we don’t know how much the context in which you work – conflict zone, developed nation where there is some chance to make demands of government, countries where government has largely collapsed – changes which category people fall into.

Maya then surveyed participants in the room by asking them to stand based on the following dimensions:
- Grantmaking is a primary function of what they do (most people stood up)
- They do advocacy work (many people stood up but not quite as many)
- They do research of some kind (about the same number were standing)

She noted that many people stood on all three dimensions. As we look at the question of what will start to produce structural transformation, we notice that we all do a range of different work, which says something about how and where we need to intervene to make structural change.

The Work of the Center for Social Inclusion
Maya then presented on the work of the Center for Social Inclusion

Overview
- What is the Center for Social Inclusion
- What we heard from you: interviews, survey
- Structural Transformation
- Structural Transformation Questions

The Center for Social Inclusion
Who We Are
What We Do
CSI is a catalyst and a bridge
- Partner with communities and national organizations
- Develop reform ideas through partnerships and applied research
- Inform the public
- Convene stakeholders
- Nurture multiracial alliances
- Support advocacy strategies to promote structural reforms

What We Heard From You in Interviews and the Survey
What you hope to get out of this convening
- Useful strategic dialogue
- Share/hear how people overcome their obstacles
- Common words and definitions
- Possibilities for doing more together

How you define social justice
- Addressing root causes so solutions are permanent; Looking at the impact of our systems. Making shifts at a real foundation level, that start to build long-term change
- Focus on the marginalized: gender, race, ethnicity, religion, caste, etc.
- Movement building:
  - change from within individual/family/community;
  - social relations;
  - voice/participation;
  - freedom of expression.
- Social justice is a lens, not an issue(s).

Activities that are part of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace
- Capacity building for policy and governance; Advocacy
- Pushing policies and governments
- Helping people express their creativity
- People become donors – ownership of problem and solutions

Some things raised are process issues (photo of teacher and students in a classroom) and some are outcomes (photo of Barack Obama). These two things are connected to one another. We have process to produce particular outcomes.

Maya added that CSI is writing up a full report of the survey results and a literature review and will share a draft of that report for feedback with all participants.

Survey results: some of the comments that led to the formation of these categories.

Individual Perspective Tendency
- It is natural to have winners and losers
- Culture determines dominance of a group
- Some children can’t learn as much as others
- People who work harder go farther

**Political Structural Perspective Tendency**
- The government needs to do more about poverty;
- Social and political needs are related
- That we need many strategies to promote fairness

**Poverty Structural Perspective Tendency**
- Poverty is outside individual control
- Crime is caused by inequality
- It is difficult for the poor to move up

**Systems Structural Perspective Tendency**
- We can't solve poverty or exclusion without addressing jobs, education, health care, and other social systems as connected
- Poverty is caused by circumstances outside individual control (more weakly)

**Trying these on for size**
Where someone falls in these tendencies may depend on context. Maya asked participants to stand to indicate which of these tendencies resonate (more than one is ok).
- Individual Perspective – Just a few people stood
- Government Structural Perspective – Many people stood
- Poverty Structural Perspective - Many
- Structural - Many

**Social Justice Definition**
Three factors accounted for 67% of the variance. That is, for a lot of respondents, these resonated as descriptions of social justice
- “Everyone can participate fully in the social, spiritual and political life of society, regardless of their position or station in life.”
- “All members of society have the ability to participate in the creation and enjoyment of society's resources and opportunities.”
- “The burdens of society are broadly and fairly shared and not disproportionately carried by some groups of society.”

**When asked if you could do only one thing**
- Get people to see that our structures and systems must be changed and work to change them for the better (29%)
- Improve educational outcomes (23%)
- Make government enforce human rights (11.5%)

**Structural Transformation: A Lens, A Tool, A Communication Strategy**

**Structural Racism – as defined by CSI**
- Interaction of multiple institutions (public and private) and policies
- Without intent to discriminate – attempts by government or businesses
- Failing to take into account the impacts on groups by race, and gender, poverty
- Resulting in racial disparities/group-based differences

Example – Hurricane Katrina example from New Orleans – the Black community (2/3 of the pop) had a harder time rebuilding their lives. Because mostly poor, uninsured, lots of structural issues of
marginalization and exclusion. Walgreens – a pharmacy chain in the U.S. – decided to invest in New Orleans by opening stores there even though things in the city had not yet bounced back. This was a business decision to lose money while waiting for the city to come back. They counted FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) trailers as a way of determining where to locate trailers. But FEMA had done a miserable job distributing FEMA trailers – particularly for communities of color. It wasn’t intentional but rather a function of the networks they used, where the water lines were, and more. White communities got FEMA trailers and Black communities did not. Walgreens relied on a system that resulted in discrimination.

Marginalization represents what we need to fix and how we have to fix it to get at structural racism. Where we have marginalization – it’s usually group-based, not individual. This tells us where we must focus.

*Egypt Example – From last night’s conversation*

The lens used by the panelists was structural.

- Dr. Barsoum – Rise in women’s literacy and education hasn’t impacted women’s employment. Why? The economy, culture of gender, the workplace, types of benefits.
- Dr. Sholkamy – If we want transformation, not reform, we would need men to get and take paternity leave.

They’re both starting with places of marginalization and using a structural lens.

*Other Examples –

Voices of African Women Declaration – Reflects a structural lens*

- Stop the support of oppressive regimes
- Free and fully participatory elections,
- An effective and transparent process to monitor and expose the role of international financial institutions and governments in promoting and facilitating corruption in Africa.
- End the proliferation of small arms and foreign military bases on Africa's soil.
- Security, safety and basic human rights for all women
- A mechanism that ensures resources are made available to civil society women's organizations by national governments.
- Stronger punishment for the crimes of rape and other forms of violence against women
- Food security be made a matter of national security and the recognition of the fundamental role played by African women in agriculture.
- The participation of African women in conflict prevention, mediation during conflict and post-conflict peace-building
- The end of the privatization of public services
- An end to the illegal exploitation of African resources by multinational corporations and foreign governments

Even when we see the structural lens being used, we generate a very long list of things that are relevant. It’s hard to know where to start. There is never one solution.

*Structural Lens on Mortality Rates*

- Relative to China, Jamaica, Costa Rica and parts of India, Blacks have very high incomes.
- Black men and women have shorter life expectancies than their counterparts in these relatively poorer countries.

So income does not explain life expectancies. It is far more complex than that.

*Structural Lens on Mortgage Crisis*

- Up to 35% of those with subprime loans could have qualified for normal, prime mortgages.
Blacks and Latinos are much more likely to have sub-prime mortgages than their White counterparts even when they have the same income. In fact, there is a larger sub-prime-prime gap between Blacks and Whites at higher income levels. This stems from earlier discrimination against people of color, regardless of their financial status. The fact that the disparity increases with income tells us that the market is not rational or functional. And the impact is global, as we all know from the current global economic crisis.

Policies that Created the Problem
If we’re going to find solutions and strategies in ways that are structurally transformative, we have to look at governmental policies. There are many that have produced particular results. We must look at what those policies produce for starters.

For example, after Hurricane Katrina, a major U.S. news anchor said: “Almost all of them that we see are so poor and they are so black”

Analysis
The interrelationship between power, people, and politics and ideas
Where people live, what kind of jobs they have, do they have transportation, what’s relationship to the food system, and so on. We can’t work on all of these things at once but we need to determine where to start to make cracks in the foundation.

Structural Transformation Questions
- What problem are we trying to solve?
- Who is most marginalized by the problem?
- What institutions impact the causes of the problem? (We force ourselves to go deep and look beyond the easy answers.)
- What do we know about the history of the problem that must be addressed? (institutional policies, attitudes, beliefs)
- What are the possible starting points? (Sometimes it’s not obvious.) Which institution or institutions? Would that starting point get us to more opportunities for transformation?
- What will be the reaction/retrenchment?
- Who do we have to be in relationship with?
- How will we know if we are headed in the right direction?

Questions/Comments
At the beginning you asked us to stand regarding our change theory, social movements was missing. Why?
- The survey is imperfect in that it doesn’t capture all components. The survey is a starting point – to lift up conceptually whether this approach has some resonance for us in our work.
- The question detected ends rather than means and social movements are more about the means.

The presumption is that the nature of our society is good enough and the marginalized just needs a larger share of what the rest of us have. But the society is not what we want it to be in the first place. It’s not just about being part of the power structure.
- We thought we were posing things that would capture something about challenging society but it didn’t come through in the survey

Financial sector…what was happening there was not alien to foundations. We were very much part of that system and we have not examined that. How we invest our assets is very much a question. Yes, we’re all in institutions and we all participate. So examining ourselves internally is just as important as looking externally.
Small Groups
We then broke into small groups at tables and asked people to apply the lens of structural transformation to their answers to the previous question (what is the most important work needed to bring about lasting change) and answer the following:

- What are the less obvious/hidden institutions, policies, or other influences of injustice the work would help end?
- Weighing them, what would be the most important first institution, practice, etc. to begin working on and why?
- What other opportunities would that starting point help create?
- What would a funder’s role be?

They were then asked to think about using the lens of structural transformation and to answer the following:

- Do you find the lens helpful?
- What are its limits?
- What else would you need in order to apply it to your work?

Debrief of Small Groups:
Describing the most important work needed to bring about lasting change, groups described their choice of the following:

- Could you do anything about addressing the issue of people becoming immune to prosecution
- Education
- Gender, poverty, etc. – used as a platform to think about the elements, hidden institutions and policies.
- Religion and separation of church and state
- Poverty
- Lasting improvement in Health care
- Culture of giving and validating giving – models of philanthropy and how we engage with community and what we consider philanthropy, value we place on wealth. Reciprocity, sharing and building solidarity as ways of bringing back traditional ways of giving. Two key scenarios – traditional ways of giving and sharing while inheriting history of colonization. Institutions set up by that colonization. Be able to identify the power that will allow us to rebuild, restructure and develop our own infrastructure. Key for discussion is to identify the values as an entry point to doing philanthropy.
- Issues on children’s rights.
- Building empowered marginalized communities
- Media reform
- Unequal access to justice system in our societies
- Peace in Africa and role of an honest broker
- Empowerment
- Well-funded networked and diverse set of women’s rights organizations that can hold governments accountable.

In evaluating the lens, people had the following to say:

- Very helpful – not unfamiliar. Quite used to do some kind of exercises looking at power and how it works. Limits: don’t have all the control we might want – having more power might be useful. Sense that you can make this process so complex that it can be disempowering (e.g., people at a
local level – could be problematic there). Needed to apply it: more difficult to apply it than the analysis. Talking about the need to involve people, participative approaches.

- Useful with a powerful analysis – possible to be too shallow in the analysis. Limits: analytic moment and design of strategy – possible to have a good analysis and a bad strategy.

- Some frustration with the structure. In choosing a path of structural change activism – role of individual person or funder with regard to making choices, hearing about preferences, capacities of those you’re supporting. Engage in this exercise outside of knowing what this is. May be applicable only after figuring out what people need, want and have the potential to accomplish. Model de-emphasizes the role of indicators based in individual human development, capacities and individual members of the community.

- Limits: vast difference between an African context and US context, different political dynamics. Incorporated into the lens but not limited to the lens. Context will make a big difference in how structural transformation starts to look, but what it produces and strategy may be different.

- Lens useful, though it could be changed. Lens would be useful depending on whether there is a structure and whether the structure is right. Just beginning to dive into the discussion. Bottom line, we believed that we need to involve the people – participatory from the word go. Cannot as institutions engage in this to address children’s rights without engaging the communities are in. Child right committees – parents, local police, local clinic, etc.

- Found lens useful in terms of starting with analysis and being strategic as a starting point – the more specific you can be, the more useful it is. Limits: less about the lens and more about the tools – step between identifying the institutions and the place to start – seems there would be more that could be done there. What’s not being done, missing? Maybe not starting at the most important place, etc. Sensitive to the analysis of the community.

- Analysis was completely taken for granted – assumed, everyone had shared knowledge and we marched right through it. Limits: so many years playing defense – global economic crisis presents an opportunity for us. Are we up to the challenge?

- Used lens without thinking about it – identified a number of aspects. Not easy to find one particular entry point – have to attack the problem in different fronts (reforming institutional justice and empowering constituencies). Combination of entry points. Context matters a lot. Role as interventionist and as facilitator.

- Useful but means matter. Need civil society to negotiate with each other. Question of means is important. Conflicts within a society based on race, identity differences, class differences. Need spaces where people come together, know each other, etc. – coalitions of rich and poor. How do we get to know each other as individual people? Can societies be built on different civilization values – individuals have interest, communities have interest – ideas of cooperation, meeting basic needs but not necessarily human needs. Need new kinds of societies.

- Felt very comfortable with the lens. Context specific analysis. Conversation led us to thinking about power and where it lies – ability of organizations to map power. Complicated for organizations. Economic power and money. Power over information, power over networks, how civil society understands its own power. Tools for organizations to map power.

- Focused on issues of patriarchal mentalities. For organizing women and women’s/girl’s human rights – less at the governmental level (though important) and behind doors/within families – threat of violence has a huge impact on the degree to which we are able to make structural change for women and girls. Found this to be very challenging questions to answer. Didn’t think they were necessarily the right questions. Bogged down a bit in the format. Usefulness of lens – needs to be a holistic approach, no one point of entry that would be the answer – and that context matters hugely. Couldn’t agree to an entry point because context matters. Structural transformation lens is a “no brainer” – the lens we are using.
Maya reflected that it’s no surprise that many would say this is a ‘no brainer’. If the lens is useful at all to surface the fact that we are all thinking about this in very complex ways – may be useful to think about what may be useful to the field to increase strategy and making connection points. If lens makes sense, helps the way we talk to one another.

Heard less about whether the lens is useful also as a communications tool – ability to talk about what we’re about and why people not part of our field should be interested. At CSI, we have found it useful as a language that invites everyone in. Issue about its limits – because a structural lens is not one thing (not one entry point, not one issue, doesn’t produce the same strategy in every place) is a challenge for creating tools that can be used across the field. Probably not one tool but a series of things that are useful to building the field, useful in different contexts and across different levels of work.

Responses

A few people responded to what they heard during the session:

**Rita Thapa:**
- A lot of the things that came out – because this is not a new thing – coming from contexts where the use of the structural transformation lens or work has been my life work – thought I could share with the group some of my life. Seeing increasingly that this work has to be introspective and reflective. Unless you take the inward journey, you cannot achieve. We need to transform structures – all of us – in terms of donors, grantees to make them more responsible. Have to look into our own issues as well. Having worked in Nepal last years – the one thing that comes again and again is that people are so ready to help themselves and be part of the larger transformation. If we don’t make interventions on a timely basis, we all have to take collective responsibility of the cost of missing that. Globalization – none of us have the time to suit our cause, to promote our cause with the speed required. To conceptualize everything in a way to be collaborative and for collective strength.

**Luc Tayart de Borms:**
- White man from western Europe. Must this be transformed into a tool? No. This conversation has shown to me that this type of exercises rae quite different depending on the situation you’re in. We can only confront in the future our differences in a pragmatic way. We think that every stakeholder has the same power – have to look into who has the leverage who can block this change. As funders, if you want to go for structural change, granting civil society organizations. Have to pay attention – back to social engineers, who think they can change society in a linear way. Change is nonlinear. Exceptions can make huge differences (9/11, fall of Berlin wall, financial crisis). Don’t be too much social engineers – it’s an attitude this thinking. Timing is everything – can have the best things in place.

**Garth Le Pere**
- Case study – goes to the heart of how we understand poverty in the African context. Crucible we contest – how development unfolds. Effects large numbers of the population of the continent. What we have tried to do is to try and address some of the problems and symptoms related to how you build constituencies. Process is quite a complex one – we do so at the invitation of and with the support of the South African government. Trying to make the kind of interventions that bring civil society activists together. Entry point is how to promote peace in countries where the fabric of society has been damaged or destroyed – how do raise trust and confidence to allow people to come together to appropriate, as a national project, building a different kind of society? We are talking about structural transformation. Talking about marginalization, trauma, under-
development, poverty, violence, etc. How do you imagine an alternative society? Is it possible to move collectively away from peace?

Monica Aleman
- Wake up! Two key things – indivisibility and universality. Our rights are indivisible. Our problems and solutions are universal. Seek to live in a world with those solutions. There is no one issue that is so unique, so isolated. We are here, given an opportunity – we have to own the problem as much as we own the solution. Structural transformation is about changing structural racism and racial discrimination. Indigenous women’s movement – a lot is happening. What happens now is that those things are invisible to those people who do not want to see it. I have a big job! If my friends are telling me nothing is happening, I have a big job to do. In a world where women are facing backlash in terms of our advance. Donors need to be conscious of that. Transformed in the amount of money invested. In the Indigenous Womens’ Forum, work under self-determination and complementarity. Each one of us complements each other. We have to be conscious that unless we continue to promote a global network, we will not be able to reach that goal – structural transformation. Importance of bringing about change in attitude and behavior – goes deep into our home, deep into our personal life. Must make a personal commitment to change our attitudes and change our behavior – talking about women, indigenous people, lesbian women, etc. We have to continue to promote the value of equality.

Stephen Pittam
- We don’t talk much about failure – relates to the issue of structural transformation. Disarmament – wouldn’t it be wonderful if the UK gave up its independent nuclear arms? Wouldn’t that help the world? Went through a process – if thinking about nuclear policy, it immediately takes you into policy and the politics of the policy. Supported a network of all the NGOs in the UK to come up with arguments for an alternative policy. All the peace groups actually agreed. Got those groups to work with the UK Labour Party (about 1991) to get them to change their policy. Thought we had done the whole process, got the policy, got the Labour committee to agree with it. Hadn’t thought about one constituency. Come the election in 1992, when the Torey party was in a very poor state, the Torey Party won and Labour Party lost. Issue that made the Labour Party lose was the nuclear issue. Limitations, getting the analysis right and the strategy wrong, etc. have to have engagement at the grassroots as well.
Thursday, 26 February 2009

Welcome

Marianne Hughes opened the day by inviting someone at each table to read aloud the poem that is at each table (see Appendix C) and the participants to reflect in pairs on what that poem evokes for them. She then reviewed the day’s agenda, talked about the changes that are being made as a result of yesterday’s evaluations, and made several announcements.

Lisa Jordan introduced Sheela Patel by saying that Sheela’s biography in the convening manual does not capture the incredible work of her organization. Lisa provided these examples. The organization Sheela works with organizes families of shackdwellers in 32 countries. They have leveraged $2 million in infrastructure. They have created 607 toilet blocks for people living in abject poverty. They have used $1 million to leverage $43 million, including $30 million for land acquisition. They have organized 104,000 families and created 52,000 units of housing that are valued at $142 million.

Lisa said she funds Shackdwellers International because they are community organizers. And theirs are the kinds of statistics that demonstrate the power of community organizing.

Personal Story – Sheela Patel

Sheela opened by sharing her six word memoir: Can’t imagine I’m doing this! She described how she started in her work by saying that she was first a therapist working with difficult family situations with mixed up delinquent kids. She worked in a neighborhood center helping women get jobs, kids stay in school, adolescent boys join basketball teams. After watching the officials of Mumbai clearing the streets, destroying the homes of people, she went to some lawyers and put up public interest litigation against the municipality. The organization she worked with wanted to get rid of her for that reason. They were a welfare organization providing services to the poor and did not want to be threatened by her actions. This was the beginning of her politicization. She left that organization and started the Society for the Promotion of Area Resource Centers.

Sheela described her belief that that poor people know what they want to do, and that it is important to find ways for them to say and do what they want to do.

Poor women are at the center of these crises. Until women are organized, Shelia said, you cannot have sustainable solutions. Sheela added that nothing can be solved in the short run; rather, the work is to doggedly go after whatever community women want to do.

Sheela’s work over the years included finding ways for women to resist evictions, get identity cards, and more.

Eventually, she and her colleagues met with the National Slum Dwellers Federation. They were slum activists resisting eviction, but they were also all men. They came to talk with Sheela and others because they had done something that amazed them. They had completed a survey of slumdwellers – 32,000 households living on the pavement. They asked the authorities to make a public announcement of how they were going to get rid of them. And they proceeded to create a federation of communities that faced land issues, aggregating them at city, provincial and national levels.

They are organizers, Sheela said. The idea is to go to land owners and governments and confront them about their actions. In the process, they create capacity in communities to participate in these negotiations directly. Now they have an alliance with the National Slum Dwellers Federation. We have
between 500,000 and 750,000 families in 70 cities and 9 states in India. We’re on every government committee related to housing issues because we demand participation.

1988 – Asian federations got together and developed the federation model.
1991 – Many of us were invited to South Africa by a council of churches to meet with people from 80 townships. My partner almost got killed when he told the community leaders there that even if Mandela were president, the world would not allow South Africa to provide housing to everyone living in the townships. Over time we formed a South African homeless people’s federation.
1996- Shackdwellers International with global members

There was some feeling that the NGOs became too much like the governments. Now we have a council representing Shackdwellers International. The goal of the process is to create federations that produce data about themselves to challenge government data, work on solutions, challenge international assistance programs that seek to produce solutions locally but where money does not come to poor people, and to talk with people like you. Mostly, issues of urban poverty are ignored by philanthropists.

Sheela closed by challenging the foundations representatives in the room to look at their portfolios to see how they are funding issues of urban poverty. Because no matter what you are talking about, she said, it’s all going to play out in the urban communities. Education and community development does not address issues of urban poverty. Most grantmakers have very little understanding of this process. She volunteered to education all of the foundations. She invited them to visit. “We are messy,” Sheela said, “and we make a lot of noise, but we are there and always will be.”

**Grantmaking Strategies**

Avila Kilmurray opened this session by introducing herself and describing the Community Foundation of Northern Ireland. She then introduced Stephen Pittam of the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and Ana Criquillion of the Central American Women’s Fund in Nicaragua.

Avila commented on the contrast between the two foundations. The Central American Women’s Fund is celebrating its 5th birthday and works in the Global South. The Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust is celebrating its 105th birthday and is based in the United Kingdom.

Avila then proceeded to interview Stephen and Ana.

*Note that the answers are provided in the speakers’ own voices.*

**Can you describe the vision and values and ethos that underlie your foundation and contribute to the work of your foundation?**

*Ana:* Our main identity is as a women’s fund and part of the international network of women’s funds. All of these ideas have emerged as we have done our work over the past few years. My sense of social justice is that women of all conditions and identities should have the same rights and opportunities as every other human being. To get there I knew we needed to organize a strong women’s movement. The women’s funds in the Global South are mostly activist, feminist organizations. We know that transformation has three levels: individual, families, and institutions and public policies. We know that changing the ways men and women are on an individual and family level and what happens in our households is critical…that the personal is political.

Before the fund I worked with women in Nicaragua to create public opinion in favor of what the women’s movement wanted to achieve, and to create a movement for changing public policy. To do this we
needed women to be involved…we needed to build and strengthen the movement so that there would be permanent pressure to change public policies.

There are three challenges to creating a sustainable women’s movement:
1. Financial
2. Political – there is fragmentation in the women’s movement, differences within the movement.
3. Safe and healthy activists are required to do this work

The Central American Women’s Fund was created with a core program called Ola Joven. It involves around 100 small organizations in six countries in Central America. Our funding is tiny – only $400,000 for this program. This is 50% of our grantmaking. We put another $120,000 in movement building and leadership training for emerging grassroots groups. The focus is on young women’s rights.

**Stephen:** We describe ourselves as an independent and progressive foundation committed to funding radical change towards a better world.

We draw a lot on Joseph Rowntree who was a Quaker, which is quite important to us in terms of maintaining a strong values base. All of our trustees and staff share these values, which is a blessing. We are aware that this is unique, and a key reason for our success.

Vision – read paragraph of what JR wrote in 1900 when he was establishing three foundations of which we are one. He wrote: “Charity as ordinarily practiced, the charity of endowment, the charity of emotion, the charity which takes the place of justice, creates much of the misery it relieves, but does not relieve all of the misery it creates…”

Joseph Rowntree told the trustees that he wanted them to have total freedom to move forward as time changes but was clear about underlying causes. He wanted all of his trusts to have the need to seek out the underlying causes rather than “remedying the more superficial manifestations of weakness or evil.”

The Quaker values are important. We have to limit our resources to certain programs. Our endowment is now 120 million pounds (it used to be over 200 million pounds). We give away about 5.7 million pounds every year. It’s a small foundation by some standards but still significant.

We have three programmatic themes:
1. Peace and security and disarmament and conflict resolution – we’ve been at this since the beginning. We take the long-term view because we must.
2. Race and racial justice, including migration and integration – we’ve been at this for forty years.
3. Power and democracy and corporate accountability.

We have a strict ethical investment policy. We also have a fund that is described as a venture fund. 10% of our money goes toward things that don’t fit elsewhere.

**How do you translate your values into criteria for grantee selection?**

**Ana:** The first decision we had to make was where our funding would go. There were many needs in the region. One tension always there is between the different priorities of the women’s movement priority. We decided to try to work with young women’s initiatives. The movement is a complex system…our intention was to grow that system by chunks – by starting small and then putting the pieces together. So we have to try many things and see what’s working and put it together.
70% of population in the region is under thirty years old so it makes sense to work with young women. There is public acknowledgement that young women did not have any leadership or recognition within society. Nobody tried to tell us how to do it because nobody else was doing it.

This was a smaller piece of the movement but a diverse one. We knew we needed diversity because of the many differences within these groups. And this is a constituency with a huge appetite for creation, change, and innovation. We are trying to transform a political structure that is very entrenched and authoritarian. We are trying to get to acknowledgement of the importance of diversity and our different perspectives.

You mentioned power and a cohesive group of trustees with a clear ethos. With regard to grant making decisions, does the cohesion narrow your frame?

Stephen: Yes, it might. Because we fund long term it doesn’t mean we fund a lot of people for a long time – we also look for new funding opportunities. We try to be responsive in our grantmaking. The reason is that we don’t believe that as foundations we are best placed to be the motivators of social change. The great social movements have not typically started with foundations. So we want to support people who have passion and creativity about what they want to do. We do have a vision for the kind of society we want. And in each of our program areas we state our vision…with broad criteria for what we’re interested in. Then we invite people to come and persuade us that their projects are worth backing. The process is an iterative one. Staff and trustees meet with the finalists. The process is such that sometimes a completely new application emerges from these meetings. We try to share power with. We think in terms of power with rather than power over.

There is an element of intuition, of giving people permission to go outside the guidelines, in what you’re describing. Do you see as an art or a science?

Stephen: Grantmaking is an art rather than a science. It’s not about logical processes – there is some logic – but the question of intuition in grantmaking is an interesting and important one. Social change is not a linear process. We fund inside organizations trying to effect policy change, and outside organizations that campaign against policy – all at the same time. As a grantmaker, we can be convenors of all these different strands.

What is your take on an approach to social change and approaches such as the logframe, which I call the logjam?

Ana: Grantmaking is a science but not like physics. It’s more like the study of biology. When you have something going on, the whole system is in bad shape. We have to try to learn how to discern patterns in which systems are changing. And create the conditions for that change. Movements emerge and foundations can support the change.

Our grantmaker decisions are not made by staff or board. Our applicants present ideas and current grantees select the new ones. We give support on their terms. We believe that to create the platform for young women will take time. The criteria is about young women’s rights so the groups need to be mainly led by young women and about young women’s issues and have a constituency that is mainly young women. We also ask the groups making the new grants to consider we want to have the most marginalized women in the region be a part of the grantmaker strategy. We are asking grantees and applicants to take this into account and then select the ones that are most important, relevant, and urgent.
Is our standard grantmaking practice adding to competitiveness between our grantees as we make judgments on their applications and between applications?

Stephen: This democratic process is challenging me. I’m not sure how it would for us. There is an element of competition between the people that we are interested in working with. We have a wonderful network of grantees but I’m sure from their perspective it feels different because of the competition. Does Ana’s approach get beyond this? I am not sure.

Yesterday a group said something about mixing the roles of grantmakers and operators. Occasionally we have taken initiatives ourselves…but mixing the role of grantmaker and actor is problematic because people in the field say why not support them to do that.

Our process is deep and I trust it but that’s not to say it doesn’t cause problems.

Avila: we have set aside a pot of money and invited expressions of interest and then negotiated the work with the grantees. It’s a form of community organizing, and it does raise issues about who is making the decisions.

What other tools do you use in terms of added value to your grantmaking?

Ana: We give away funding of about $5,000 to each group each year but it’s also about building leadership and building the capacity of the groups. We do this through the funding process in that all of the applicants have to push their own limits to convince each other they deserve funding. They learn new strategies from each other during the selection process. We then offer a workshop with current and new grantees on planning and budgeting because they have not had these experiences before. This is a final part of the selection. The groups know each other by this time…although not by name – only focus and location. We have a convening to promote networking and strengthen and deepen knowledge of the issues, to exchange skills and abilities.

How do you exercise your role as a critical friend to your grantees?

Stephen: Some of the organizations we fund we have funded for forty years or more. I wonder sometimes what would be different if forty years ago we had told them we were going to do that.

The role of critical friend makes me think it would not have helped. Having a funder that is supportive of and committed to the issues…coming in and prodding and challenging every three years can be helpful. It’s out of this critical friend role that we can think about other things than just money we have to offer groups. For example, we tried to find a bank to fund an Islamic human rights organization and there was not a single one that would open a bank account for them. Another example is our work with destitute asylum seekers…these were groups that did not have sense of the big picture…we brought them together to do a research project.

In closing
Avila made note of how Stephen and Ana both mentioned the importance of being aware of the power they have as grantmakers. There is a danger given the power of money that we lose the ability to exercise humility. There is also a tendency within philanthropy that we act like Moses coming down from the mountain with tablets of stone, probably expensively commissioned from some university.

Avila closed by inviting grantmakers in the room to think of their grantmaking strategies as as a contract between them and their grantees – a two way contract, not like one coming down from the mountain with a monopoly of wisdom. The role of the working group is now to work out the terms of that contract.
**Impact Analysis**

The theme of this afternoon is impact – how do you make a difference. The Working Group thought this was a key point in thinking about how the field could make progress. One of the key objections to philanthropy for social justice and peace is that you can’t measure the impact – takes too long, curvilinear, etc. If accountability was the mantra of the 1990s, the watch word of the 21st century is impact, which creates fear and loathing among many people. To quote one of the evaluation forms, we’re not actually going to talk about it, we’re going to do it. Not just “we” but “you”. The central task is for you to perform an impact evaluation. We will also try and entertain you with a completely untrue story called “Kirsty and the Evaluators”. Will then wash up.

We first will kick off with Albert Ruesga, who will run through some of the **12 reasons no one wants to play with Social Justice Philanthropy**.

- My partner and I were sitting in the Cleveland airport, when coming over the loud speakers, heard the voice of the goddess valium, reclining on a gossamer bed, and said “Mr. Richards, Mr. John Richards, please pick up the White Courtesy Telephone.” The idea of a white courtesy telephone with its strange racial overtones, its irresistible absurdity – as if a telephone could be courteous, could complement you on your choice of a tie – seemed the perfect metaphor for philanthropy. Thus was born the White Courtesy Telephone, a group blog, written both anonymously and not. The piece you read, “The Twelve Most Common Objectives” was a post animated in part by a number of people in mainstream in the United States. Many apply to the art and project of evaluating social justice philanthropy. One in particular, the objective that problems we seek to address are too big, that foundations are ill-equipped to address them, is of special significance to the session this afternoon. We put the objections in the politest terms possible – the commenters frequently aren’t so polite. Some of the things people say (actual messages):
  - You foundation types are the worst kind of dilatants, out of touch, middle class people pretending to represent the poor but completely ineffective when it comes to people on the ground.
  - I work with several big foundations in Baltimore, you people are much more strongly motivated by ideology than strong science.
  - The revolution will not be funded

- These are the kinds of things grantees and others say when they’re off camera/microphone and really expressing a lot of foundation rage. There’s an enormous amount of foundation rage about the unequal power funders bear – and a lot of the rage comes out in the blogosphere. Words are also a challenge to us to demonstrate to ourselves and to others the impact that we’re making so that we can demonstrate that we add real value through our grantmaking work. How do we do this in a way that improves our work, satisfies all the skeptics represented by the twelve objections, etc?

**Table Buzz**

Lisa Jordan then asked people to spend ten minutes in a table buzz, talking about the following question: What are the challenges of demonstrating the impact of your work, the complexities of that – will we be able to satisfy some of the toughest critics we have of this work. How do we satisfy them?

**Kirsty and the Evaluators**

Lisa introduced the story and play “Kirsty and the Evaluators”, a fictional story describing the journey a program officer goes through when trying to figure out how to evaluate their portfolio. The story was acted by the following:

- Narrator: Hassan el Kreidli
- Patricia/Health Program Officer: Sara el Sayed
- Kirsty: Miriam Ali
Small Groups

After a break, groups were asked to look at the case studies assigned, the overview of evaluation materials, evaluation frameworks for social justice frameworks and the modified TAMI framework and were asked to identify the components they would need to commission a Terms of Reference/Request for Proposals to evaluate the case, answering the following:

- Who is the audience for the evaluation?
- What do you want to evaluate?
- Which of the approaches/techniques in the summary of frameworks might be particularly helpful?
- What more would you need in order to design your terms of reference/request for proposals?

Debrief:

In response to the question, “What have we learned?”, people answered the following:

- In retrospect, we wished we had looked at page 157. Learned what we didn’t know.
- Our case study was a multi-agency grants initiative. We learned that this was a feel good project for funders, not particularly well thought out for impact on the front end.
- Dalit Foundation case study – context is recognizing it’s a new organization – setting analytical goals at an appropriate level. Modified TAMI table (stolen from King Badouin Foundation) extremely appropriate and helpful – encourage you to look at it. In case of a five year old organization working on grassroots level, initial appropriate focus would be to pick a set of transforming outcomes at population level – and over time at institution level. In fact, this kind of process could be incredibly helpful internal to the organization – not for marketing to build a case for other donors. As an internal tool, valuable for helping organization plan its next five years. Developed fairly concrete ways based on the case study.
- Went a different route (because we actually read the case study) – talked about the Dalit Foundation, all of the activities it needed to grow into. Needed a public facing evaluation. Thought that while there’s good models, none of the existing frameworks worked for that – but pieces of it (Making the Case, Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment, etc.) Given success of the foundation to date, additional resources could help to build to a different level of scale.
- We used the TAMI framework, for the sake of simplicity – needs to be in terms of making the case, needs to be woven in. Discussion and learning was that the whole thing of impact assessment is skewed in favor of a funder/donor and it’s power relations are implied.
- Did think about the need for different kinds of lenses – and for the need to keep it as simple as possible. Problem with evaluation frameworks is that there are 4000 cells to fill in.
- Just recently worked with another group with the Revised TAMI framework – one of the pieces they identified was, in each box, adding something saying “Unintended consequences”
- In presenting an evaluation to the consultant, do you propose to the consultant the framework/methodology to use – or what? Lesson is that too much of the time, it’s not what you want that you get. Part of the problem is because of the methodology the consultant may use.
One of the things in the play was “don’t trust a consultant to do this right.” The big message was that people need to take control themselves and not give over the power to consultants who may not do what you want – and most commonly won’t do what you want.

Truly important that you own the questions you are evaluating. There are evaluation techniques one can use for other kinds of organizations. For this case, I found that most of the time, it was the donor was going to have the grantee evaluate. Very difficult to have a consultant who understood what I was looking for – whether my strategy was going to work or not. That’s an evaluation of a different kind of level than what the field of evaluation was giving back to me. You have to own it.

Evaluation should be negotiated between grantees and donors. What do we want to learn – and what do we want to learn as grantees. Grantees may want to learn other things. It is a negotiation. The way we are going to evaluate what we are going to evaluate – and the specific tools is basic. Issue we had with Making the Case – we like in terms of contextual framework, but were never able to have our grantees use it by themselves. We adapted it for several of them, translated it into Spanish and it didn’t work. Conclusion was that complex issues (social justice, etc.), we have to get very simple methodologies and be able to come up with three conclusions. Usually what we don’t get from evaluations. So complex that we don’t get at the end what was the point.

Things should be as simple as possible but no simpler (Einstein).

Challenge of the premise of the need to evaluate impact. Make sure that the effort, cost and effort by groups doing evaluation is worth what you learn from the evaluation. Quite often not that useful. Also think about evaluating the larger context, not just the grantees or the funding – but evaluating the field and other things happening in the field and choices being made.

Started the conversation with conversation about the purpose of the evaluation. Rowntree Foundation. Started with the idea that the purpose was to demonstrate radical funder. If starting with purpose, may help you get to who you’re evaluating, etc.

Helps to be very clear about the purpose – don’t have to evaluate everything.

Success of the portfolio is under certain assumptions – interconnection.

Posed a question in our group – final point to consider. Must organizations set up their own internal evaluation or continue to use external evaluators.

- Not necessarily an either/or – always think about own system before thinking of an external evaluator. Cheaper and more systemic and more reliable.

Residual Issues/What Should We Consider About Next Steps?

- Problem of measuring things like dignity, well-being, security. Need collective thinking and sharing about turning those into indicators.

- Reflecting on what’s happening in the UK – huge obsession with outcomes mantra. Risk that the outcomes mantra becomes so powerful that people want to see immediate results. When long term change is wanted (e.g., grant made 20 years ago), important to keep in mind that there’s a real risk with the outcomes mantra – a risk to Social Justice Philanthropy.

- True in US as well. Re. having own systems before going to outside evaluators. Not sure how many organizations feel their internal systems are up to par or adequate. Another issue: evaluation won’t be considered valid or helpful unless done by an external person.

- We are being swamped with the outcome mantra. Feel for those of us doing social justice funding, social justice feminist work. There’s middle ground there. We can get really self-righteous about doing social justice, feminist work – not sure how, but we feel it. We could use a little more rigor. We need to say more than what we’ve been doing.

- No right answer – a range of right answers, which is where we’ve come from in trying to use this kind of impact session – not as the preserve of wacky math people but to democratize it and make it available as a tool on a wider basis. One of the things Karen, who led work on developing the
framework, found was that if you went to any group and said “here is the impact evaluation template you need to use”, the guarantee is that the whole group will reject it. People need to work out their own struggles. Kirsty needed to struggle with these issues – we all need to struggle, but do better than we are. Conversations were very good.

- One of the things we started seeing while taking this framework to different groups, as well as looking at the case studies – the difficulty of deconstructing an evaluation when it wasn’t clear what the project was trying to achieve. Part of our evaluation became how to go back to the funders of the collaborative to figure out what outcomes they were looking for. Start from the front end.

Conversation about what we’re evaluating for – learning or proving? If for learning, does the organization have structure and systems in place to enhance results of work – or just proving – reflecting philanthrocapitalism. Who captures the knowledge, defines what knowledge needs to be captured, where does it go?

**Reception at the American University in Cairo**

**Welcome**

*Barbara Ibrahim, Director of the John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement*

Welcome to the American University of Cairo. Since 1919 this university has been providing a liberal arts education to Egyptian, Arab, and increasingly international students. Our founding Presbyterian fathers were not here to convert people, but were real believers that education was key to change, development, and taking back Egypt for its citizenry. Their guiding focus on social and civic engagement remains central to the mission of the university today. The demographic weight of young people in Egypt today is pushing the urgency to work for better lives. In 2006, I was part of a group of people who felt that the university was a place that could be a catalyst and an advocate for expanded civic engagement and philanthropy across the region (Arabic speaking countries, including Egypt). Social justice is not a new idea here. It is enshrined in the faiths – Islam, Christianity, and Judaism. Social justice is a part of the banners of nationalist movements here and is present in attempts of citizens today to take back reform and change their own societies. Why is the university a good place to forward this work? We use our academic curriculum and other programs, we are embedded in our community, we want AUC to be a model for other universities, and we want to find possibilities for partnerships with other universities in the Arab region. We are a resource for civic engagement and philanthropy. We are a knowledge leader for analysis, facts, figures, and mapping of trends. We just published a study about philanthropy, *From Charity to Social Change*. We will have an electronic database that includes all the material we have been able to gather on Muslim philanthropy. We also do public education and provide services and supports.

*David Arnold, President of the American University of Cairo (AUC)*

Welcome to so many good friends from different parts of my life and career. The Ford mafia is far flung. Barbara did some of the earliest work documenting philanthropic activities of the region when she worked with Ford here in Cairo. Now Barbara directs the Gerhart Center, which she helped to create. The Center is helping to contribute to the further development of commitment to civic engagement, working with faculty to develop service learning programs, continuing to increase outreach as an institution to the community, building to develop the field of philanthropy (especially social change), and developing philanthropy throughout the Arab world. I am delighted to welcome you to AUC. This is the historic downtown campus, which was created in 1919. Today 6,000 students, including 1,200 graduate students attend AUC. The student body is 80% Egyptian and includes 130 other nationalities. The university moved to a new campus recently. Building that new campus enabled us to think about the purpose of the university as we approached our 100 year anniversary and this has been a transformative experience.
Many things have changed about the university, although the commitment to service was there at the founding and was the raison d’etre for AUC coming into existence. We work hard to infuse that in our students and in all of our programs. Currently we are renovating this space to become a downtown cultural center since our academic programs have moved to new campus. We also run an active, dynamic adult and continuing education program that serves 40,000 part-time learners. We are aiming to expand those programs on this campus and to have an art gallery, performance space, and more to create a cultural and educational oasis in busy downtown Cairo. We are interested in ways that higher educational institutions can be agents of change and work in partnership with NGOs and foundations for our shared goals for the future.

**Gara LaMarche – A Foundation Embraces a Social Justice Approach to Grantmaking: Atlantic Philanthropies as an Emerging Case Study**

It is bracing to be in a room with activists, intellectuals and philanthropic leaders from all over the world who are committed to furthering social justice both in the communities in which they work and globally. A roomful of people who work on a daily basis to address structural injustices and systematized violence all over the world -- supporting women’s rights in Brazil and Mongolia, lesbians and gay men from California to Zimbabwe, protecting the rights of Palestinians living in Gaza and the Occupied Territories, and encouraging room for pluralism here in Egypt.

It is bracing, but challenging, to be asked to give a keynote on social justice to such a gathering, where knowledge, experience and wisdom are so widely spread throughout the room, from such colleagues as Nimaya from India, the Media Foundation for West Africa, the Global Fund for Human Rights, and so many others. The best I can do is stand here not as an expert on social justice, but as a lifelong learner, who has been fortunately situated to apply that learning as an advocate. What I know best is my own experience and that of the foundations I have been privileged to lead, and though all but one of the institutions in which I have spent my career are global institutions, I will do my best to avoid the US-centrism that is the occupational hazard of most people on my side of the Atlantic – the ocean, that is. In any case, my experience, for whatever it is worth, will form the core of what I share with you tonight.

Social justice is woven into the fabric of many organizations trying to effect change, whether or not they embrace or promote the term. It is an unspoken objective for many foundations’ programs and implicit in many of the problems they seek to address, from poverty and education to peace and environmental degradation. But why is it so often unspoken, and what are the costs of that silence? When mainstream philanthropy neglects to acknowledge and deal with the way issues of race, class, nationality, gender and sexual orientation pose barriers to bringing about the change and reforms they seek, there is a price to be paid, not only in a degree of complicity with these systems, but most of the time, in our very effectiveness.

I’d like to use The Atlantic Philanthropies as a case study to highlight how we came to acknowledge, and will soon proclaim more forthrightly, what has always been there to a significant degree – the awareness that social justice is the connective tissue that knits together the work we do in the countries in which we operate. They are an unusual and interesting collection that includes the United States, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Viet Nam, South Africa and Bermuda – chosen over the years without a pattern in mind, but all countries that are striving to overcome a legacy of conflict, of racial hierarchy, or both. Social justice is also an overarching framework for our four broad programme areas: Ageing, Children and Youth, Population Health and Reconciliation and Human Rights. We have come to recognize that across the boundaries of these programmes and geographies, we must support campaigns, and build enduring institutions and leadership to tackle structural barriers to improving the lives of people who are systematically and institutionally disadvantaged by their race, economic status, nationality or gender.
I joined Atlantic in April 2007 to oversee the foundation for the remainder of its life. As many of you know, Atlantic is a “spend down” foundation following the “giving while living” philosophy of our founder Chuck Feeney. As a consequence, Atlantic is committed to spending its remaining $3 billion-plus endowment by 2016 and will close its doors a few years later. Since coming to the foundation, I have emphasized the value of supporting advocacy by institutions and movements to push for increased and smarter government funding and support, and for stronger and fairer laws to protect civil and human rights and foster economic fairness. I have stressed the importance of assisting change that is coming from the bottom up, and the imperative of having people most affected by the issues on which Atlantic works speak on their own behalf, in their own voice, rather than primarily being spoken for by others – to use my colleague Martin O’Brien’s good and simple phrase, to be at the service of “those who need the change.” I have urged Atlantic to consider how our support for issues and organizations relates to the role of government, for so much of the enduring, sustainable change we hope to accomplish, ought to have the government be, if not the principal funder, the primary funding partner. (The recent U.S. economic stimulus bill, which has many progressive elements, alone will spend almost twenty times the total giving by American philanthropy in 2007.) And I have pressed to ensure that our staff and grantees reflect the rich diversity of the countries in which we work.

All of these factors are important for framing how we think about our work in the remainder of Atlantic’s life —the problems we target, the tactics we support, and the guiding principles that inform our views of the way change takes place. Though distinct, they are all a piece of a whole. What we had not done until last year was articulate exactly what that whole is: put another way, how all of these elements, and others, fit together to comprise an overarching framework for guiding and expressing all of our work. Like almost all foundations, Atlantic had and has a mission statement. Ours is both broad and succinct. It reads: “to make lasting changes in the lives of disadvantaged and vulnerable people.” Though only twelve words long, a lot is implied by those few syllables: “lasting,” well beyond the foundation’s own life; “change,” the status quo being unacceptable; “lives,” the totality of them, not small or isolated parts; “disadvantaged,” lacking access to what is necessary to achieve much of the good, and even the essential, in life; and “vulnerable,” subject to prey by stronger and less benign forces. These last two words in particular we have had to examine closely and reconsider, as they tend to suggest a lack of agency, tend to define people by what they lack or what they suffer, not by their strengths and capacities.

On top of this, or perhaps behind it, we had highly detailed strategic objectives for our programmes – forty-one of them, to be exact, all with measurable, deliverable outcomes. Yet we lacked much of the connective tissue that could make our work fully coherent to ourselves or others. Between the mission statement and the programme objectives, we said little about what knit together the disparate programmes we were pursuing – about why we had made our choices from among an array of options, what guided our thinking and what constituted enduring achievements as opposed to ephemeral gains. While no single “theory of change,” however compelling or fashionable, can do this, and the messiness and unpredictability of life suggests that it would be folly to seek some kind of holy grail, we needed to fill in this missing piece. I felt both the need for an overarching framework and then an “aha” moment when one emerged, or rather was uncovered, like a hidden Renaissance mural, after being there all the time. It is what we now call a “social justice framework”.

What do I mean by that? A few years back a working group of which I was part, set up by The Foundation Center and Independent Sector, a coalition of nongovernmental organizations and foundations in the U.S., sought to define social justice philanthropy. What the group came up with, and what these two key philanthropic sector organizations adopted, is worth quoting. Social justice philanthropy is “the granting of philanthropic contributions to nonprofit organizations based in the United States and other countries that work for structural change in order to increase the opportunity of those who are the least well off politically, economically and socially.”
The report went on to describe the characteristics of a social justice framework, which makes lasting change more likely, as including:

- A focus on root causes of inequity rather than symptoms
- Striving for lasting systemic and institutional change
- Employment of a combination of tactics such as policy advocacy, grassroots organizing, litigation, and communications that together are more likely to yield enduring results
- Strengthening and empowering disadvantaged and vulnerable populations to advocate on their own behalf.

In fact, these characteristics well describe the essence of Atlantic’s grantmaking, particularly going forward. And some of the many examples of the social justice work that Atlantic has invested in to date include our support:

- For integrated schools for Catholic and Protestant students in Northern Ireland
- Work in Viet Nam to enact and implement a motorcycle helmet law, saving many lives, particularly among the car-less, more disadvantaged population
- The fearless and lifesaving Treatment Action Campaign in South Africa.

This also includes our founder Chuck Feeney’s farsighted support for institutions of higher education such as Limerick University in that hardscrabble city in the west of Ireland, and the University of the Western Cape in South Africa, which open the doors of access for communities of colour traditionally shut off from higher education. Providing a coherent framework to our efforts is not just an exercise in giving clarity to our past and current work. It is most important to illuminate what we aim to achieve in the years that remain. A framework creates clear parameters, and limiting principles, that help to sharpen our focus for this last important stretch. It is a clearer guide to important decisions about not only what we aim to accomplish, but how, and, just as important, what falls outside our priorities.

It’s worth taking a minute to think about the vision behind a social justice framework, to sketch the world we want to live in, because our work must always, in a sense begin at the end. It is a world in which peace prevails against history and odds, and in which respect for individual liberties is coupled with a sense of collective social responsibility for the most vulnerable. It is a world in which the rule of law is respected, not undermined, in the name of democracy, and in which respect for human rights is the basis of policy, not expendable in a crisis. It is a world in which democratic participation and meaningful civic engagement are the norm, and where governments provide a baseline measure of support so all have the benefit, which I assume is universal across all sports cultures, of the proverbial level playing field. And we want a world in which the most vulnerable are viewed as most deserving of public support, not expected to live – or die – on their own.

These are all lofty goals, to be sure. We have both to resist grandiosity and be clear eyed that Atlantic and its grantees are not going to achieve all of them in the remainder of our foundation’s life, if ever. But it is always worth articulating our highest aspirations, to keep our eye on the kind of change we’re after and what we need in our toolkit to inch our way closer to it. In order to make even a fraction of the progress we wish to make, we need to employ well considered strategies that are the surest and most direct route to achieving lasting social change.

As someone identified in The Wall Street Journal upon his appointment to Atlantic as a human rights advocate, with years of work at Human Rights Watch, PEN American Center and the American Civil Liberties Union under my belt, and who still considers himself one, I feel the need to say a word about why the two words we use for our overarching framework are “social justice,” and not “human rights.” I understand there is a strong movement, led by several very good friends of mine, and sparked by Ford support over the years, to get foundations and activist organizations to use a human rights lens for their work. I have been supportive of this, with my voice and with grants from OSI and Atlantic, and there is
much that is attractive about a framework that taps into a set of globally accepted standards and aspirations that bind people and communities together across diverse geographies and traditions. I believe human rights is an essential element of social justice — a just world, not only for individuals, but for communities and cultures, cannot be achieved without their protection — but I think social justice is a more inclusive term, and therefore preferable in a global movement.

In the United States human rights connote for most the classic political and civil rights like free speech and assembly. That crabbed view, which excludes basic and universal economic and social rights, is not as common in other societies, but it is the context in which human rights claims are heard. For too many other regimes around the world, human rights are seen as the opposition’s battering ram, a stalking horse for the west. It is a self-serving argument, a way of deflecting attention from oppression of those within a country who demand justice and fairness, and who invoke international norms along with whatever they can claim in their own cultural, religious or political traditions. It doesn’t signal a retreat to any degree from our commitment to an expansive notion of human rights and a commitment to their steady advancement, embrace and codification, to come to the judgment that social justice is a bigger tent. The same considerations apply, I believe, to protection of the environment and the advancement of peace and democracy. All are encompassed in social justice, none can be achieved without it, but none have the broad sweep that social justice has.

Now, what might a social justice frame look like and what would it mean for our work? To begin to make it more specific, it means:

- Support for the empowerment of communities, and in particular those that are most vulnerable
- A commitment to increase the ability of people to engage in democratic processes
- A commitment to the distribution of resources in order to give people and communities stable footing and equal access to opportunities.

Most notably, a social justice framework puts a premium on addressing the causes of inequities that prevent people from participating fully in society and that perpetuate disparities in power and access, rather than just focusing on the symptoms of those inequities. It seeks institutional or systemic change to eliminate the sources of continuing inequities. It aims to diminish the chronic need for charity by addressing root causes of social inequalities.

Put another way, a social justice frame asks not only who is disadvantaged and vulnerable and what their needs are, but also why that group of people is disadvantaged and vulnerable. What are the structural and institutional barriers that have rendered them so, and what might be done to alter the structures and institutions that perpetuate that condition? To take this out of the realm of the abstract one need only look at classes of people that are historically marginalized.

Of course this varies from geography to geography. Some factors, like economic status, gender, immigration status, age, or sexual orientation, may be universally relevant, while in some locations religious status (as in Northern Ireland) or race (as in varying manifestations almost everywhere) may be a key determinant. What is a constant is that if we do not take these realities into account in our grantmaking strategies, we have no hope of sustained effectiveness. We saw this in the reluctance of the advocates we supported on immigration reform in the United States, preferring to march into battle under the flag of good public policy, to acknowledge and address the racist dimension of opposition until it was too late to counter it.

Indeed, the social justice lens is already causing us to sharpen our programmatic approaches. For example, our Ageing Programme identified more clearly the underlying causes of poor health care for older adults in the United States and is focusing on targeting our resources on advocacy for treatment of chronic health problems which disproportionately affect the poor, and looking at the reality of who
predominates in the ageing population, and those who care for them: women, of course. Our Reconciliation and Human Rights Programme in South Africa moved to focus on using the constitution to litigate in areas where we could have a broad transformative impact, such as traditional land rights where gender-based injustices are deeply engrained. Our Population Health Programme in Viet Nam is preparing to focus more sharply on health disparities among the nation’s fifty-four ethnic groups.

Because a social justice framework is focused on the political, social and economic factors that produce disparity, it is necessary to vary the framework from one geography to another, and its application may play out differently among programmes in a given geography. In the United States, for example, the ideological assault on government in favor of privatized solutions for nearly 30 years, a dramatically changing economy, as well as legacies of racism, sexism and age discrimination, are part of the ground in which all of our grantees in the U.S. toil. The racist bargains that produced the systematic exclusion of certain workers like house cleaners and farm hands – jobs that have traditionally been dominated by black and brown people – persists to this day in the set-up of our unemployment and other benefit systems. In South Africa, our work is unalterably shaped by the continued emergence of that country from the apartheid years, and the systematic disadvantage to black individuals, communities and institutions that is their legacy. In Northern Ireland, the application of a social justice framework might lead us to see all of our work through the lens of whether it serves to perpetuate peace, and whether it supports emerging political and social structures that encourage, over the long term, the integration of deeply divided communities. And in the Republic of Ireland, the framework may lead us to consider new ways to protect economically marginal children, older adults and communities as the vaunted “Celtic Tiger” slows down.

I want to say a word on how a social justice frame relates to advocacy and the other grantmaking tools we apply at Atlantic. While Atlantic’s unusual legal status gives us a broader set of approaches than most other foundations, for any donor, supporting advocacy directly advances the goal of making institutional change. (It’s worth noting here that advocacy encompasses an array of tactics—from public interest litigation to policy advocacy to efforts to educate the public on a given issue. All, though, are in the end geared toward making changes in law and policy, or pushing for the implementation of laws or policies.) Money spent on changing government policy can, if successful, go much farther than funds spent on direct service. As the May 2008 Atlantic Report on advocacy noted, “the Nature Conservancy protected 15 million acres of land over 50 years, but President Clinton protected over 60 million acres with a few strokes of his pen.” At the Open Society Institute, we spent ten to fifteen million dollars supporting advocates fighting the Clinton Administration’s restrictions on welfare benefits for legal immigrants. When they won, $16 billion in benefits were restored.

This seems the place to say, despite the fact that this is a gathering of philanthropy, albeit its grassroots flank, that in our common efforts to strengthen and build philanthropy we must always be careful not to play into the hands of states eager to be relieved of their public obligations. I hear my Irish and Australian colleagues, for instance, applaud the generosity of private donors in the U.S, and the tax laws that make facilitate that generosity, but who would wish to trade, say, the Australian government’s support for the arts, which has led to so many great films and state-aided actors, for the stingy approach of the U.S., which spends more on military bands than all the arts agencies combined?

While philanthropy must be careful not to substitute for government, this is not to suggest that direct service should have no place in our array of grantmaking strategies. In fact, in Atlantic’s Children and Youth programme’s work in the Republic of Ireland, our support of evidence-based models for children’s services has been a key factor in the development of the government’s close alignment with our objectives. Delivering a service is one of the best guarantors of authenticity in the policy realm. A social justice framework would require that support for direct services to vulnerable populations will always be similarly coupled with efforts to affect government policy and spending.
Social justice also puts a premium on building vibrant and engaged communities through the support of grassroots mobilisation and civic engagement, as was evident in the U.S. presidential election last year. Enabling those most affected by an issue to speak out about it in their own voice is central to self-determination and participation in democratic processes. Grassroots organising has historically been an important tool of those who lack access to political power to create change. In the United States alone, we have successful grassroots efforts to thank for many of the protections and rights we now take for granted—from the 40-hour work week to the right to vote to school desegregation. This bottom-up engine of social change helps build healthy and vibrant communities, strengthens civic life and empowers communities to push for change on the issues that affect their daily lives. Indeed, as we now have a U.S. President who got his start as a community organizer, who applied those tactics to his successful campaign, along with the latest advances in technology and social networking, philanthropy and much of civil society in the U.S. are in the strange position of being behind the curve – of having much to learn from our new government even as they scramble to recalibrate their relationship to it.

Litigation, community organizing and public education are only a few of the array of tactics and strategies that may be used to advance a particular goal, or set of goals, within a framework of social change. Grants might support research organizations, communications efforts to educate the public and influence policymakers, think tanks, legal advocacy and lobbying; national anchor organizations, media strategies, policy centres or networks that serve as the “connective tissue” between national and local groups. Of course we can’t fund every facet of this infrastructure, so the questions each of our programmes must ask are:

- Are we addressing the major obstacles to the full participation of vulnerable and disadvantaged people, whether they are older adults, immigrants, the rural poor or others?
- What pieces of the infrastructure to address the problem are present, and what pieces are missing?
- Where can Atlantic make an investment to strengthen the field in order to achieve our desired ends?
- What combined array of tactics is necessary to make headway on a given problem?
- And finally, given the scale of our resources relative to the geography and the problem, if we are ambitious enough, can our investment be transformative?

This approach was evident in Atlantic’s support for the Older & Bolder Campaign in the Republic of Ireland, which mobilized older people to advocate for a national strategy on ageing and persuaded every major political party to develop a platform on issues of concern to older adults. Improved quality of life for older people nationwide. Their efforts, which included sophisticated lobbying and communications campaigns, also resulted in the creation of a new government position: a Minister of State for Older People, which, if properly resourced, will address a range of social exclusion issues that confront the elderly every day. The appetite for engagement that this campaign produced among older people in Ireland led to mass protests last fall when the Irish government, faced with the onset of the economic crisis, moved to cut the medical card benefit for those over 70. It was quickly forced to back down. There are similar examples from the work of every programme and geography, from the Treatment Action Campaign, which influenced the government of South Africa to provide effective medications to people with HIV/AIDS, to our support of the legal team that persuaded the Supreme Court to abolish the juvenile death penalty in the United States.

It is important to recognize, in adopting a cross-cutting social justice framework for Atlantic’s work, what is not included in that framework. As noted above, with few exceptions, we would not often fund direct service in isolation from work to change or implement policy. We would rarely fund research standing apart from a connection to policy and action. There is a value judgment in the approach we have taken so far, and that we propose to sharpen in the future. We believe that social inequities are more likely to be reduced from the empowerment of those who have been on the short end of the stick than from, say, a belief that the core of the problem is insufficient data that all reasonable-minded parties can agree on. We
believe that strengthening institutions, leadership and movements, particularly among the most vulnerable and disadvantaged, is critical to achieving social justice.

A social justice framework, as distinct from any other approach to philanthropic endeavors, is not without its challenges. Evaluating the outcome of social change initiatives can be difficult, and Atlantic has already contributed much through our Strategic Learning and Evaluation team’s work toward sharpening practice and deepening the capacity of the field. The amount of time, money and intellectual energy required to achieve sustainable transformation is significant. And given the sheer size and scope of the obstacles faced by disadvantaged and vulnerable people, identifying discrete problems and solutions that can be addressed through these means in the lifetime of Atlantic can be daunting.

But it also carries many benefits: the ability to focus not only on the populations most in need of help but to reach for sustainable institutional change rather than ameliorate the symptoms and to empower communities to shape their own future. In the end, an overarching social justice framework may be the surest route to achieving enduring change in the lives of the disadvantaged and vulnerable people who are at the heart of Atlantic’s work around the globe.

I hope these reflections on Atlantic’s work have been helpful. Just the opportunity to step back and think about the choices we have made has been helpful, and clarifying for me. May I finally say that in reading the notes from the conversations that were had with many of you as Ford was preparing for this conference, to try to make it most useful to its many diverse participants, I was struck by a strongly felt need, from so many who spoke, for connection. An old-fashioned, or slightly staid way of putting this, might be collegiality. An also old-fashioned, and recently out-of-style, word might be solidarity. Whatever the right word is, it is about overcoming isolation. Working for social justice has many benefits – indeed, for most who do it, it is not about a cost-benefit ratio in any sense, it is what they must do, more like breathing than anything that is a matter of choice. But along with its benefits often comes isolation, and worse. At one end of that spectrum, as in far-flung parts of Texas, where I traveled for years with the ACLU to give support and voice to those fighting for civil liberties from Amarillo to Beaumont, you are not popular, you are not understood, you make the majority uncomfortable. At the other end, you are in danger. We have the full range of that spectrum in this room, and around us in our daily work wherever home is. In thinking together – despite our diversity, and even some differences – about social justice, let us take a moment, tonight and regularly, to celebrate our solidarity. In a room such as this, we are never alone in the struggle for social justice, and wherever we return, we will try to stay nourished by its spirit.

Questions and Answers

I am hearing about your foundation shutting its doors for the first time – can you tell us more about that? The decision to spend down the assets was made before I got there, and came from a strong belief of the founder, Chuck Feeney, that it was important to focus resources now on urgent social problems. There is a debate in philanthropy for which pluralism is the answer and many foundations have made the decision to manage assets in ways that allow the assets to last for many years. Atlantic made a different choice, which at the scale we are doing it, is unprecedented. Probably the founder of Sears Roebuck, Julius Rosenwald, is the only comparable case. He invested in historically black institutions and didn’t put his name on buildings like some of the other big names that we all know from the same period, like the Rockefellers. The reason we’re doing it, while respecting others, is that Feeney and Atlantic’s Board has the view that new wealth comes into being constantly (although not in the last six months). Twenty years ago there was no Gates, Google, OSI, etc. so there are considerable sums of money that have come onto the scene that didn’t exist before. Over time there will be other new donors. Atlantic’s idea is to make a more concentrated focus on resources in a shorter time. Some other spend-down foundations in the US are the Aaron Diamond Fund and the Belden Fund (people from both now work at Atlantic). OSI and Gates are slow spend-down foundations.
How do we overcome the obstacles that foundations face to doing social justice philanthropy? Can you be candid and talk about obstacles you may have faced in this process with trustees as learnings?

In my view it has been remarkably easy. People wouldn’t have thought of Atlantic as a social justice foundation and so I was an unusual choice for Atlantic’s CEO. It wasn’t identified as a social justice foundation or visibly allied with social movements. In hiring me, the board indicated a desire to shake that up and they knew what they were getting since they all read my blog. I give them credit for opting to go in a certain direction. George Soros is now identified as a left-winger in the US, but he is really more of an open society and human rights person with no strong politics. Soros doesn’t quite get the grassroots stuff as much as his foundation does. Both OSI and Atlantic have boards that are very mainstream, including a lot of university presidents and academic administrators. I have good relationships with all of them, but an excuse you hear particularly is that in mainstream philanthropy, boards will not do this, and that should be pushed back on and interrogated a bit. My own experience is that boards have been excited about being led in this direction. In June, the Atlantic board made a $10 million grant for healthcare advocacy. I understand it is difficult in many cases, but sometimes people don’t give even mainstream boards enough credit for what they might do if they’re asked to do it.

Some of the injustices we seek to solve are often consequences of the ways that assets were built and markets are operating. Do you have any suggestions for how we can use the asset base itself rather than its proceeds to change some operations of the market at time when it is looking for new way of operating? There is a big movement in philanthropy to direct investment resources in the foundation to advance the mission of the foundation. It’s more complicated to do that if you’re spending down, but that general trend is really important. The sources of most wealth that enables this kind of philanthropy range from relatively benign to pernicious. The money I’m spending through Atlantic comes from tobacco and alcohol (Duty Free shops), so it is not illegal, but it is not a great source of money. We are doing the best we can to do good with it.

This seems like a well-planned spend-down, but how will you know the impact of your funding since it will only continue for a few more years?

We do a lot to assess our impact with state-of-the-art evaluation. We pay attention, in partnership with our grantees, to agree about what a grant is supposed to accomplish and share the information for the benefit of grantees as much as for our own decision-making process. It is true that we won’t be around to see much of the impact, but I don’t worry about that too much. If we get through this hard time we are all grappling with in the next 8-10 years, and we hope to spend larger chunks of money in significant ways as our time dwindles, we will leave behind significantly stronger institutions and that will be the legacy. You can see impact in terms of specific social gains, which are important and we are involved in some specific shorter-term campaigns now like healthcare, but a longer view dictates that victories of that sort often prove to not be enduring. For example, I have been around long enough to see the death penalty almost abolished in ‘72 and then rejuvenated in the US. The best thing is not to leave a tangible set of achievements because they may not be enduring.

I am impressed by the work of Atlantic on health in America and know you do work on health in South Africa. As we walk across a continent, and you know Africa is the only one who loses so many lives to only five trackable causes, can we entrust you to consider doing what you have done in the US on access to health across the entire continent of Africa, in terms of least supporting public health advocacy? When you talk about social justice, what does that mean in terms of the attitudes of philanthropic organizations to traditional civil society organizations like trade unions (in our part of the world trade unions are extremely important for political change in society)? In the past few decades there has been a strong intervention of philanthropic organizations in Africa, we have had more robust democratic movements, AND at the same time we have had one of the most gruesome experiences in terms of carnage. When you look at the intervention of philanthropic organizations, only Ford has set up a specific agenda for Africa in the name of Trust Africa, which is laudable. Quite often the culture of philanthropy
is to come in and do projects, then back off and go on to other projects elsewhere. How do you propose sustaining what you start?
With a limited life, Atlantic focused on the countries we’ve focused on and felt we couldn’t add ones we didn’t have strong roots in. In the reconfiguration of Atlantic, more space is open for venturesome work that is across geographies and program areas, in particular for human rights and health because they are global problems and systems. Trade unions are not a very standard partner for foundations and there is a long history of that which I know better in the US, where unions can often be important places for social justice to be advanced. In the US there are several labor unions who we partner with on certain issues. I just spent some time with Trust Africa and others and some important aspects of health work in Africa came out of that. I am a big believer that big foundations should work with indigenous foundations by sharing funding sources so that they can have a base in the community that big foundations cannot have. It is difficult for big grants to get to the grassroots, which demonstrates more need for intermediaries.
Opening

Marianne Hughes welcomed everyone and reviewed the day’s agenda. Today we move from our roles as grantmakers to taking a look at the emerging field of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace.

She reminded participants about signing up for this afternoon’s conversations about taking responsibility and action to move the field forward. When we come back from lunch, table hosts will each give a one to two minute headline on their topics and then participants will “vote with their feet” by going to the table of their choice.

Marianne then invited participants to share reflections at their tables about Gara LaMarche’s remarks last night.

Personal Story – Walter Echo-Hawk

Walter Echo-Hawk greeted everyone in the Pawnee language and made the following remarks about his work (in his own words):

I am a member of the Pawnee tribe of Oklahoma. My title name is (spoken in Pawnee) which means “good horse.” I am participating as part of a brand new permanently endowed foundation dedicated to supporting native art and culture in the U.S., the Native American Arts and Culture Foundation.

Thank you to Christopher Harris and the Ford Foundation for putting on this convening. It is my privilege to be here with you all. And it’s humbling to listen to the remarks and inspiration that have been given here. I hope we can leave here with a plan in mind to fulfill the wonderful vision that Chris set forth for us.

Why am I here? I came in a quest for social justice. You might wonder what is an arts and culture foundation have to do with social justice? I will address my remarks to that question. I will tell you about the Native American quest for social justice in the U.S., and how our foundation is approaching that problem as an arts and culture foundation.

Chris captured our quest quite nicely when he talked about his aspiration or need for cultural self-determination in a society that protects multiple cultural identities. This is the Native American quest for social justice. In the U.S. there are four million Native Americans, according to the last census. They are Native Hawaiians, Native Alaskans, and American Indians in the 48 continental states. The relevant social unit is the tribe…the tribal nations. Each of us has our own languages, religions, ways of life, histories, and legacies that we inherited from our own ancestors. We look at the world through the tribal unit. In the U.S. there are five hundred federally recognized Indian tribes. For these five hundred tribes, our situation generally is that we are living in a colonial setting in the U.S. in terms of the economic, social, political, and legal system. Even though colonialism has been repudiated in many nations, it’s alive and well in many parts of the world with regard to indigenous peoples. We Native Americans share a common fate with indigenous peoples around the world. Here in the U.S. our people hit rock bottom in 1970. In 1970 Native Americans were at the bottom of every socioeconomic indicator…living in a racially segregated society…in a society with enforced assimilation stamping out all attributes of Native American culture. In the early 1950s the policy was also termination…to unilaterally terminate the relationship by which Native Americans entered into the union.
From the late 1950s to the present we have witnessed a historic social movement that rivals the African American civil rights movement among our indigenous populations in the U.S. The core of that movement was cultural survival as a race of people, and cultural self-determination…trying to change America into a society that respects different cultural identities. The infrastructure for moving in that direction has been tribal sovereignty…to support the tribes as political entities. My career has been devoted to working on the legal framework of Indian law. We have seen the rise of the modern Indian nations in the U.S., and we have achieved great strides even though many challenges remain.

There are two sides to tribal sovereignty, a political side and a cultural side of life as Indian tribes. This is the glue that has held our tribal communities together. It’s our legacy, our way of life, that which inspires. These two sides are inextricably linked. The entire purpose is to protect a way of life. As we look to the future we want to consolidate the gains we have made as far as our political sovereignty is concerned but also focus on and nurture our cultural sovereignty, our cultural self-determination. The use of arts and culture is a tool to do this…a tool to change American society into one that respects multiple cultural identities…we will use our intrinsically beautiful arts and cultures as a tool for social change.

Our foundation is the nation’s only permanently endowed foundation to support Native arts and cultures. It is our goal to become a powerful funding engine for Native arts and cultures. It’s a radical idea to give monetary and other kinds of support to tribal arts and cultures in the U.S., rather than to try to suppress them.

Internally, these efforts will help each Indian tribe to define their cultural sovereignty and self-determination, how our Native cultures will be honored and perpetuated into the future. This will come from within the people. It is up to us. It is our responsibility to reach within to use it or lose our ways of life.

Externally, the use of arts and culture addresses a structural problem within the U.S. with regard to its relationship to its indigenous peoples. There is an almost absolute lack of information regarding Native American peoples in the world today. Most Americans have not met Native Americans, have not been on a Native American reservation, and relate to us only through stereotypes. This ignorance becomes dangerous. Through our arts and culture and profound spirituality, we can educate America about ourselves and be ambassadors to the world, thereby bringing out the best in people. We can achieve respect for diversity and we can live safely as a culturally diverse people in a settler society in a post-colonial world.

This is how our work relates to social justice…this is why I am here. I want to commend Christopher and his vision to forge a field of philanthropy for social justice. I thank you for that and I thank each and every one of you.

**Engaging Constituencies in Support of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace**

**Session Overview**

Ana Maria Enriquez introduced herself and set up the session by explaining that we want this morning to take a step back from the craft of grantmaking and have a discussion about potential of moving the field forward.
Ana María’s remarks (in her own words):
Good morning everyone, my name is Ana María Enríquez, I am the program manager of the International Initiative to Strengthen Philanthropy at the Ford Foundation. I am also part of the working group on philanthropy for social justice and peace, and together with my colleague and friend Karen Zelermyer, we have prepared what we hope will be an interactive session entailing a reflection and discussion about the actual field/sector of philanthropy for social justice and peace.

The idea for this session is that we will now look at the field of philanthropy for social justice and peace as committed actors (and “actresses”) of this sector and begin a conversation about potentially and collectively moving the field forward.

But before we do that, I wanted to share a reflection about the last two days of our journey. As we started this meeting, Christopher Harris talked to us about the state of the field noting that only 11% of all philanthropic giving in the US (and the number is considerably smaller outside of the US) goes towards philanthropy for social justice which, in short, aims at changing unjust structures and unfair practices. Practices that are often replicated in the very institutions of philanthropy itself. So—as many participants of this convening here have so eloquently remarked—lifting up the “how” we do our work that is, how we practice philanthropy, in this conversation and in our own institutions matter.

We embarked on a beginning of a conversation about what a structural transformation lens might look like, and how such lens, which for some might mean “intersectionality” lens, or gender, racial, class, cast, sexuality, age lens can potentially help us identify the structural arrangements that maintain the causes of violence, discrimination, and poverty, but also, the understanding of what maintains and perpetuate “powerlessness”. As grantmakers, there is an eagerness to “apply” solutions, but Santosh Samal from the Dalit Foundation and Monica Aleman from the Indigenous Women’s Fund reminded us that to make change, “we need to own the problem as much as we want to own the solution.” Some of us continue to be intrigued by the question: if we have a “structural transformation” lens, does it carry over to our social justice grantmaking strategy? How does that play out in traditional grantmaking models versus the models we heard of yesterday from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust in the UK and Central America Women’s Fund, models which in fact deconstructed for many of us, our ways for applying “grantmaking solutions.” Grantmaking: a craft or an art? Or both?

And yesterday we were also challenged by the complex task as social justice philanthropies of thinking about how to measure social justice philanthropy impact, is that possible? needed? strategic? conscious of power relations? Surprisingly and against all predictions by the working group, yesterday we all stood with the task at hand, and did not resort to avoid the “evaluation” question completely. I think that the social justice philanthropy field needs to find ways—alternative ways—to claim to the larger field what social justice philanthropy impact really looks like.

Key new trends in the field that tend to be invisible in the philanthropic sector (but actually are not invisible here today)

In the last decade or so, vibrant social justice foundations from the Global South and East (women’s funds, peace foundations, human rights foundations, Indigenous Foundations) have emerged and many of them are represented here in this convening. They are joining other “players” in the field: social justice foundations, community foundations, affinity groups, philanthropic advisors, and private foundations that have been most visible in the philanthropic sector, particularly in the US.

Today, we want to have a conversation between some representatives of the field while lifting up the emergence of these “new” foundations. We heard Gara LaMarche articulate yesterday a social justice framework that aims at long term change, not shy of taking risks. He highlighted the importance of local
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social justice foundations noting that he is a believer on “large foundations identifying ‘indigenous’ foundations and helping them raise money” because “people in the ground know the solutions to their own needs.” He noted how this model of philanthropy allows a private foundation, to “see from the eyes of the people and the community, and thus have better impact.” This is an example of how local public and private philanthropy could work in alliance. We need more of those alliances!

Denise Dora called these foundations from the South fundaciones del cambio – change foundations, the new generation of foundations (women’s funds, peace funds, human rights funds, indigenous foundations) that strive to redistribute resources. These institutions articulate transformation not just through what they are able to achieve, but by transforming the field itself.

So as we step back from our work as grantmakers, let’s try and have a conversation about our role as players of the philanthropic equation. We have invited some of these “players” or “stakeholders” of the field. We want to talk about not only what our financial assets are, but also about the intellectual and social capital that we bring to the field. For example, we will take a look at the contributions and limitations that “infrastructure” groups such as the Asian Pacific Islanders in Philanthropy have in the field. We will look at the role of philanthropic advisors such as Wellspring Advisors, and private foundations such as Atlantic Philanthropies, public foundations of regional scope such as the African Women Development Fund, and local foundations such as Semillas in Mexico. We will take a look at each of our contributions and challenges as committed actors working to advance philanthropy for social justice and peace at local, regional and global levels. Again, how can we maximize all of our assets? How can we forge stronger strategic partnerships among ourselves to advance our common goal for social justice and peace?

The image that I want to leave with you is the same one with which Christopher opened this convening “that of a field—whose parts are becoming more self-aware and that has the possibility, if the work is done right—to become something far more powerful in the future than our individual organizations and networks.” I would add to that in the words of Avila Kilmurray, “Powerful beyond nature”, as she said at a recent meeting on global south social justice philanthropy that took place in Colombia, “the only limitation is our own imagination.”

We have prepared for you a session that will start with a video where we will give you a snap shot of some of the organizations represented today. Because this convening said death to the boring traditional panel, we have prepared for you a talk show. Allow me to introduce you our talk show hostesses. Two amazing women from the social justice philanthropy field: Katherine Acey, Executive Director from Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice and Nicky McIntyre, Executive Director of Mama Cash. They will take it from here and introduce the guest speakers.

Thank you.

Talk Show
Katherine Acey introduced the guest speakers: Emilienne de Leon, Bisi Adeleye-Fayemi, Andrew Park, Martin O’Brien, and Peggy Saika. She then described that at the end of this, we’ll do solidarity forever together. Asked each, representing different sectors of social justice philanthropy. What are the assets/benefits your fund brings to philanthropy

Emilienne: not only about money but also about capacity-building program and alliances we’re building with other donors to support women’s organizations in our country. We got funds from the MacArthur Foundation – and from corporate donors in Mexico. Different types of resources – financial and from national. Technical and advice needed for women’s organizations. Some directed by Semillas staff – and from the network.
Bisi: regional women’s fund (African continent). Bring many assets – biggest we bring is the fact that we were a product of the women’s movement. Started because we thought it was important for women’s organizations to have access to resources for cutting edge work – kind many of women around were not able to pay for. Have the agenda, analysis from the movement. Have money and a building – but many others have that as well. Another big asset we bring to the table is humility.

Andrew – philanthropic advisor. Traditionally, an individual with wealth would put money somewhere and decision-maker would be in the same entity. Expensive, cumbersome, limiting and heavily regulated. More options developed – could place money in one place and decision-makers could be in another place. There are many advised funds in the room. Means that the advisor and the donor each have a relationship of power. One has to defer to the other to a certain extent. In order to influence that system, you have to influence both. Doubly hard to do fundraising – and two checks on what is actually going to happen. The ability for someone to say with their own bank account that they’ll make a decision isn’t there.

Katherine: Talk a little bit more about that relationship to the donor and grantee.

Andrew: what advised philanthropy can do is that it can take donors into places where they have not gone before. When you’re sitting and making your own decisions about money – philanthropy is governments, churches, individuals, foundations, staffed foundations – social justice 11% of that. The power is an individual sitting alone writing a check. An advised relationship is a formal structure to talk to that donor and to say to that donor, “let’s try something else.” That’s why advised are flexible, willing to go places that are a little risky, willing to go places to get around certain regulatory issues, etc.

Martin: First thing from an Atlantic perspective is that because of the way in which Atlantic has been set up, it has a much greater degree of flexibility to support lobbying and advocacy (at the heart of social justice). Very important resource. More generally, the world of private foundations is a very diverse one. Other kinds of assets which private foundations have – one of which is a convening power. More generally, foundations (particularly large ones) have a lot of power – and it’s often not acknowledged and often not used and could often be put to service of the agendas. Underutilized and sensitive resource. Using power more would mean entering the fray possibly – standing with grantees at time when they’re under pressure. Regardless of whether we like it or not, private foundations have a lot of power – have to work out how to deploy it.

Katherine: Talking about standing with and power relationships. Peggy, talk a bit about the role of AAPIP and organizations like AAPIP, essentially advocacy groups.

Peggy – want to put it into context. We’re talking a lot about US philanthropic infrastructure. Connection to global philanthropy – affinity groups have come out of a history of trying to democratize philanthropy. It’s an unshakeable belief in hoping that we can have a truly multi-cultural, multi-racial democracy in the US. What kind of infrastructure do we need to build? Constituency building goes alongside those movements around the world. Putting together affinity groups is so that we are not intentionally trying to build siloes. For constituency-based, values based affinity groups – binds us together and social justice framework moves us together.

Katherine – Talk about that in the context of values and constituency but what the added value is in terms of the funds in the global south.

Emilienne – women’s fund is in the field, working with grantees, bringing women’s organizations, supporting women’s movement in Mexico – also about building bridges between donors and grantees. Money has a real power in the relationship. How can you deconstruct that in such a stratified social class
like Mexico. When a woman gives her money to a different organization. It’s about money (because we need money) but also all the other assets and capacities we’re bringing together to produce social change. We cannot say that because Semillas is in the field, Mexican society is changing – planting our seed in the relationship between donors and grantees. When we do convenings, you can see acknowledging themselves, respect.

Bisi – agree with what Martin said about the power foundations have and that we need to use it more, including the power to convene. Use convening very effectively. For many years, individual feminists on the African continent have been concerned about having a platform. Started convening the African Feminist Forum. Amazing things have happened. Feminists in different countries (Ghana, Uganda and Nigeria) – starting their own national feminist forums.

Katherine – We have the power of convening. How do we use the power in this room – the power between and among us and take it out? How do we build this field, what do we need to do? Do we need to do more internal work? What does that look like? For all of us, it may have been challenging to work among us. What have been those uncomfortable moments of tension and how you navigated that – and how we can use the collective power.

Peggy: Want to share a story for AAPIP. Three years ago, we did a report on the impact of 9/11 on Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim and South Asian communities. Found out it was the only report of its kind in philanthropy. A lot of funders in San Francisco came together and wanted to create a fund. It’s become a fund (moving into third year) where small grants and capacity building. When we’d done this, we worked with 17-25 organizations and discovered that in the community, these are not communities that work together. The small fund has become a space where these communities can come together. Trying to build the capacity of these communities. Real AAPIP story – why would an Asian American organization host a fund like that. Got a call from al Jazeera who wanted to interview us. It’s because we have a social justice framework. Key learning is that people want to stand up on behalf of those communities that are still trying to find a way to stand up for themselves. It’s the best of who we can be. Gives AAPIP an opportunity (they think we’re an ethnic silo – it’s an access point, but doesn’t reflect the broader vision) to be able to speak our truth and to act and behave in a way that builds philanthropic capital for the broader good. Lesson in where our limitations are and to advance the social capital, intellectual capital and philanthropic capital to build the kind of movement we need.

Andrew: When funders come to a meeting like this, I think the question is “can I be this?” Was head of human rights funders work – question was can I take on human rights, which seems too big, too complex – seems weird to equate my rights as a gay man with someone who’s had their arm chopped off. Are these the same? No. Do I need to buy into social justice? It’s really big – doesn’t have the rules problem Human Rights does. Am I ok with that? Are there rights that are in conflict. Issues around sovereignty. There are conflicts within the room. How do you negotiate that? A funder meeting like this is the second meeting a funder is going to go to – I’d go to the LGBT, you might go to the women’s group. Bigger tent makes it seem overwhelming. Is making the tent bigger an excluding inclusiveness? Is it just too big and I just can’t go there? That’s a big tension.

Bisi: For us to do this work effectively, we need two things – sometimes I have a sense it’s lacking. Need courage and passion. To start a women’s fund, you have to be either very rich or very crazy. Many of us in this room have great ideas, don’t know what our foundation will support. Every time at a meeting like this, have to have the courage to say, “I’m going to go back and make some kind of difference.” It’s so important! 2004 at Toronto Council Foundation. By time speech on HIV/AIDS in Africa finished, tears in the eyes. Room full of powerful foundation executives. People wondered, “what can we do?” I thought, “what can I do?” I knew I had some passion and some courage. Got some money from a
foundation in the UK – leveraged this to start an HIV/AIDS program. Gave over $2.5 million. So “YES WE CAN!”

Martin – social change is a difficult thing to get. Consensus is that the best way to get social change is to work together. Foundations great at encouraging grantees to work together, but not so good at working together themselves. Best collaborations work around something very specific and concrete where something has to be done and accomplished – where there’s a shared interest. Collaborations are built around people realizing there’s something we both want to do. Otherwise, they don’t work. Everyone engaged in social change has to think about how to work better together on specific things.

Emilienne – uncomfortable sometimes – being in such a huge convening and feeling like a tiny, small public foundation. One of the things we’re always experimenting with – when you’re talking about women’s issues, you’re talking about other vulnerable populations. If we are half of the population, why do we always have to struggle putting gender on the agenda? It’s a challenge for us to be in all the other topics but at the same time, it’s a challenge for any large foundation to think of women as part of the solution not as an outside group. Always experimenting with. Moving forward, strategizing together the women’s funds in Latin America. Six women’s funds based in Latin America got together to talk about the lack of funds. Could be a point more of competing than working together. Why not work together and imagine that we can bring into the field a difference and not one by one. Which could be one of the common things? Economic justice and sexual identity/sexual diversity – and choose a way of working where we selected one of our women’s funds to be the one who leads this effort. Engaged other constituencies, women’s funds like Astraea and MaMa Cash – the Ford Foundation has been one of our greatest allies. Total amount is near 1.8 million dollars. This may seem a tiny amount in this room. We are supporting the LGBT movement in Latin America – general support to very tiny organizations to strengthen their ability to come together. Fund is also helping with peer-learning processes, to strengthen their abilities and have a regional meeting. Sometimes we underfinance – necessary that you can support women’s organizations and sexual identity organizations. Mobilizing resources. Some have the ability to mobilize resources at the local level. Also putting funds we are raising from donors. No matter how small you are, you can make a difference if you work together, strategize together with large organizations and look at the other assets you are bringing together from the field.

Responses from the Larger Group

Nicky (moderating from the audience): **One of the things a lot of you touched on is the idea of working together. Obstacles. In your situation, have no idea if you’re working with other foundations. Do you still feel the same way toward the end of the conference.**

- Avila: the Community Foundation for Northern Ireland works with different foundations. Want to check with Martin about shared purpose. We’re involved with the Foundations for Peace network – peer exchange network about how to survive in conflict-ridden societies. We have managed to work together by developing common projects, shared narratives. That’s fine. Also have experience of piggy backing on other affinity groups. Barrier as a small relatively poor foundation is the cost. Generally search for websites. Other barrier is that I’ve started to be turned off to big conferences. Other side is the fact that I sometimes get worried – Marxist over many years. Sort of feel that there is a danger among us that we get so purist and focused that we exclude everyone else. Saw huge number of affinity groups. If we go too deeply into ourselves and don’t draw on relationships, we could lose the plot as related to social change. Go more global and broader. Keep focus where that focus is practical and productive, but put it in the larger context. Like it because it can accomplish broader context with smaller groups within it.

- Nat: Working with others – working together across philanthropy and in relation to social justice is vital. One thing that struck me around the first day’s conversation is that because of the complexity of the ways we have to analyze all the different things we have to look at – we have to
think differently and practice differently. Have separated out issue-based philanthropy is a barrier to a structural analysis. If we don’t overcome those challenges, we won’t be able to fully realize the potential we hope to realize. We’ll be stuck if we don’t integrate analysis and practice. Work with other foundations on specific projects and with other partners on just being together and learning together. There is inherent value in building relationships. What I’m really getting out of this over the last few days is that sharing experience and perspective is as valuable as any concrete thing you may get out of a specific action. This is the time when we have to make challenges into opportunities so we can achieve what we want to.

- Monica – question of humbleness and whether we can afford to work separate or together. Have to be conscious that if we see the ice melting and it means islands will disappear, we have to do something. Shocked to be in a room where we question whether to work together or not, in a room where we are melting together. Another thing that I’m kind of surprised about is – having the capacity to reach out and do double-track fundraising. How am I going to be able to do two-track fundraising? How do I get that database of those people? Just give it to me.

Katherine – The question is not if but how. How are we going to work differently? Clearly there are some relationships that are working here – and there are challenges. I’m not hearing that the challenges are stopping us – though they might be slowing us down. How do we break through that? How do we integrate and have this bigger vision we believe in and go about in different ways, but become more aware of each other. I don’t know how many people in this room knew about Walter and his community’s issues. We have a big responsibility. We don’t have to do everything, but have to do more. Where are we going to take some risks, to really partner?

- Courtney – GEO has been effective at looking at the strategies and practices that lead to nonprofit effectiveness, gather and synthesize and widely share them. Idea is broadening that from nonprofit effectiveness. What are the strategies that a group of us could provide. Talked about convening power, democratization of fundraising, etc. Sense that some strategies and practices that are widely used. Interested in aggregated those and disseminating them.

- XX: Pick up also on the changes we are facing because we do work together. There are foundations – within this room, we have private foundations and public foundations. Some are huge and some are very tiny, small foundations, some based in the North and some in the global South and it makes a difference. How do we deal with the grantee/funder relationship among ourselves. Beyond the amount of money we have to put together into this field, how can we be together taking into account what each of us can bring to this field or to the work of social justice? Have to take this under courage. How do I convince you to work with me if I’m a tiny foundation? How can we be more flexible and respectful of the ways we do the work. Different selection processes, grantmaking strategies, ways of fundraising, evaluation systems – how can we work together and be flexible enough to not be stopped by that? Scared of changing everything we do that we may prevent ourselves from working together. New way of doing things. Working together sometimes means that we have to. Need different mindsets and openness to let go some technicalities that are obstacles to work together. I’m struck by things coming from several places around the room that suggest one of the ways we can get value added is a different kind of agility given different legal, cultural environments. Ford Foundation has a country arrangement in Egypt, which constrains what they can do. Arab Fund for Human Rights is registered off shore and able to do things that get around the law – something we need to keep talking about. We believe as a group in the rule of law, when appropriate. Don’t have to always do the same thing – need an information architecture that allows us to do things more effectively.

- Kwame: courage! Quite often, there has been a lack of courage by most philanthropic organizations. So many areas of factors. One of the areas where I think funders ought to have courage is to look at Africa as one despite the many complexities that exist. For many reasons good and bad, Africa is in a process of integration. Ugly things we’ve seen in the last two
decades and efforts of governments and international agencies are also helping toward the integration. We have two great institutions that represent this interaction and oneness – Bisi’s organization and TrustAfrica. Propose two practical things for funders to consider. One of the things Africa needs is a rapid intervention fund. If you take the women’s rights question, domestic violence is a major cause of death, destruction. Take Congo and the phenomenon of rape as a weapon of war. Area of free speech and freedom of expression. Need some kind of rapid intervention support – for women, Bisi’s organization can host – and for other areas, TrustAfrica can host. Rapid intervention on critical social justice issues. This is important because these organizations are credible. There’s a lack of courage by international organizations – many of the things about capacity and corruption in Africa are not true. Funders as well as government speakers must have the courage to risk rather than be in the framework of Africa – puts rocks on your feet and hands and you don’t move. It has grown, but challenge is the courage to do more. Can’t do everything but we can do more.

- Rotimi: the challenge I have in a gathering like this as an emerging public foundation is how do we get bigger colleagues to see the usefulness and effectiveness of supporting what would not immediately appear as sexy issues? For instance, public health in an integrated way – see the issue of water. Don’t see anyone who would be interested in giving us capacity on clean water for public health. Issues like cholera, typhoid have a big impact on HIV. If you have HIV without access to clean water you are a complete goner – it exposes you to all kinds of risks. These are some of the issues that have the biggest impact on social justice. What does supporting treatment for HIV do in relation to broader thinking with bigger impact for more people?

- Sara: Agility and courage – issue of our governance systems of our foundations. We are mainly staff people who go back to governing body. Another tension – how organizations could be governed differently in order to be more courageous, more agile, able to work together. Tension between building movements and building our own organizations.

- Working together is critical. However, from African context, African Women’s Development Fund, TrustAfrica, Southern African Grantmakers – Southern African Grantmakers greet. Request would be that small foundations that may not have the capacity to be able to fund – see if there’s consideration for that. There is another way of working together. Community Foundations of Canada will be convening a meeting which is a tool that helps organizations build evaluation in an integral way. Those opportunities when they arise could offer another way for us to work together. If the bigger foundations could facilitate a broader network of foundations participating in that – is a way of moving things forward.

**Table Conversations**

After the break, we broke into table discussions. The instructions were to identify 3-4 strategies that address structural inequalities in the field and build a healthy, vibrant field.

- Table Conversation
  - Knowledge building and Professional development
    - Literature as much as possible
    - Basic tenets of practice – standards with teeth
    - Upstream $ is the benchmark
    - Common mission is to convert $ to root causes of philanthropy
    - Specificity and political will
  - Pipeline of leaders with infrastructure to connect them.
  - Convening
    - Shared mission
      - Concrete objectives and goals
      - Group who identifies with mission
      - Strategy
      - Basic tenets of mission and practice clarified and outlined
Language – impediment or helping to identify a common mission?

- Expand Pool of People
  - Synthesize learning and practice
  - Umbrella organization to bridge differences
  - Create a common project or fund
  - Not an exclusive club
    - Thematic groupings
    - Capacity for groundbreaking issues
    - Regional hubs

- Sustainability
  - Brand – grantmake according to these standards
  - Allocate investment – use of assets to do no harm
  - Social Justice Values need to be uncovered and held up – Marker is the $$ you convert to social justice

Table Conversation

- Organizing strategy to show funders they can be more effective in moving their missions by working within a social justice framework
- Build a database of experience and learnings on collaboratives and on the broader practice of philanthropy for social justice and peace. Need a strategy on how to expand the audience of listeners
- Need to identify and manage the power differentials of the funders you bring together to do the work
- Provide many more opportunities for funders to work collaboratively on social justice issues. Need to cluster smaller groups around issues or geography to do this field building work. You need specificity and political will
- CEOs are often more open and flexible than other staff members

Table Conversation

- Sharing information around philanthropic restrictions and limitations and the philanthropic field in general
- Access to build more philanthropic capital for philanthropy for social justice and peace – clarify distinctive role of philanthropy
- Use convening and advocacy powers, as well as grantmaking
- Grantmaking procedures must be more iterative because social justice is a process
- Work on the ground with victims of injustice and oppression regarding their role as agents of change and link with philanthropic institutions
- Convene people to learn from those who are willing to talk about their failures – what has not worked, what has been missing
- Invest in networks
- Funders’ collaboratives

Table Conversation

- Support/strengthen and learn together with existing networks (e.g., the Funding Network, FFP, etc.)
- Build a strategy for mutual learnings, understanding through crossing the borders/divide through communications
- Globalize good practices, policies, strategies on Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace
- Convert non-Social Justice Philanthropy money to Social Justice Philanthropy
- What is philanthropy without social justice?
- First strategy is to see how to convince/radicalize others
- Mutual respect between funders
  - Exchange between grantseekers and givers
  - Global rotation so phil. Staff can see what it’s like
Strengthen learning network while ensuring autonomy – affinity group on social justice

Mechanism for cataloging common, global problems

When we form strategies, how do we leverage them to go farther?

Transforming philanthropy is harder nut to crack
  - N-S gaps
  - Difference between public and private

People are on the verge of a change – speed of globalization has made infrastructure building difficult
  - There is no time to work out structures (e.g., communication highway limits in Nepal – 16 hour power cut off)
  - Problem: knowledge limits for those who work in specific locales.

Size should not matter – Even if we don’t have $$, we have ideas, passion, experience.

Governance issues

Table Conversation
  - Field → movement. Objective is to enhance. Common mission → mindset

Structural inequities
  - Education to be self-aware
  - Networking
  - Democratizing access to resources

Strategies
  - Regional networking: umbrella institutions creating and building and democratizing access to resources – cross conversations, rapid responses
  - Philanthropy in the spirit of partnership – use of convening power to bring diverse groups together under the framework of social justice philanthropy
  - Capacity within the field to be self aware – to network and democratize resources – governance structures, gaps and learning – built potentials
  - Opportunities for voices (voices most impacted) – agents of change involvement, new technologies

Table Conversation
  - Creating “pairing” relationships at the individual level or small groups (old with new, north with south, small with large) to build understanding and capacity, social capital to influence change
    - Around conferences
    - Engage practitioners and NGOs
  - Create a fund of peer funders whose criteria for access is developed by the field of practitioners
  - Pooleed funds that are inclusive of a spectrum of types of funders so a range of perspectives and strategies are included
  - Info on the nature and potential of partnerships with “intermediaries” – clarify the actual added value of these institutions and relationships
  - Create a space that fosters networks, relationships and info development with the social justice frame that can inform domestic and global philanthropy. Use contemporary as well as traditional tools.

Table Conversation
  - Increase the ability of social justice public foundations to engage and raise funds directly from affected or marginalized communities
  - Build a pipeline of social justice philanthropy advocates who can move into program officer and CEO positions. Include intentional mentoring and cultivation of those leaders.
  - Share knowledge and information among social justice philanthropy advocates. Keep it updated regularly. Share south to south, not just north to south.
- Develop a strategy to influence trustees to support social justice. Also diversify trustees. Use peer influence and stories and case studies
- Organize ourselves to nurture personal connections, regional connections and international connections

**Table Conversation**
- Action plan with clear message & communication
  - New philanthropic message to respond to the economic crisis. Make an opportunity of the crisis. Be aware of media opportunities
- Regional action plans, relevant to culturally specific contexts.
  - Resources to support this.
  - Possible help line point of contact/inquiry on the website
  - Need not use social justice terminology if not appropriate
  - Be conscious of what is there
- Need to develop a strategy around support for infrastructure organizations where there is limited infrastructure in order to raise social justice with new donors – but rationalize existing affinity linkages
- Need serious resources for local philanthropy for social justice
- Remain conscious of power dynamics and inter/intra-organizational level.

**Table Conversation**
- Build something global linked to smaller groups based on issue, region, country
- What are the goals of such a field?
  - Building and engaging more people and organizations – changing mindsets and behavior
  - Demonstration of different impacts of this kind of philanthropy (making the case)
  - Sharing of strategies and perspectives/knowledge
  - Courage to be larger political actors (in a concerted and coordinated way)
- Difference between the “bottom up” funds that raise money and the “few” big piles of money (Kellogg, FF, Atlantic)
- The tension between taxing the rich (does this reduce philanthropy?) and more philanthropy

**Table Conversation**
- Accountability within foundations – ethical investments/shareholder actions
  - Sharing information and strategies about how individual foundations have dealt with this successfully
  - Networking/learning among chairs of foundation financial investment committees
- Develop the website with additional resources/information/profiles
- Help us understand the component parts of social justice philanthropy (knowing about the different funds in the Global South, for example) more opportunities for learning about each others’ contexts and work, opportunities for mutual support; sharing of tools, strategies, information, lessons learned
- Encouraging large foundations to help build the field of social justice philanthropy by supporting local/regional funds at geographic levels, but also around key themes across geographies (e.g., climate change, global governance, etc.)
- Develop mechanisms for international support by foundations and affinity groups around issues (e.g., LGBT) that are too sensitive to treat/deal with locally

**Debrief**
- Common mission - to convert dollars from dollars going to non-social justice issues to social justice issues.
• Professional development, research
• Basic tenets of practice that people can find themselves in – with standard of what social justice philanthropy looks like.
• Sharing information around philanthropic descriptions and limitations.
• Access and building more philanthropic capital for social justice and peace agendas
• Use convening ans well as grantmaking power
• Look at procedures of grantmaking and make them more iterative – about process issues as well as results
• Victims of injustice and link them to
• Include people willing to talk about failures
• Invest in networks
• Build funder collaboratives
• Identify and acknowledge and manage the power issues in any collaborative effort
• Look for ways to create mechanisms that are appealing to donors and give them a way to work on areas of substantive interest to them.
• Think about ways to connect the learning about effective collaboration with the desire of others to learn
• Increase the ability of social justice public foundations to engage and raise funds directly from marginalized communities
• Pipeline of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace advocates who can move into Program Officer and CEO positions – mentoring and cultivation
• Sharing knowledge among Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace advocates – keep updated regularly. South to South
• Develop a strategy to influence trustees around supporting Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace – diversify trustees, use stories and case studies
• Organize ourselves to nurture personal connections, regional connections and international connections.
• Develop accountability within foundations
  o Share info and strategies about how foundations can do that
  o Develop mechanisms for network learning among chairs and financial investment committees
• Encourage larger foundations to support local and regional funds at geographic levels (e.g., underfunded areas, climate change, etc.)
• Nanny 9-1-1. Social Philanthropy 9-1-1, where a group of people can come in to a philanthropy, look at mission statement, programs and let them know that it sucks – talk to board, ED, should get together with another foundation. SWAT Team to come in and help, leave some place to implement.
• Clear message, communication – new philanthropic message around social justice to take account of the opportunity around the economic crisis. Should have a journalist here.
• Have to be relevant to specific culture/contexts. Social Justice language not always appropriate. Also need to be conscious of what’s there. Established indigenous groups. Contact inquiry offered through the website
• Strategy around support, infrastructure organizations to raise social justice with new donors. Need not be millionaires – can be broader donation base. Also rationalize existing affinity groups.
• Remain conscious of power dynamics of inter and intra-organizational levels
• Serious issue will need serious resources – should not be absolved. Needs to be by example re. showing social justice initiatives at ground level.
• Don’t agree with dollars going to non-social justice moving – people desperately need services, so we can’t take those dollars away. I would suggest that we expand the funding base and funding goes both to social justice and to much-needed services.
  o In terms of the service, ways to think creatively about ways to do the service and advocacy/organizing from it. Not abandoning service need, but looking at a broader approach.
  o Interesting taxonomy questions. Is climate change a social justice issue? What about public health issues?
• A lot is in context.
• Re. affinity groups – about six years ago, did create a network of affinity groups.
• Purpose:
  o Engaging more people in organizations and change mind, heart, practice – engagement of new actors
  o Demonstrate different impacts – making the case
  o Be courageous in relation to larger political actors
  o Sharing of perspectives
• Courage –
• Be self-critical and honest about our work individually and together as we build this field.
• We’re all going to sink together, so we better figure out how to work together
• I increasingly think, from view of movement-building versus organization-building, transactional versus transformational – need to figure out how to get outside of the box. We’re working within 20th century institutional structures in a very new time.

Taking Leadership in Support of a New Field
Christopher Harris described that in order to move things forward beyond Cairo, we will spend the rest of the time in self-organized groups, talking about taking leadership in different areas.

People proposed the following topics:
- Lenka Setkova: I’m kind of hoping that the current financial and economic crisis is one of the biggest opportunities for social justice philanthropy, imagining that this window will last from 6 months to a year, what can we do to influence how the financial sector will evolve.
- Michael Roberts: Philanthropy for indigenous and disenfranchised groups can’t be built on the model that disenfranchised us in the first place, what are the models that we need?
- Sheila Patel: I want to invite you to come and explore the potential of working on social justice especially in cities which is where the poor people will be living in the next 20 years, ranging from climate to health and we don’t have any infrastructure
- Anmol Vellani: There is an older discourse of philanthropy that is a positivist discourse, and if you talk to your constituency in this way you will alienate them. Eric Dolphy, saxophonist would not have talked about needs, he would have talked about desire and creating cognitive dissonance and this is tied to the social justice discourse, we need more people from the arts in this room, how will we enrich this discourse. I want to think about a larger coalition of people
- Mark Rosenman: Much of philanthropy does not identify with our call for the last 20 years for social justice funding and I want to talk about how do we approach this as organizers, meeting people where they are, the movable middle, without requiring them to first subscribe to our language
- Bisi Adeleye-Fayemi: How can we strengthen an infrastructure for philanthropy in the African continent.
- Sarah Gould: What would a larger network begin to look like, it would be a brainstorming session, synthesizing what we heard this morning
Albert Ruesga: The idea here was that you do an analysis of your context and different approaches to solve an issue and then a miracle happens and you have a strategy, so we are going to look at into how does the miracle happen, it is a question, I don’t have the answer – how to move from structural analysis to strategy

Nicky McIntyre: A discussion about how to forward philanthropy for social justice and peace specially looking at the relationship between private and public foundations – resource mobilization and fundraising

Courtney Bourns: Picking up on the field building piece that is about knowledge and practice

Ana Criquillon: Continuing the conversation about impact evaluation, we all need it and we think that it is possible to measure the impact. There is still a disconnect between the entrepreneurship some of us are doing and the planning and evaluation tools that we have, I would like to continue exploring more about this disconnection and how we can overcome that, applying complexity science to our field.

African Grantmaking Infrastructure

The group talking about African Grantmaking Infrastructure agreed on the following:

- The proposed AGN is an idea whose time has come. This network will be a critical voice in strengthening philanthropic activity in Africa.
- The proposed AGN, as has been conceptualized by the conveners (Trust Africa, AWDF and KCDF) hopes to achieve the following:
  - Be a space for peer learning and information
  - Develop shared grantmaking perspectives and good practice
  - Joint resource mobilization efforts
  - Advocacy and awareness raising with international partners
- The AGN meeting will take place in May 2009

The Arts

- Two ways of thinking about arts and philanthropy for social justice and peace
  - What do the arts do?
  - What sort of assets to they represent?
- One form of resistance (e.g., Russia, SA) → solidarity and protest
- Arts validate the marginalized, get people to think about their own lives in different ways
- Arts amplify voices of those who have been denied voice (e.g., women’s work songs, sining to each other – embedded in these is a critique of patriarchy)
- Assets
  - Arts is a key asset for poor communities
    - Way or creating income
    - Way of being seen
- We think of race, gender, etc. when thinking of discrimination
- Most arts support in India comes from development lens or corporate lens or state lens
- Reduction of artist to an economic player
- Arts funding is very low, e.g., 15% of budget in India on the arts. 80% of this is on own dysfunctional arts structures.
- Arts sector is divided, individualistic, competitive, etc. Need them to own their problems.
- In India, trying to bring them together to agree on some common issues/approaches.
- Some art is not connected with social justice.
- Art as a hammer, not just a mirror (with apologies to Brecht)
- Need to be careful in defining center in art as elitist. All elements of expression from opera to small community-based plays are valuable.
Endemic problem in our sector where we don’t have the language, the discourse. We are consistently deconstructing – we haven’t been able to build a movement. Why are we unable to present valid points we can take action on?

Arts in crisis about what its meaning is – it’s been separated out from the rest of life (e.g., Native American culture). In some cultures, there’s no word for art but for walking or balance. Wanted to have this conversation with the de-Westernizing one! This wouldn’t hold true for lots of the arts in India. There is not the same disjuncture between art and life in India.

Need to start conversations/dialogue on the arts in smaller, local contexts – and then move it out to bigger contexts. So how do we create forums for art practitioners to be together? Need to be forums that they own, that they trust.

It’s a newly emerging sector – especially arts. We feel isolated – and yes, we need tools to help us. (Fairooz)

Do artists want to be in forums where they discuss social justice? Can they generate this? Do they need to do it with others?

In India, where four artists had a discourse with each other over 18 months by responding to each other. Idea came not from them but from an enabler. It was very moving (Sithie).

It’s a voice, a testimony – a way of sharing.

Maybe our task is to provide such opportunities for artists. We need to support art for arts sake, especially in repressed communities (e.g., in Native America, most families have many art activities within them).

Art and culture is the voice and spirit of a people. It’s important to share these with other people, communities, etc.

In Native American, often only had our spiritual power – everything else was taken.

I would encourage a social justice lens in the work we do. Create a funnel or informal bridge.

Art should not be a silent forum – it should speak, it has a voice and it has been silent. It’s an important source of expressing people’s inner discontent.

Maybe we should focus on professionals in this field who are interested and ready to be more active/vocal – to produce work that is more powerful. We should start with those who are already eager – build a movement with them.

How do we impact other sectors (people in communities work on poverty, HR, women’s issues, etc.)? How many people in our sector know about other sectors? It’s problematic.

Arts processes as well as productions make a contribution to social justice.

Children get alienated from their schooling – art can be used here.

Victims of violence can use art as a way of healing

We don’t know how to speak about, explain the contribution that arts can make. We are not good at this.

Art to help with healing has been well recognized. It has a fundamental role in our lives.

The art and the artist. Artists may wear many hats. Maybe our lesson is not taking account of this complexity.

Art can help many social justice advancements. Artist may not have social justice on his (sic) mind – and produce a beautiful and powerful painting.

A cultural practice may be renewed not out of social justice movement but it may propel the people. Art can have an indirect result…

Need to develop a collective of people who will create policies, do the work, create tools. We don’t have the mechanisms for this.

In the US, there is resistance to linking art with social justice – it’s growing naturally.

We have less money to do this work. We have talent, workers, etc. It’s urgent that we grab resources, begin to build a movement. We are losing ground.

Seems like the arts are always the first to go.

Not in India! Here, arts funding is growing. Many have arts built into their missions – and now are beginning to live them.
How to make a case for the arts. Need to state your argument differently and co-opt the opposition. Document case, build a global database, research how art has influenced 100 most influential people in the world. Document cases out there about the impact of the arts.

Need to be infiltrating other fora whilst building art clusters themselves

Need to come into other fora with force, need to know own case.

Where are the artists in other movements (e.g., HIV-AIDS, etc.)?

Individual artists may not see/feel connected to other artists. They often don’t work together.

Maybe we need to strengthen the enablers, to build bridges

We (artists) don’t know each other, are not part of a group and therefore don’t have a powerful voice.

How do we fund this?

- Start by funding ourselves
- Stay in email contact
- Share information
- There are some donor coalitions who try to work on this (e.g., World Social Forum)

Sithie: Politically, all voices are silent, there is no discourse. Arts is our uncontested space. Would like to build this component into my grantmaking work – but don’t want to be from top down level telling people what to do (danger of finding art that only relates to giving voice). Maybe there needs to be specific focus on this on our part as grantmakers.

Coordinated strategy of grantmaking, e.g., to establish the right of freedom of information – in India, theater was used. Sithie – street music was a vehicle of change.

As a sector, we are poor information builders

If this is something important we need to dedicate time, resources, etc. to ensure that it’s done (“I don’t have time to art.”)

Arts service organizations need to be empowered to do this.

There is such a global networks (he thinks). Maybe capacity of already established networks can be supported.

Research in Arab world is being undertaken – maybe this can be used as a template.

Need to think about social justice implications of our foundation (Native American) as we build it.

Key Points

- Building forums for artists to talk together about needs, desires, etc. – different clusters – Philanthropy for Arts can support this.
- Piggy back on existing networks and try to infiltrate them and help them develop an agenda that includes social justice
- How our grantmaking needs to add mobility, mobilization grants.
- Go to other sectors and educate them
- Maybe also provide residency opportunities and employment opportunities for art professionals and artists to be embedded in other grassroots organizations (environment, gender, poverty rights…)?

De-westernizing Philanthropy

This small group was convened by Michael Roberts. Participants were Mirna Cunningham, Monica Aleman, Betsy Richards, Ana Maria Enriquez, and Bradford Smith.

What is non-western philanthropy?

- Funds controlled by non-western folks
- Board of directors controlled by members of the community the philanthropy is trying to support
- May use some tools from traditional philanthropy, but only if you can strip them of the capitalist values and make them appropriate for using with indigenous groups
Background about the First Nations Development Institute

- How it started
  - Got its first grant from Ford 25 years ago when Rebecca, the founder, told Ford she wanted to make an economic difference in native communities
  - Rebecca knew that indigenous people know what to fix and how, but lack the resources and appropriate technical assistance – this is still First Nations’ premise

- What First Nations does
  - First Nations educates grassroots practitioners; advocates for systemic change; provides technical assistance for groups to succeed through trainings, one-on-one consultation, workbooks and materials
  - Types of capital needed in American Indian communities
    - Grantmaking capital (First Nations gives money to new organizations that haven’t been funded before)
    - Debt capital (alternative loan structures are necessary, banks are inaccessible, lack of entrepreneur sector in native communities)
    - Equity capital for new business creation (this is the part that First Nations hasn’t figured out yet)

- Philanthropic context for indigenous communities in the US
  - There isn’t a lot of money from philanthropy going to native communities and this hasn’t changed in 30-50 years – it probably will not change
  - The question is how to create indigenous-based philanthropic institutions – need to create pools of capital created by Indians for Indian nonprofits
  - The good and bad news is that 95% of operating capital of First Nations Development Institute comes from foundations – this is a blessing and a curse because First Nations (and other indigenous funds) are at the whim and fashions of public philanthropy and have to contort their needs to match the foundations’ in order to get funded
  - A danger for native funds is to end up looking like mini Fords without looking at whether that capitalist model is appropriate for these communities
  - In 28 years of existence, First Nations has had failures and successes – maybe it is a failure that First Nations became a grantmaking organization at all!
    - Became a grantmaker because of desire to make decisions based on Indian controlled asset theory
    - In ten years spent learning how to be a grantmaker while making grants, First Nations could have been more strategic – started out funding groups based on “needy or nice” criteria without focus on alignment with our change theory
    - May not have moved asset change theory as far along as we could have in that amount of time with the amount of money we granted
  - First Nations is funding new indigenous funds that are emerging – most of these in the US are run by women and most are modeled after western systems and tools – some are doing really innovative work → need to open channels of communication between these funds and their staff

Background about the new Global Indigenous Women’s Fund

- Has existed for one year
- Was created by indigenous women from all over the globe
- Has a big mandate: to raise funds from outside as well as from within indigenous communities
- Has gotten $100,000 from Ford to set up the institution and begin grantmaking, but are at the beginning of that process
- The Global Indigenous Women’s Fund has already done intensive values work, but how does that get applied to the practical aspects of the institution’s grantmaking? How can the Fund take the best of both sides?
Suggestions for the Fund to consider
- Maybe the Indigenous Women’s Fund should give out less money initially so that as it is trying out these new practices, it can see how well it is working and reevaluate, make changes to the practice, etc. before giving out larger sums of money
- Select projects to fund at the beginning that you can easily demonstrate success in a short period of time (pick the low hanging fruit that will please both funders and communities) → this will facilitate fundraising for future grantmaking
- Must be transparent about why you make the selections you do

The Fund will have three areas of grantmaking
- Education
- Economic development
- Strengthening indigenous institutions at the community level

Discussion about the capacity of indigenous institutions to adapt philanthropic tools and systems that come with colonial values
- How can we integrate our values into mainstream philanthropy?
- If you create a values-based foundation, you can adapt tools (native cultures have been excellent at adapting western tools for a long time, e.g. horses) and processes if you can strip them of their other values, BUT it is hard to take value systems out of the tools
- US natives are sitting so close to the worst part of US symbols → tribes struggle with what is theirs and what should be theirs
- Maybe it is impossible to find a true indigenous model that isn’t contaminated by our surroundings, and that is ok
- How can we create a philanthropic entity that adapts new tools, but doesn’t lose true values?
- Bicultural issue for staff of these funds – you must be comfortable in your brown skin and about your indigenous identity in order to manage two sides of expectations and in order not to fail as leaders → do not let fear of doubts let your systems be manipulated by other people
- Governance structures must be carefully considered for indigenous institutions
- Need to try out new ways of being a philanthropic institution as we navigate this issue → must be clear with the communities and funders that we are learning as we go, and share those learnings
- Transparency is essential – this is indigenous value, but is not how indigenous communities are accustomed to being treated by funders

Fundraising challenges for indigenous funds
- Concern about backlash if you raise money from outside indigenous communities, and at the same time, there is not enough money in indigenous communities to raise and create systemic change
- Important to control expectations of two groups – funders (especially bigger foundations) and communities who expect you to solve all their problems
- Indigenous funds have a greater and more direct accountability to their communities than other philanthropic institutions

Indigenous philanthropy – it does exist and is based on values
- There is a longer history of indigenous philanthropy than there is of mainstream philanthropy
- In mainstream philanthropy, institutions get ranked according to how much wealth is stored, not how much is given away (foundations recognized at the top are the ones with the biggest endowments, e.g. Ford, Atlantic Philanthropies, etc.)
- In indigenous cultures, value is based on how much is given away, NOT how much is stored – traditions like the potlatch system are about redistributing wealth
- From the perspective of indigenous communities, it is unreasonable to save money in a bank account while there are urgent problems in those communities
- Do these values and traditions demand indigenous funds to not accumulate wealth in the form of an endowment? Or to give away more than the 5% mandated by US law?
- Indigenous-led organizations tend to operate more holistically because of a worldview that compartmentalizes less → arts and social justice are impossible to separate for us
- Is it possible to articulate a positive vision of indigenous social justice philanthropy beyond the deconstruction of western systems? Yes, but many rather than one
  - Alternatives to “de-westernizing” might be: intercultural, holistic
  - Does philanthropy need to be smashed to be rebuilt?
- Language – there are different indigenous words for “justice” with different meanings
- Philanthropic institutions will keep emerging and must be appropriate to indigenous communities → big question is how to get there
- There is a hunger in broader circles for new ways of thinking and we have a lot to offer in that realm and can be leaders in shifting thinking – yet if we label it “indigenous,” it gets siloed

**Economic Crisis: A Crisis is a Terrible Thing to Waste**

Will this be the group that drives a stake into the heart of global capitalism and dances in its grave?

Lenka Setkova, Drummond Pike, Mark Randazzo, Jen Peterson, Kelly Brown, Dina Sherif, Monica Patten, Avila Kilmurray, Amalia Fischer, Stephen Pittam

- Carnegie UK Trust: We came to think about this work by running an inquiry into the future of civil society in the UK and Ireland, bringing them to think ahead to 2025 and looking at the key drivers of change and the uncertain drivers, one of which was the economic drivers and the uncertainty of that economic agenda. So we started to look at how we can grow a civil economy, and the increase of social investment in the financial sector and what share holder activism could look like, how could we look at the financial instruments of the future, specially for those currently excluded. We are looking at the role of cooperatives and faith based organizations as having a role in the financial sector. Civil Society has been pushed out of a role in the financial system as not having the expertise. It is also an opportunity at foundation assets and how these can be invested for long term gains, towards a more just and fair civil society.

- FNTG: We were in Seattle and came out of that experience, we do a lot of work with funders of all types. The other side of the work has been around the global justice movement, work with the WSF and the Climate Security Administration for example. We often do a meeting in DC during IMF/World Bank annual meetings. We had the head economist of the AFL/CIO come last April. We will convene a meeting on the financialization of the global economy and how it has taken over the sphere, we have turned this convening in the Fall into a discussion on the crisis and what can funders do. In December, we had economists who have been critical of the casino economy and included grassroots groups who are doing the work on the street, movement building. Policy solutions to this crisis must reflect the systematic nature of the crisis. We think in the US we have at most a 2yr window before they get back into electoral mode. Funders talked about how much they had lost, with OSI being a noted exception. This is an opportunity if funders receive very ambitious proposals to address this crisis and the opportunities. Funders did recognize this historic opportunity to do something. That’s all about perception and intentionality. We are asking IPS to partner up with this configuration of grassroots organizations to come up with a proposal for a series of activities over the next 6 months. We want to work with Civil Society groups who are thinking about this from the Global economic sense, we want to address systemic and structural issues, governance issues, taxation. We want to ensure that those who are most affected are part of those discussions. It is primarily a US focused initiative that is linked to global initiatives. Our goal after the 6 mos period of collecting info is to then see what bold proposals emerge.

- Lenka Setkova – it would be helpful to have the inward conversation about foundations and what kind of influence they can have given their assets. We want to keep this very opportunities focused.
More outwardly we could look at social change and what kind of activities we could engage in. We also want to look at what your entry point is.

- Stephen – I’m interested in talking about the global structure and how we might link in. Looking inward we are concerned with how the money is kept being consonant with how we spend it. Because of the way the global markets operate we have to screen our shareholders on a monthly basis. Recently we publicly disinvested from a publishing company that invested less than 1% on an arms company, we worked with them for three years and still they refused to budge, within 3 months they got rid of the arms company after we disinvested. The issue for us is the amount of time and energy that it takes. Some companies find it helpful and appreciate our asking them these questions, others would rather not know. We are 100% in equities, and all of it is monitored. We invested in a company that now we contract with to do the screening for us, but they also now do it for others.

- Jen – Our board made a commitment to spend at least 5% of their portfolio in Vermont, including an organization making affordable housing loans, a green economy enterprise, a socially responsible investment pool, and in our primary pool we are starting to do some screening. We worked with Bed and Bath and Beyond to increase the diversity of their trustees.

- Drummond – We’ve managed to outsource all along, we’ve had screened investment since ’91, we work with Walden Assets in Boston, they have a very robust screening mechanism. They developed a positive screen fund, focused on smaller high social value companies, the third thing they do is engage fully on your behalf in Share Holder activism, according to your criteria, they’ll look into what they want to do, and they call our CFO and ask if they can use our name. We have found this to be a market advantage with our donors, they understand that all of our funds need to be screened. From the early 80’s to know the nature of criteria that you’re screening for has changed. We moved from South Africa and Tobacco to the environment and other current ills. There is no reason not to do this work, we hardly ever lag behind the rest of the market.

- Stephen – I’m interested in the whole question of transformation of the system, and perhaps a more fundamental question – is the system dead? Change is coming, is there anything we can do to think about what that can be, reclaiming a role for civil society in that financial space. Is there something we could do to globalize this US conversation that FNTG is talking about. If we want an alternative system, what is it?

- Drummond – as appealing as the question is, it’s not a practical early steps. One of the problems that we have is that for none of our institutions is this a primary agenda. It seems to me that this speaks to a potential role for FNTF. What if we had a funders initiative to divest and FNTF identified it. If we want to give visibility to the need to change the system we have to begin to spotlight the really bad actors.

- Lenka – the financial industry is broken and trying to work out what it’s future looks like, so how do we look at their behavior. Say for example how sill the banking system look at individuals.

- Mark – we know that there are actors who have been looking at this for a long time and how do we help them have conversations to come up with ambitious projects that then we organize the funders to fund. There are all kinds of things out there, how do we infuse funding into all sectors but also make sure that they are smart and interconnected.

- Amalia – speaking as a funder from the South there is something that is missing from your analysis. It’s not only the NGO’s that have to be in your analysis, but you have to think about the funders in the South and the work that they are doing locally where it is much harder to fundraise. The global crisis is going to hurt me worse than you, the rich people of Brazil give for charity, it’s not only about NGO’s but it is about how you work with our foundations in the south. The changes affect us since 30 years ago when globalization started, now you are feeling it in your countries but we have been experiencing this even longer.

- Dina – I’ve been listening, and talking about endowments and assets in this part of the region is pointless because we don’t have them. It is all direct giving. This crisis might be an opportunity to get donors to systematize this giving from a social justice perspective, our giving in the South could just end. We want to institutionalize philanthropy forward.
Lenka – I suppose we in the North should consider our absence from institutions everywhere that are working to change the financial sector, we should not miss the opportunity to influence/support institutions that are having an effect in the South.

Avila – It’s not my primary focus and I don’t feel like I can do a huge amount about it, I’m grappling with how we have allowed social rights to become commodities so when the banks go down, down goes housing. How can we reformulate the discourse in both South and North so that certain things are not in the market, like health for example.

Kelly – What are the economists in IPS looking at, the assets of foundations are minute compared to the assets that are a stake right now. Governments have the upper hand right now, including determining who is going to own those institutions and how they will be regulated. How does the discourse affect how the potential ownership of these institutions is guided. What are the trade policies that are going to emerge?

Mark – Social Justice Philanthropy has to mobilize against the philanthrocapitalism that is emulating the model that has just failed. Can we drive a steak into the heart of neo-liberal market fundamentalism? How can we push governments further than they would normally go in the next two years? The IMF and WB are rebounding as we speak. How do we break out of this thinking about market that has framed so much? Can we ask “what is the economy for?” in a time like this?

Monica - The piece I would add, is in addition to supporting those who are already committed, is how these charitable organizations are now being self-serving and competitive, unable to imagine a different role for themselves. There is a challenge for us in widening your network, bringing in many of the groups on the ground right now.

Stephen – There is a question of democratization, and our finding that there are no democratic controls at all in how these systems are being redefined. This is a huge issue for this conversation.

Mark – democratizing, localizing and making things more transparent.

Stephen – the sector has no say, we are now funding the tax justice network which is working around the world to look at tax evasion and tax havens. They are the first NGO to participate in Doha. It’s almost as if our vision of what Civil Society should be about is a bit too limited.

Kelly – Civil Society doesn’t step into that role, and of course it doesn’t get the funding to do the work because the funding is not designed to do that. This is an opportunity to hear those voices. This is a moment when people are realizing that there is a role for the public sector and we need to be part of the conversation. We risk that whatever is happening now will only be temporary and intentionally so.

Avila – not even the regulators knew what was going on.

Mark – let me get into the 6 areas of work that this proposal is looking at

- Org an info clearing house
- Strategic dialogues – cross-fertilization
- Link grassroots activists and the populist anger is translated into policy in Washington, then why not G20 and Doha rounds?
- Training of Trainers, bringing popular education
- Alternatives – how do you raise up all the models that are out there
- If we can find 5million over two years to support all of this work – is that going to help?

Avila – We just funded a study of the social impact in Northern Ireland of this crisis, what I would need is something to help craft the questions we could ask of the treasury for example

Stephen – what is the idea of the regulatory framework and how to affect it?

Mark – these are all there, they’ve been sitting on shelves. The Global Justice movement is smart, sophisticated and connected to the millions of farmers, fishermen, women groups.

Lenka – what will it take to bring the transparency lens to all of that?

Drummond – I’m more concerned about preventing them from doing the bad things that they did at the multinational level than about getting them to do the marginal good things that they could.
• Mark – there are alternatives, we’ve been talking about a Tobin Tax for 20 years. As funders how do we organize so that funders can get resources they don’t normally get and get those funds into those groups doing this work.
• Kelly – there are unlikely allies that have a stake in this change, how do we work with them?
• Lenka – a lot of it is about getting the information out in an empowering way, this can be so obscure that people won’t even look at it. People can see that the opportunities are there but when we talked about ideas for action people retreated into what they know. There are groups that still won’t move until funders give them a go. How do we work with groups that are already organized, like trade unions.
• Avila – let’s be careful with the protectionist arguments that focus on sending immigrants back.
• Stephen – Mark we look at you because you are a place in the foundation world
• Mark – our current work on this is primarily in the US context, but there is a report about groups doing this work in Europe, let us know. We are doing monthly learning calls and information sharing, everyone will ultimately act within their own institutions.
• Stephen – we want to know what is happening with the G20 in London? It is immediate. We don’t have a shared sense of what we should be pushing for and where do we get it from?
• Mark – Hillary Wainwright knows, there have been coordinated activities around the world.
• Lenka – It is about how far different messages need to go, a very simple, clear reframing should be useful to Civil Society as a whole.
• Monica – Another group is Civicus.

Impact Analysis
Participants: Judy Barsalou, Ana Criquillion, Barbara Ibrahim, Andrew Milner, Luc Tayart de Borms

Summary and Next Steps
This group believes that the old ways of enforcing rigid evaluation frameworks is damaging our field…damaging relationships. We need to find new ways by exploring new approaches.

- Arrange a small group convening to explore some new approaches – invite others who are interested to help plan it. After that, if we are interested in what we are discovering, set something else up with additional people or find other ways to disseminate information beyond this small group. Consider doing this on a regional basis.
  - Luc offered to host this meeting to happen in Brussels and to take care of the costs if people can get there.
  - Make sure that some intermediaries are there.
- Create a Google group or something like that to provide a place for the group to engage in further discussion, post documents (on a very selective basis), exchange new information, and ideas we’re hearing from the field.
- Explore approaches used in different disciplines and new approaches and share that information via the on-line platform that is set up (see above).
  - Explore complexity theory
  - Explore environmental science, biology, other areas
  - Consider engaging someone to do a preliminary screen of these newer ideas as they might relate to nonprofit social justice work.
- Find out about an existing group working on evaluation and share these findings.

Discussion
- It is helpful to have a summary of the tools in one place, such as was presented to the binder for this convening. But a question remains – is there anything written that critiques these methodologies (more than what is here)? We really need to know more, go deeper.
TAMI framework – as adapted and the Making the Care framework. These are helpful to use after the fact but not for planning because we don’t know ahead of time what all the outcomes will be. Forcing ourselves into indicators, to predict outcomes, doesn’t work.

Perhaps we should look at difference in approaches to evaluation, rather than commonalities.

We need to get out of the logic model approach because we already know it doesn’t work. And most funders are using logic models.

Accountability agreements have come out of the legal perspective and are not helpful either.

Indicators and measures…in order to share them, would we not need some level of commonality? Or does every project/context need its own indicators?

Commonalities are not realistic. There is too much variation from project to project, context to context.

We must measure differences between the status quo and what happens after the interventions. We must have a starting measurement of some kind. The ways to do this have already been devised in the social sciences. We don’t need to reinvent them.

However, making the connection between the intervention and the outcome is tricky.

Efforts to impose an existing system are not satisfactory.

Has anyone described a process that can be followed? For example, framing a project in terms of observable results – is there a descriptive approach for doing this?

Complex thinking systems used mostly in the for profit sector are now being adapted to the nonprofit sector. These efforts are underway.

The issue is not between quantitative and qualitative information. It’s more complex than that. There are different ways of approaching an intervention. And predicting what outcomes will be, and then assessing outcomes in relation to the intervention, makes it even more complex.

Many of us want to learn from doing evaluations. We don’t just want to predict outcomes for the purpose of proving we were right about our investment choices.

Some elements are not so complex and can be evaluated using a logic frame. But many elements are complex and it is far more difficult to predict and measure.

Missing from the donor/grantee dynamic is communication about what is happening along the way so that mid-course corrections can be made.

Some things are not measurable or predictable. Rather than thinking in terms of evaluation, how might we building learning and coaching to our grants? Encourage learning systems? Is there a science for this?

It would be good to be able to extract learning from a portfolio and connect grantees with one another to benefit from this learning.

Impact assessment can be simple but requires distance, or thinking outside the box

The level of control over things – if not control, cannot evaluate…BUT social sciences approach says we can measure…

Social justice transformation – it’s a difficult thing to identify the relationship between small fixes and relatively complex systems that are contributing to injustice

We have to accept the complexities and the paradoxes. It may be difficult to explain to staff and board but it is what it is.

In the end, we are not using what we spend so much time developing because every situation is different. Or we use it even though it doesn’t work.

We should be as simple as possible. Pick 2-3 things to evaluate and leave it at that. We’ve seen how not useful the complex sophisticated evaluations can be. Requires us to think differently about planning and evaluation.

Set the direction and recognize that it won’t be straightforward.

Also, our goals are usually too big. We must break them down in each project and we won’t need to go so deep.

At the more modern, newer foundations, this process is more straightforward. We are looking at something we want to accomplish and we are trying to identify ways to measure that. We need to
focus on this and push back on the rigid, less applicable impact evaluation trend in more mature philanthropy.

- For ex, how to measure sense of security of people. So we have to agree on how to know what goes into making people feel secure or insecure.
- The foundations are saying...if I funded an organization for five years to work on children’s well-being, I want ways to know what’s working, what they can do differently that might be more effective, etc. Information to help me choose strategies.
- Is there a clearinghouse for this kind of information?
- Wilson-Grau framework in the binder...seemed interesting but there is not enough information. It’s very new and there isn’t much reference information. I want to know where this approach has been applied and how it worked.

**Proposed ideas**

- It would be beneficial to have an exchange b/w these academic people and some of us in the field. Discuss what has worked well in what contexts. Best practices.
- Who would be a convenor of this to get the right people to the table?
- This meeting should focus on the differences in what’s out there, not the commonalities.
- Once such a meeting is held, how can we share effectively the information with people who cannot be there?
- It is tempting to think in terms of internet and written material, but the stuff is so complex.
- Maybe we need to think in terms of regions...identify people who can be the hubs for this...and increase chances of people being able to attend a gathering.
- When you see theoretical frameworks applied, they may seem complex at first but can actually be quite simple.
- When talking about attitudes, change, knowledge – how is this evaluated? We might need to try to find things that are outside of our sector but that are working well in other applications.
- Start with a round up of what we have. What’s in the book is a good start. Take that further and if we are still unsatisfied with what we have, we should look to other fields.
- The international network of women’s funds decided this year to focus on impact evaluation and we are convening a meeting to explore complexity science, systems thinking in evaluation frameworks.
- We should organize a convening to explore this same material to see if it can be adapted to our work.
- If every region is represented, people can be charged with learning and taking it back to their regions.
- Ana offered to put this group in contact with the folks who are coming to the international network of women’s funds meeting about the above and if it works will then we can do it for our group.
- Should we be looking at the field of environmental science where they look a lot at unintended consequences. Find other reps of other fields that are different from ours – such as biology.
- These folks – and more – are definitely engaged in the complexity theory work.
- What about political scientists? Are they trying to understand tipping points?
- Some people are doing scenario planning...is that relevant?
- What about someone in the field of social movements...is anyone doing this work?
- If we have too many high level people, academically speaking, than we have too long of a time frame to figure it out. We need people who are already applying their work to the real world (if you will).
- Maybe we could do a research project to identify the possibilities first...get someone or some group of people to review the ideas from the other sciences and cull or screen the possibilities to see what’s most relevant that can be brought to a meeting.
- Some academics are different from others. Many universities are pushing them now to apply their work to real world situations.
- A group of evaluators exist...some sort of network of evaluators...but they haven’t applied their evaluations to our type of work. It’s been used in business and health institutions but not applied to nonprofit, social justice work. But they are already conscious of what’s out there, they have filtered it. Ana Criquillion can provide this reference.
- Let’s see where they are now. We should not re-invent the wheel.
- Complexity theory – Texas Institute - Brenda Zimmerman
- Social networks analysis would be important for this. To measure the quality of the interaction between people.

**Moving the Middle and Field-Building**
(Note: the “Middle” is mainstream philanthropy)
- Talked a lot about the language to use to move the “middle.”
  - Suggestions: talk about social change which is dear and powerful
  - Use the framing language of the common good
  - Focus on root causes and change
- All this work must be grounded in values – we must lead with a values frame
- Mark is developing a self-assessment package where people can take their values, root causes, etc. and apply it to their work.
- We need to work on the communication and practice aspects of “moving the middle”
- Need to be more intentional about moving people to social justice work
- Need newer, business-focused foundations (like Google, Gates, etc.) to adopt the social justice frame. Who of these new funders can we cultivate? What does their grantmaking look like and can we shift it to a social justice frame?
- We need champions in each philanthropic sector – large private (who can be a champion with Ford and Atlantic?), new business-focused funders, community foundation leaders, public foundation leaders
- Need champions outside of philanthropy: politicians, religious leaders, white house offices of social innovation and office of philanthropy (in US)
- Need to develop “elevator speech” for philanthropy for social justice and peace
- Need to define a number of messages for different audiences
- Conduits for our messages after they are developed: Affinity Groups and Regional Associations of Grantmakers, Foundation Center convenes philanthropic leaders for discussion of impact analysis
- There will be a track on social justice philanthropy at the 2010 Council on Foundations Conference. Need to go in with a clear definition/message of what philanthropy for social justice means – have case studies and tools developed.

**Network-Building**
The group supported the idea of an ongoing network of social justice and peace funders. This small group wished to note that it was entirely made up of people from US. While this did not necessarily mean that others outside the US weren’t interested in the topic (many simply had higher priorities among self organized groups), it does mean that the suggestions made are restricted to those from a US perspective.

The purposes of the network would include:
- Increasing resources for social justice and peace work through increasing the level of engagement between and among social justice and peace funders;
- Developing a strong case for Social Justice and Peace funding;
- Sharing knowledge and facilitating transfer of knowledge;
- Modeling the courage to take risks.

The process identified by the group included:
- Asking the Working Group to continue organizing the inner circle that attended the Cairo convening. Help keep them connected. Further analyze the participants to establish or test whether there is active interest in moving out to the next concentric circle;
- If so, identifying and reaching out to the next concentric circle;
Asking the working group to consider when and how its composition should change.

**Philanthropy Focusing on Urban Conditions**
Sheela Patel, Marina Tabukashvili, Shaheen Anam, Pat Brandes, Maya Wiley, Slavica Stojanovic

- **Urbanization**
  - Global economy → agrarian “reforms”
  - Landlessness
  - Environmental degradation

- Women refusing to do hard, grinding work. Women running away. Cities hostile to them.
- National migrants (North of India coming South). Treated as “immigrants” within own country.
- Politics of city development means no services, etc.
- In India, poverty is measured as nutrition. Ridiculous measure. (Same in Bangladesh.)
- Potential for real violence → forced evictions, violence against livelihoods that are informal. Domestic violence and prostitution are increasing.
- Basis of international, national and philanthropic policies is agricultural reform. People are voting with their feet. Lives are very hard.
- Not even 5% of funding in Africa and Asia is urban-based – not targeted
- In Georgia, people would stay in rural areas if they could get more work. Wine, citrus markets are now closed. Government is focused on urban development. Georgian President opened agricultural market to Turkey. Georgian market for organic farming, but no state support for transportation, storage, etc. Land gives out. People dependent on harvesting so no food or money. April is the hungriest month. People had to sell land. Bought by neo-riche and foreigners. Not producing on land. People became tenant farmers and paid very little money. Women in particular. One in four people are leaving for cities.
- Foundations want to solve rural issues to prevent migration. Often foundations think rural poor organizational strategies will work in urban areas. Also domestic foundations are biased against urban poor.
- Empowering of urban poor is lacking. NGOs are empowered.
- Patriarchal analysis
  - Not acknowledging that there are no safe spaces
  - Shack dwellers organize older women as “aunties”. Their analysis is that men are frustrated and take it out on their wives. Now old women go and sit outside of the house of a man who comes home drunk. It’s harder for him to beat her. Women insisted that men get micro-credit. The interest is much lower so he has to put the balance of interest in women’s savings account. But the violence of breaking down a whole settlement needed a response. Federation building to aggregate power. Land security is the biggest federation; railroad, airport, pavement, etc. They have to do a self-census. Relocated 10,000 – have 15,000. Framework that’s global: people-centered approach, opportunity-producing.
  - Need local institutions to carry the process when now can get Mayors, etc. to the table. They need a small NGO to support them. They need a small amount of money for organizing work. It doesn’t cost a lot but need to sustain the work over a long time.
  - In Bangladesh, very hard time getting land. Need government to support it. Requires a movement.
  - The Shack dwellers model has worked in Cambodia and Zimbabwe, not just India
  - Because of climate change, whole cities will get wiped out. How does the model get to that? It can’t without organized communities. Shack dwellers can’t get funders to understand its budget.
  - In Georgia, internally displaced people who then get relocated from schools to horrible settlement. Couldn’t begin with organizing. Had to start with services and classes. Eventually created a Center for Social Responsibility for village-based women (and open to men). Through empowerment of women, strengthen them to become a movement.
  - Could we do tools/info on this as global problem and the critical role of people-centered citizenship development as critical to solution
- Land erosion in Bangladesh pushes people to urban areas. If they had jobs, they would stay. Urban greater allocations than rural. Feels hopeless, but inspired by Shack dwellers now.
- Shackdwellers looking at collaboration with foundations and maybe including academics.

**Resource Mobilization and Fundraising**

Priscilla Hung, Ami Nahshon, Ajay Mehta, Nicky McIntyre, Emilienne de Leon, Rita Thapa, Lalita Missal and Katherine Acey

What do we want to do? What get out of it?
- Investigate the balancing act of fundraiser/grantmaker – what are the challenges?
- Build the infrastructure of this field – we cannot expect it to be done by Ford (etc.)
- Adapting US tools of fundraising in different contexts and looking at non-US and North ways to fundraise
- Where should the money be coming from? Where should it be raised?
- How can we leverage money to best interest?
- India – honeymoon with private foundations is over,
  - Changing the mindsets of donors
  - Where will the money come from?
  - What does sustainability mean, what’s the time frame?
- Impact of current crisis
- How do we get the money from religions giving to social justice (in India)?
- Nepal – two levels of fundraising – community-building and sustaining yourself (by buying property, etc.)
- Need to sustain ourselves in the global South of the public foundations is crucial
  - Semillas – using property (buildings) for income
  - India – this is illegal
- Mexico – corporate philanthropy is very difficult due to governmental laws
- Creating a restricted endowment for sustaining operating costs
- Donor education is important – they need to be aware that our work takes money to operate.
- Training the government in social justice funding?
  - India has become a donor (i.e., to Africa) but prefers to give to governments, not to civil society
- Nepalese saying: “You can wake up someone if they are sleeping but if they are pretending to sleep, you cannot.”
- Joint ventures?
- Can non-profits work with local government?
  - Depends on the context
  - Depends on the scale
- Resource mobilization of people as well as money (e.g., women giving to women is empowering)
  - Remittances – can we get the “Western Unions” of this world to reduce their fees and get part of that for social justice issues?
  - Using community banks
  - Matching funds programs
- Connections between US organizations and local Mexican organizations to mobilize resources
- Maximizing the grantmaker/grantseeker relationship
- How do we do massive resource mobilization without it costing a lot of money?
  - Individual
- Rita: US consumers are so wasteful – target the individuals to give
- Who do we want to be accountable to? Large donors? Individuals?
- Building communities – not just fundraising
Getting your existing individual donors to bring in more individual donors
  o Semillas – 1+1 program (bringing a friend to an event)
Online giving/fundraising
  o Mama Cash: 88 days campaign, Dinner party
Trading email lists
  o Building email lists
  o Working with online activists (care2.com)

From Structural Analysis to Strategy
- Structural Analysis (not too clear about the steps here)
- Strategies
  - Knowledge
  - Experience
  - Professional/Academic training
  - Intuition
  - Guess work
  - Divine Intervention
  - A Queen-sized bed in one’s office

Overall Debrief
Marianne Hughes asked for a few comments from the conversations. Some of the tables reported back, as follows:

Philanthropy focusing on urban conditions
- Used to find working on urban poverty very overwhelming – Sheela Patel inspired me to go back to that work. Empowering the people and raising their voice.

Network
- Purpose -
  o Develop a strong case
  o Responsive to newly presenting issues that come up in Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace in the various regions
  o Share knowledge and facilitate the transfer of knowledge
  o Courage to lead
- Outcomes
  o Increasing resources (financial, social, intellectual capital)
  o Increase the density of connectivity
  o More philanthropic organizations have leaders working in the frame of Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace
  o Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace has powerful, legitimate and edgy recognized space in the field of broader philanthropy – hold on to the justice peace
  o Have fun
  o Want to charge the Working Group with keeping the network together and beginning to expand it.

De-westernizing philanthropy
- Is there an indigenous philanthropy we can promote?
There is an indigenous philanthropy – different from traditional philanthropy. Foundations are very successful. Basic is to share.

- Governance Issue – if we want to promote indigenous philanthropy, governance has to be indigenous people.
- Indigenous philanthropy institutions – some of the challenges
  - How to deal with expectations of donors and of our communities?
  - Have to feel comfortable in our brown skin – be sure of our identity to be able to manage ourselves in those two worlds.
  - Indigenous philanthropy needs to be built on transparency – the communities have to be able to participate. If we make mistakes, they can forgive you and we can start again. Become more learning institutions – track what is the best way to do things.
  - Indigenous philanthropy has the capacity to adopt the tools that have been designed in the traditional philanthropy organizations – with the problem of how to adapt the tools without adapting the values.
  - Language of social justice – have a more holistic approach to the concept of social justice philanthropy.
  - A lot of things we can share with other people.

**Philanthropic infrastructure in Africa**
- Test out the Africa grantmaking network
- Very good consensus. Time has really come.
- In May this year, will be meeting again. Want to share what’s happening in the continent – want to influence the agenda.

**Economic Crisis**
- Challenge of how foundations have left the financial world untouched. By looking inwardly at how foundations apply assets, investment screening, shareholder activism.
- How to mobilize wider civil society to get a democratic dialogue about how to reform the system.
- Connect concerns about what’s happening in the north with the Global South.
- Create information sharing – build our own literacy about what the problem is, how we can engage with it, be in dialogues. There is participation in this – grassroots organizing, how to train trainers to help people engage with the economic system – and empower existing civil society groups already working on it. Share info about who’s doing what.
- Short window of opportunity to be able to do that.

**Impact Analysis**
- Messy and chaotic discussion
- What we want to stop: rigid and unhelpful evaluation that we impose on grantees that lock them into quantitative indicators and get in the way of them becoming learning organizations and us having feedback loops.
- What we want to start: review of conceptual frameworks coming out of other fields (complex systems, biological systems work) that we could review critically, see what it has to say
- Start google group that we can upload
- Share what we’re learning in small convening.

**Resource mobilization/fundraising**
- Instead of investing endowments in the stock market, invest in buildings – greater financial sustainability, creating a resource
- Fundraising as a way to mobilize people and organize. With women’s funds – women giving to them are taking an empowering and transformative act – can use that to bring them in closer.
• Create community infrastructure in people’s home towns
• Innovative fundraising strategies (online tools)
• Blurring the lines between being a funder and fundraiser.
• Non-western ways of giving and asking
• Thinking bigger about where money should come from
• How can government be involved in funding Social Justice NGOs
• Moving to long term
• Question about financial sustainability – what does that mean, for how long, what are resources needed to do that?

Closing Comments

Christopher Harris:
We have come to the close of this remarkable three-day gathering. I hope that is has been useful to you and meets at least some of the expectations that you brought with you.

Thanks
Before anything else, deep gratitude—as well as good manners—requires thanking the many people who worked hard to make this convening a reality.

To those colleagues and friends who said “yes” to a request almost two years ago to serve on the Working Group—and who have given countless hours of work, much intellectual heavy lifting, quiet dedication and seemingly limitless patience—I (and we) thank you.

To Judy Barsalou and our Ford Foundation colleagues here in the Cairo office, we owe enormous thanks. Despite running the busiest and most demanding office of the Ford Foundation, you have been generous with time and attention—and we all know that comes at a cost. Thank you.

To my several other Ford colleagues, especially Monique Ekmekjian and Karin Krslovic—who made sure that it happened and that we had the funds to pay for it all. Thank you.

To the remarkable gang of the Interaction Institute for Social Change, led by the unflappable Marianne Hughes and IISC’s own Pharonic—Linda Guinee (the Queen Hatshepsut of IISC) who organized all of us and provided unreal support to the Working Group from our earliest meetings. And to all the IISC staff around the room and out at the desk. Thank you.

To our community organizers Juliette Majot & Nancy Cunningham (Barak Obama was not the only one with community organizing…). They interviewed all of us and wrote synthetic pieces about what they heard—they allowed us to get to know one another before we even met. Thank you.

To Nadia, our videographer, and her crew; Andrew Milner our evaluator; Radna and her colleagues who have handled logistics;—and of course to Gara LaMarche, who traveled so far to share his views on philanthropy for social justice. Thanks to all of you.

Next Steps
In my opening remarks I offered a vision of a possible infrastructure to support philanthropy for social justice and peace. That infrastructure highlighted certain capacities that we believe are lacking:
**Structural analysis for transformation.** Many in this room employ such an approach; far more foundations elsewhere do not. We need to provide more options.

**The design of appropriate grantmaking strategies.** I could certainly benefit from more conversations—and a systematic collection of such stories—with Stephen Pittam and Ana Criquillion.

**Social impact analysis.** We have to bring both rigor and common sense to “impact analysis.” We see a tendency by some to reify evaluation and miss what our real purpose is. The field of philanthropy has a passionate love affair with generic “effectiveness” which some believe is a proxy for social impact analysis. It is not, but we need a discourse that supports both. So we need to be more sophisticated and nuanced—and grounded in justice and peace about impact analysis. (Recall, as a friend tells me, an out-of-control bus has impact.)

I used these capacities—and resource mobilization, data collection and others—to sketch out the institutional help that we might develop. These, or course, are necessary but insufficient.

**Avila Kilmurray** reminds us to reach out to allies outside of this room.

**Walter Echo-Hawk** and **Monica Aleman** reminded us about the deep ties to identity and context of culture for justice and peace.

**Luc Tayart de Borms, Andrew Park** and **Sheela Patel** reminded us about the need to be opportunistic, flexible and non-linear.

**Bisi Adeleye** drew our attention to the important role of passion and courage.

In other words, there is much to consider regarding a kind of grantmaking that deals with social justice and peace efforts. This convening is obviously emphasizing the capacities that are missing and how some of us might work to develop them over the next 10 years.

As I said in our opening session, what emerges from this convening depends on us here present. The locomotive for new work is all of us. The Ford Foundation and the Working Group endeavored to create the convening—to establish the conditions—but will not drive what follows.

Of course we all hope that important new efforts will emerge today and in the immediate aftermath of this meeting. The Working Group has agreed to continue for another 12 months in a supportive and coordinative role—so that discrete efforts by smaller groups can be followed by all. The WG will also attempt to produce a working report and use the interviews of this convening that would serve more as a tool than a transcript. The IISC will maintain the website for another 12 months as a source for follow-up, sharing information, presentations here, materials, group memory, products and organizing. We will reach out in a few months to see what work is moving forward.

While the Working Group will serve as facilitator and coordinator (we will meet in May). We assume, if there is clear demand, that the Working Group itself will evolve to a different structure.

As smaller self-organized working groups identify work that the field needs, and begin to design and organize that work, there are several foundations willing to be approached for initial modest support (in line with our current funding).

What is exciting is that we have enough people together, with the right kind of contextualized experience that, *if we choose*, we can summon a “creative turmoil” in the field of philanthropy that can give birth
(continuing the birth metaphor from Seamus Heaney) to a new form of philanthropic engagement around the globe—one that unashamedly is biased toward justice and peace.

Conclusion

In that spirit, I would like to close with an excerpt from Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s Nobel Prize acceptance speech of December 10, 1964 in Oslo, Norway.

“…I refuse to accept despair as the final response to the ambiguities of history.

I refuse to accept the idea that the "isness" of people's present nature makes us morally incapable of reaching up for the eternal "oughtness" that forever confronts us.

I refuse to accept the idea that people are mere flotsam and jetsam in the river of life unable to influence the unfolding events which surround us.

I refuse to accept the view that humankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daybreak of peace and sisterhood & brotherhood can never become a reality.

I refuse to accept the cynical notion that nation after nation must spiral down a militaristic stairway into the hell of thermonuclear destruction. I believe that unarmed truth and unconditional love will have the final word in reality. This is why right temporarily defeated is stronger than evil triumphant.

I believe that even amid today's mortar bursts and whining bullets, there is still hope for a brighter tomorrow. I believe that wounded justice, lying prostrate on the blood-flowing streets of our nations, can be lifted from this dust of shame to reign supreme among the children of humanity.

I have the audacity to believe that peoples everywhere can have three meals a day for their bodies, education and culture for their minds, and dignity, equality and freedom for their spirits. I believe that what self-centered people have torn down, people other-centered can build up. I still believe that one day humankind will... be crowned triumphant over war and bloodshed, and nonviolent redemptive goodwill will proclaim the rule of the land.

I still believe that we shall overcome.

This faith can give us courage to face the uncertainties of the future. It will give our tired feet new strength as we continue our forward stride toward the city of freedom. When our days become dreary with low-hovering clouds and our nights become darker than a thousand midnights, we will know that we are living in the creative turmoil of a genuine civilization struggling to be born.

Thank you. And safe home all.

Nat Williams:
Thank Chris and the Working Group for inviting me to this amazing convening and for having the perseverance for seeing this through and for having so many people come together. This is my first international philanthropic event. When I piled onto the Lufthansa flight, I lapsed into a fitful dream about what my time would be like. I had images of coming here and rolling my sleeves up with my
comrades. Thought we’d create some kind of radical Social Justice Philanthropy party that could be taken forward – that we would creative manifesto, have matching berets and t-shirts and go home engaged in the struggle. Than I came and Barry talked about relative density. I realized this might be a little different. Over the first couple of days, I struggled to find my place and to find the meaning for this meeting for me. Didn’t fully see an answer in the agenda. Had a conversation with Nancy Cunningham – who said you have to take responsibility for yourself in this space. In one session, we read a poem - Wage Peace – which said, “think of chaos as a field of dancing raspberries” – I have no idea what that means. Change the way I think about things and be comfortable with I don’t know. I developed a new six word biography: I’ve never been so sleepy for so long. Barry’s description of sociometric distances. I slightly decreased my relative entropy and really needed to expand my networks. I brought a stack of business cards which is reduced by a third. I also increased my density quotient – literally. I had to travel halfway across the world to build deeper relationships with people that walk in my own back yard, building relationships to move us forward. The other thing though – from Maya’s presentation the first day – if we are really going to use a structural lens, we have to develop a structural practice. Have to figure out how to collaborate across issue, region and interest. From all these experiences, I really am inspired – even though our foundation does not do international work, I’m inspired to figure out international perspectives. Am extremely humbled and honored to be in the presence of so many amazing people that represent great work. I thank you for your powerful words.

Yuri Dzhibladze

Thank you to Chris and the Working Group and Ford Foundation for bringing me to this gathering. My board and staff will ask me, what did you learn? What is the impact it has had on you? I will tell them that I learned 17 definitions of Social Justice Philanthropy, 35 different evaluation frameworks, learned 60 more people and increased my density coefficient by four times and references from 126 publications. In fact, I will tell them something different – about other lessons that will not be measured in numbers. The first lesson is the power of ideas – power of transformative ideas. In the times of crisis, when money is not out there any more in the amounts that they used to be, it is the power of transformative ideas that is our great capacity. After all, this is a unique moment when the old institutions and old systems are not working any more. We have a unique opportunity to come up with the new ideas and replace these old institutions and old systems. It takes a bold vision of the sort that Chris and many others in this room have. We are not afraid to say that we have a dream – a dream of a world that is free from want, need and oppression, where people enjoy peace, fundamental human rights and equal opportunities. The second lesson is the importance of seeing people, human beings, behind the reports and plans. With suffering, human dignity, pain, anger. Have learned many human stories. This is the kind of lens we need to wear all the time. Third lesson is the recognition of us being one – sharing our aspirations, facing the same struggles and linked by the precious solidarity. This room is a little replica of the universe – men and women from N, S, E, W, rich and poor communities, representing minorities, underprivileged – and this is a good reminder of the world we try to make a place for. At the same time, we recognize our diversity. For all of our commonality, we value our variety. This is a very important characteristic of this group. A couple of things we as a group probably building a social movement should remember – it is important for us to walk our talk, to practice these ideas in our own work, networks and movements. As we claim to dismantle hierarchical institutions and democratize decision-making, we should practice the same thing – those who are experienced and newcomers from the North and South. We are already doing this. Important if we stick with these practices. The art of listening is very important. Avoid self-righteousness. It’s not that we know all the answers. We have a lot of capable minds in this room who will help us to challenge unjust institutions, continue to self reflect and exercise the approach we have been doing. We need to prevent social justice philanthropy from becoming a fashionable trend. Many people who happily call themselves – many people where money coming in. We must remember fundamentals about human rights, sustainable change, peace, and checking the power balance. Finally, it’s about taking responsibility. It will take a lot of work for real change on the ground. We as a group
can do it and turn visions into reality. Many new jokes about the crisis. Will carry on the torch of light – keep light of peace and justice on.

**Betty Murungi**

This is the first convening I attended where I got about 30 or 40 emails before the convening. Mr. Harris and Marianne and Linda and Nancy – thank you very much for helping me here. I was really scared because it felt like we were preparing for some kind of exam. Had to do all these questions, surveys. I was wondering, “Who are these people that Chris has working with him?” I started just saying yes to everything they asked – and ended up on three panels. First session was hilarious. Had met Barry Knight, who I keep thinking of as Barry White, at an IISP meeting, and he was talking social justice. Stuff went to his head when he talked about relative entropy. Wanted to increase my relative entropy by over 100%. Knew 24 people quite well – and by the end of today, I have known 36. Two or three people I haven’t made a connection with – that’s a challenge about how we go about building movements when we don’t have the space to do that. Build this movement for social justice philanthropy. All of us have a responsibility to do it in our regions. What came out of the very rigorous and focused conversation about the lens – which many of us employ in our work. It just occurred to me that everybody knew what they were talking about. Grantmaking strategies, impact assessment, or constituency building – people did know what the structural lens entailed, but the way we go about sharing information and knowledge is what limits our abilities somewhat. And the way we communicate to the communities in which we work is something I will take back and think about how to do better. The poem that brought home the entire convening to me was the poem “The Low Road” by Marge Piercy. When she was growing up, there was a statement in which the person taking the low road will get there before you. Very powerful. This morning, Martin O’Brien said something that I’ll always remember – power regroups, power always regroups. Power is regrouping to defeat us – we must always regroup right after them or before them. We have quite a bit of power – all $58, billion dollars.

**Suzanne Siskel**

I’d like to apologize for missing the first day. I was at the same meeting with Akwasi, who missed so much being here and asked me to convey his warm greetings to everyone and his hope that this would be a productive convening. I have faith in the power of this group to keep us going and build and not just have social justice philanthropy be the flavor of the month. Chris has been an incredible inspiration to all of us. He and Brad Smith pushed that philanthropy is about social justice – found all of these people and allowed us to create something that we cannot allow to end when we all go home. Ford has term limits. What’s happening at Ford? Good news to say to all of you that our leadership and board reaffirmed the foundation’s commitment to philanthropy. We try to be a leader. For the first time, we’ll have a group of people working together as one, to promote philanthropy, build a field and work across the sector to continue the work. It’s part of the DNA. Chris knows that I usually write limericks and satirize meetings I’m in. I couldn’t satirize this meeting – is not a meeting I’d want to turn into a satire. Here’s what I came up with:

**Onward from Cairo by Suzanne Siskel**

So….
What from Cairo to take away
From challenging one another each day?
With telephones courteous and white
Getting our evaluations right
Sharing stories our work to portray.

We’ve met hummingbirds with humility
And generous giraffes with agility
Who work for justice each day
Empowerment with love, some would say,
Toward a democratized philanthropic facility.

Everywhere marginalization abounds
So fighting myriad injustice resounds
For each one of us here
Who holds fairness dear
With dedication that seldom knows bounds.

We struggle to fight norms perverse
Colonialism and despair to reverse
We long to rejoice
Having raised silenced voice
Embracing peoples courageous and diverse.

Our lofty charge is to bring work to scale
But we know what this work will entail –
Too much travel and meeting
Personal lives only fleeting
And an endless onslaught of email.

Yet with us as we leave Cairo most ancient
A transformative network so urgent but nascent
Peace and justice the goals
Of our philanthropic roles
That require mutual trust and much patience.
Avila Kilmurray

**KIRSTY’S EVALUATION by Avila Kilmurray**

Well I’ll sing you a song of a gathering,
A convening, a network, a field,
From the East, from the West, North and South –
Sure Christopher’s invite appealed.
And as we all landed in Cairo,
There were hopes, there was anguish, and more,
The challenge – to frame Social Justice,
To knock on philanthropy’s door.

But when we saw that conference book –
Beneath those smiles there was a look –

Are you right there Marianne, are you right,
Well 200 pages gave us all a fright,
What with poems and blogs and cases,
Sure you should have seen our faces,
But we’ll read each page, for sure, tonight.

2.
And Maya, she’s got us all structured,
All ready to convince and transform –
Those white men they may count their dollars
Before Maya – she takes them by storm.
But Stephen, he’s got an advantage,
A funder – with chocolate to hand,
For Maya there’ll be chocolate for all
When the revolution is planned.

And as those tables buzz and sing
Sure Albert’s phone, it well may ring –

Are you right there Albert are you right,
Are elephants or moles within our sights,
Well it all depends on whether
Those Presidents, they get together,
Holding purse strings that are knotted tight.

3.
Well Lisa, she’s fit as a fiddle,
What with pilates to ease out the stress,
And Barry, he conjures those figures
To make impact look less of a mess.
But those measurement frames they’ve been stirred up,
In a brew that is lethal to slug,
But Karen, she swears by the potion,
Notwithstanding the odd Gallic shrug.
And as social justice is defined, 
We surely can’t leave peace behind –

So are you right there Barry, are you right, 
Well those graphs and co-efficients are a sight,
But the logframes they are broken
When our values, they are spoken,
Your whacky maths may yet just see us right.

4.
Well I’ve come to the end of my story –
You can all breath a sight of relief,
Next steps – well the feet they are many,
And the road map – well that’s shared belief.
And the Women’s Funds know there are roses
In the field, Chris he hopes we will grow,
And the Peace Funds, they say where is peace
If social justice is never to show.

And as we leave this fabled land,
This one last call – to take a stand –

So are you right there Christopher, are you right,
Can we mobilize to get our funding right,
Well there’s those who say we can –
If we plot – as well as plan –
And sure we might now Christopher, so we might.
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Buenos Aires
by Marjorie Agosín

When she showed me her photograph
she said,
This is my daughter.
She still hasn’t come home.
She hasn’t come in ten years.
But this is her photograph.
Isn’t it true that she is very pretty?
She is a philosophy student
and here she is when she was
fourteen years old
and had her first
communion,
starched, sacred.
This is my daughter.
She is so pretty.
I talk to her every day.
She no longer comes home late, and this is why I reproach her
much less.
But I love her so much.
This is my daughter.
Every night I say goodbye to her.
I kiss her
and it’s hard for me not to cry
even though I know she will not come
home late
because as you know, she has not come
home for years.
I love this photo very much.
I look at it every day.
It seems that only yesterday
she was a little feathered angel in my arms
and here she looks like a young lady,
a philosophy student, another disappeared.
But isn’t it true that she is so pretty,
that she has an angel’s face,
that it seems as if she were alive?
Buenos Aires
by Marjorie Agosín

Cuando me enseñó su fotografía
me dijo
ésta es mi hija
aún no llega a casa
hace diez años que no llega
pero ésta fotografía
¿Es muy linda no es cierto?
es un estudiante de filosofía
y aquí está cuando tenía
catorce años
e hizo su primera
comunión
almídonada, sagrada,
ésta es mi hija
es tan bella
todos los días converso con ella
ya nunca llega tarde a casa, yo por eso la reprocho
mucho menos
pero la quiero tantísimo
ésto es mi hija
todas las noches me despido de ella
la beso
y ma cuesta no llorar
aunque sé que no llegará
tarde a casa
porque tú sabes, hace años que
no regresa a casa
yo quiero mucho a esta foto
la miro todos los días
me parece ayer cuando
era un angelito de plumas en mis manos
y aquí está toda hecha una dama
un estudiante de filosofía
una desaparecida
pero no es cierto que es tan linda,
que tiene un rostro de angel,
que parece que estuviera viva?
Call and Answer
by Robert Bly

Tell me why it is we don't lift our voices these days
And cry over what is happening. Have you noticed
The plans are made for Iraq and the ice cap is melting?

I say to myself: "Go on, cry. What's the sense
Of being an adult and having no voice? Cry out!
See who will answer! This is Call and Answer!"

We will have to call especially loud to reach
Our angels, who are hard of hearing; they are hiding
In the jugs of silence filled during our wars.

Have we agreed to so many wars that we can’t
Escape from silence? If we don't lift our voices, we allow
Others (who are ourselves) to rob the house.

How come we've listened to the great criers -- Neruda,
Akhmatova, Thoreau, Frederick Douglass -- and now
We're silent as sparrows in the little bushes?

Some masters say our life lasts only seven days.
Where are we in the week? Is it Thursday yet?
Hurry, cry now! Soon Sunday night will come.

In the Hard Times
by Brecht

In the hard times, will there also be singing?
Yes, there will be singing
About the hard times
Democracy
by Langston Hughes

Democracy will not come
Today, this year
Nor ever
Through compromise and fear.

I have as much right
As the other fellow has
To stand
On my two feet
And own the land.

I tire so of hearing people say,
Let things take their course.
Tomorrow is another day.
I do not need my freedom when I'm dead.
I cannot live on tomorrow's bread.

Freedom
Is a strong seed
Planted
In a great need.

I live here, too.
I want freedom
Just as you.

In Peace (or Pieces)
by Akwasi Aidoo

Comrade, since you say
We can't eat democracy with
All those sour choices
Pinstriped lies
And decorated fools

Since you say
Only war will do

Tell me then
How else can we dream in peace?
How else?
Can we dream?
In Peace?
Kindness
by Naomi Shihab Nye

Before you know what kindness really is
you must lose things,
feel the future dissolve in a moment
like salt in a weakened broth.
What you held in your hand,
what you counted and carefully saved,
all this must go so you know
how desolate the landscape can be
between the regions of kindness.
How you ride and ride
thinking the bus will never stop,
the passengers eating maize and chicken
will stare out the window forever.

Before you learn the tender gravity of kindness,
you must travel where the Indian in a white poncho
lies dead by the side of the road.
You must see how this could be you,
how he too was someone
who journeyed through the night with plans
and the simple breath that kept him alive.

Before you know kindness as the deepest thing inside,
you must know sorrow as the other deepest thing.
You must wake up with sorrow.
You must speak to it till your voice
catches the thread of all sorrows
and you see the size of the cloth.

Then it is only kindness that makes sense anymore,
only kindness that ties your shoes
and sends you out into the day to mail letters and purchase bread,
only kindness that raises its head
from the crowd of the world to say
it is I you have been looking for,
and then goes with you everywhere
like a shadow or a friend.
October – November, 1984
by Bishnu Mohapatra

A pitch dark night.
The tame owl’s
Dance of death
Makes the earth shudder
Fear piles up
On the roads of the city
Death’s long shadow captures
Its lands and by-lanes
On the still waters of the Yamuna
Float corpses of heart-rending shrieks

Who knows
How this night will end
The sun’s gray face
Will emerge from the forest of dense smoke,
Around a curtain of nightmares
Nervous eyes will peep,
Bearing no traces of life or tenderness
Their wings flapping loudly,
Countless flocks of vultures
Walk through the heart of the city.

This city is full of memories
This road that runs from my village to yours,
From the king’s palace
To where his subjects live,
Layers and layers of skin.

Old memories –
The sepoy’s harsh voice,
The sound of horse hooves
Shattering the stillness
Of quiet village paths.
Who comes?
Whoever the sepoy takes away
Never returns.
Whoever he ties to his horse and drags away
Turns into a tale
That takes on a life of its own.

Any animal that gets caught is sacrificed
To be served at the grand feast.
The city has set the forest on fire today.
Everyone excitedly waits for the grand feast.
They know not what happens
When the jungle gets burned to ash.
Who knows what terrible calamity
Waits to strike this place?

How can I have the heart to tell you,
The one you are waiting for
Will never come back,
How can I tell you
Waves of hatred
Have washed your father away?
On a stone at the end of the street
Dreams lie shattered.
Smiles shatter into splinters,
And feelings of helplessness
Force their way into every heart,
Like a cruel winter night.

What can one write of today,
What can the idiom of files capture?
Eyes swollen from crying,
A widow’s grief staring out of the eyes of a woman
Whose husband is still alive,
The oppressed hearts of orphans, defeated time –
All this slips through the net of empty words.
All that remains includes
One’s brushed voice,
And a few government and non-government reports.

Do not let history be written
In the language of files.
May everyone’s tears and grief
Course through the veins,
Till the hand
Turns stone-hard
And smashes
History’s countless ribcages.
Red Brocade  
by Naomi Shihab Nye

The Arabs used to say,  
When a stranger appears at your door,  
feed him for three days  
before asking who he is,  
where he's come from,  
where he's headed.  
That way, he'll have strength enough  
To answer.  
Or, by then you'll be such good friends  
You don't care.

Let's go back to that.  
Rice? Pine nuts?  
Here, take the red brocade pillow.  
My child will serve water  
To your horse.

No, I was not busy when you came!  
I was not preparing to be busy.  
That's the armor everyone put on  
At the end of the century  
To pretend they have a purpose  
In the world.

I refuse to be claimed.  
Your plate is waiting.  
We will snip fresh mint  
Into your tea.
The Peace of Wild Things
by Wendell Berry

When despair for the world grows in me
and I wake in the night at the least sound
in fear of what my life and my children’s lives might be,
I go and lie down where the wood drake rests,
in his beauty on the water,
and the great heron feeds.
I come into the peace of wild things,
who do not tax their lives with forethought of grief.
I come into the presence of still water,
and I feel above me the dayblind stars,
waiting with their light.
For a time, I rest in the grace of the world,
and am free.

Tapestry
by Grace Nichols

The long line of blood
And family ties

An African countenance here
A European countenance there
An Amerindian cast of cheek
An Asianic turn of eye
And the tongue's salty accommodation
The tapestry is mine
All the bloodstained prints
The scatterlinks
The grafting strand of crinkled hair
The black persistent blooming.
The Disappeared Ones
by Marjorie Agosín

The disappeared ones,
Where are they now?
Where is Miguel with his pockets full of bread?
Where is Señora Rosa?
and the echo of blood
muffles questions
and the air itself splatters me with blood.

A split,
a scab like a scream in the grave
foretell throats spilling silences
words never and always said
farewells to dawn and to love.

I am an unarmed woman
small and with hair blue as acid.
I search behind hospitals for a makeshift morgue
behind forbidden churches
beneath the traces of my Chilean widows
then
I swear to arm myself with the word
take it along the walls of the city
take it where the whip went
take this word
not given by God
to seek out the toothless mouths
as hunger does
go in search of your eyes.

I swear to be the word
but never to lament the dead
who are present.
Now.
Forever.
Los Desaparecidos  
by Marjorie Agosín

Los desaparecidos,
¿Dónde están?
¿Dónde está el Miguel con el pan en los bolsillos?
¿Dónde está la Señora Rosa?
y el eco de la sangre
empañan preguntas,
y el aire se me mancha como la sangre.

Una rajadura,
a una costra como un grito en el sepulcro,
vaticinan que las gargantas segregan silencios,
palabras nunca y siempre dichas
despeditas del amanecer y el amor.

Yo soy hembra sin fusil
pequeña y de cabellos azules como el ácido
que busca tras los hospitales de una morgue improvisada
tras iglesias censuradas
tras los signos de mis viudas
entonces
yo juro apoderarme de la palabra
ir con ella por los miros de la ciudad
ir con ella donde anduvo de látigo
ir con esta palabra
que Dios no me dió
al encuentro de las bocas desdentadas
como el hambre
ir en busca de tus ojos.

Yo juro sur la palabra
pero nunca lamentar a los
muertos que hoy y siempre
están.
The Low Road
by Marge Piercy

Alone, you can fight,
you can refuse, you can
take what revenge you can
but they roll over you

But two people fighting
back to back can cut through
a mob, a snake-dancing file
can break a cordon, an army
can meet an army.

Two people can keep each other
sane, can give support, conviction,
love, massage, hope, sex.
Three people are a delegation,
a committee, a wedge. With four
you can play bridge and start
an organization. With six
you can rent a whole house,
eat pie for dinner with no
seconds, and hold a fund raising party.

A dozen make a demonstration.
A hundred fill a hall.
A thousand have solidarity and your own newsletter;
ten thousand, power and your own paper;
a hundred thousand, your own media;
ten million, your own country.

It goes on one at a time,
it starts when you care
to act, it starts when you do
it again after they said no,
it starts when you say We
and know who you mean, and each
day you mean one more.
Wage Peace
by Judyth Hill

Wage peace with your breath.
Breathe in firemen and rubble, breathe out whole buildings and flocks of redwing blackbirds.
Breathe in terrorists and breathe out sleeping children and freshly mown fields.
Breathe in confusion and breathe out maple trees.
Breathe in the fallen and breathe out lifelong friendships intact.
Wage peace with your listening: hearing sirens, pray loud.
Remember your tools: flower seeds, clothes pins, clean rivers.
Make soup.
Play music, learn the word for thank you in three languages.
Learn to knit, and make a hat.
Think of chaos as dancing raspberries, imagine grief as the outbreath of beauty or the gesture of fish.
Swim for the other side.
Wage peace.
Never has the world seemed so fresh and precious.
Have a cup of tea and rejoice.
Act as if armistice has already arrived.
Don't wait another minute.