

BOSTON COLLEGE
SOCIAL WELFARE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE

"Varieties of Philanthropic Logic Among the Wealthy"

Paul G Schervish and John J Havens

to

Voluntary
and Nonprofit
for publication



VARIETIES OF PHILANTHROPIC LOGIC AMONG THE WEALTHY

This paper presents the findings from the Study on Wealth and Philanthropy concerning the logics of philanthropy among the wealthy. By logics of philanthropic action we mean the various ways wealthy individuals insert themselves into the world through their philanthropic efforts. Although there are characteristics of philanthropic practice shared by virtually all wealthy individuals, we have been able to discern a limited number of specific logics of philanthropy pursued by the wealthy. As we will demonstrate, each of these logics is a distinct combination of strategic meanings and practices for ordering philanthropic involvements in time and space.

In portraying these logics our goal is to provide more than a descriptive laundry list of philanthropic types. Our aim is to derive the array of philanthropic logics from a series of theoretical considerations concerning the structural context of philanthropy and the distinctive nature of individual agency among the wealthy. On the basis of such considerations we can explain how these logics are themselves logically ordered within a common conceptual schema. Each logic of philanthropic agency represents the point at which the biography of an individual agent intersects with the history of society in the form of structural constraints and opportunities. By reference to these underlying dynamics of philanthropy and agency it thus becomes possible to move beyond the anecdotal reporting of our findings.

It should be emphasized that situating individual meanings and practices within a structural context no way diminishes the place of individual decision making. Social structure never mechanistically determines practices by individuals. Rather, it determines a range of social relations, constraints, and opportunities that limit the course of personal behavior and belief. Even if a captain steers a ship according to whim, the ship must go upon the water and must eventually seek a port. In the case of philanthropy no less than in any other sphere, social structure is the historical backdrop for each particular biography. But it is also the accumulated historical record of all biographical work in the world. In this way, focusing on the social structure of philanthropy actually highlights rather than obscures the place of the self-directed human agent. This is nowhere more true than in a structural analysis of the wealthy because of the especially forceful agency that the wealthy bring to their participation in the world.

This paper then presents some initial findings on the logics of philanthropy carried out by the wealthy within the general structural framework of framework. The findings are based on interviews conducted in ten metropolitan areas with 140 individuals with net worth in excess of \$1 million. In the first section we elaborate the general meaning of social structure, and delineate five specific elements of the social structure of philanthropy, including the nature of a "logic" of philanthropic practice. In the second section, we apply these theoretical considerations to explain how each philanthropic logic is a particular concrete expression of the intersection of philanthropic structure and agency.

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF PHILANTHROPY

In the past a substantial amount of research has addressed the historical and structural aspects of giving by corporations and foundations. This research ties the patterns and purposes of philanthropic giving to the nation's industrial development, the evolution of the modern state, and transformations in the cultural morality and substantive objects of social responsibility (Bremner, 1960). However, research on the structural aspects of individual giving has been restricted for the most part to how changes in giving patterns over time derive from revisions in the tax code and in regulations governing the formation of foundations and their disbursement of funds. Yet to be developed is a general theory of the structural aspects of individual giving situated within the historical evolution of the social structure of society.

In this section, we outline the general meaning of social structure and then address five specific aspects of the structural foundations of individual philanthropy. These are (1) the organization of philanthropy as a production process; (2) the social positions of consumer and producer connected to this production process; (3) the structure of class relations within a philanthropic enterprise; (4) the way changes in the structural contours of philanthropy derive from specific historical developments in the socio-economic environment; and finally (5) the nature and meaning of a social logic as a way of understanding how individual philanthropy is organized in accord with structural properties.

The Meaning of Social Structure

Our analysis of the modes of philanthropy among the wealthy begins by situating individual philanthropy within its structural context. We argue that as a social structure, philanthropic practices intersect with the broader institutional workings of society and both reflect and produce changes in them.

A social structure is the compilation of interrelated social positions, cultural meanings, and behavioral conditions which, according to Giddens (1983: 69-70), serve as both the "medium and outcome" of individual or group practices. As such, a social structure is both "constraining and enabling." It is a field or terrain that provides both limits and barriers to action as well as resources and opportunities for changing the structure itself. It produces rules for social action and which in turn become the objects of production.

In this view, a logic of philanthropy is not simply the more or less well-motivated voluntary giving activity of individuals, foundations, or corporations but a particular instance of the intersection of moral agency and political economy. It is a patterned array of "constraining and enabling" positions located within the broader organizational framework of a society's leading cultural, economic, and political institutions. The particular array of positions that require our attention is determined by the structural workings of philanthropy as a production process within this broader setting.

Philanthropy as a Production Process

Elsewhere (Schervish, Herman, and Rhenisch 1986), we derived a theoretical understanding of contemporary philanthropy as a set of product and labor market relations producing various critical and conservative agendas by matching a supply of resources to a demand of interests and needs. Specifically, we defined philanthropy as the non-legislated or voluntary accumulation and distribution of resources to achieve personal or institutional needs and interests. We insist on identifying the dual process of accumulation and distribution not only because the concentration of resources is an essential precondition for their application, but also to emphasize the intrinsic connections between the way resources are obtained and the way they are disbursed. Such resources extend beyond money or financial capital and include physical capital such as in the use of a business to pursue philanthropic ends; human capital such as one's time, skills, and ideas; and cultural capital such as one's status.

Although not directed toward the accumulation of financial profits, philanthropy as a production process does strive to maximize the accomplishment of specific goals by the application of accumulated resources. As such, philanthropic activity takes on the organizational form of an enterprise in a market economy. The form of such an enterprise, however, is not limited to that of the giant corporation. It is just as likely to be a small business or partnership. In fact, the institutional shape of philanthropy recapitulates the entire specturm of organizational forms present in the market economy from self employment and sole proprietorships to large scale corporations as in the case of the major foundations.

As an aside, this definition of philanthropy as an organized production process provides another way to conceptualize the hybrid character of the "independent sector" as well as a way to distinguish between charity and philanthropy. First, the "mixed" character of philanthropy can be understood as resulting from philanthropy's unique institutional combination of (1) a set of labor and product market relations similar to that of a private firm in the business sector with (2) the systematic accumulation and distribution of resources on behalf of a public agenda similar to that of the government. Second, in these terms the narrow difference between charity and philanthropy is that charity revolves around the personal relations of voluntary giving while philanthropy revolves around the social relations of a production process.

Supporter and Producer of Philanthropy

The concept of social structure of philanthropy therefore refers to the set of institutionalized rules of production within which individuals or organizations voluntarily carry out their public wills to shape the historical development of society. Therefore, to examine the structural aspects of individual philanthropy requires that we first locate the set of positions or seats that establish the parameters within which individuals carry out their philanthropic activity. We focus on two such sets of positions directly related to the structural setting of philanthropy as a production process. The first set is that of supporter and producer and concerns whether an individual exerts an indirect or direct role in determining the existence and purpose of a philanthropic organization. The second set is the array of positions within a given philanthropic organization and concerns the type of relation an individual has to the actual production of philanthropic outcomes.

In common parlance we often speak of large and small contributors, endowed and unendowed philanthropies, and of founders and sustainers. Conceptualizing philanthropy as a productive enterprise provides a way of addressing these and other fundamental distinctions in a more parsimonious framework.

As a social organization dedicated to the production of outcomes, each philanthropy attempts to attract resources as the condition for applying them to fulfill a private (non-governmental) perception of social needs and interests. Most individuals respond to appeals for contributions in the way a consumer responds to the products or services of a business in the quite specific sense that their individual dedication of time or funds does not alone determine the existence or purpose of the philanthropy. This does not dismiss the long-term impact of some form of consumer sovereignty whereby a philanthropy that fails to perform in a way that appeals to the heartfelt interests of its contributors would either lose support or change its course of action. In this limited sense, therefore, all contributing consumers of philanthropy are in fact producers in that their accumulated individual support can ultimately shape the existence and direction of philanthropy. However, in contrast to those who contribute major gifts or actually establish philanthropies themselves, smaller contributors must be regarded as indirect producers.

It is a different story altogether, however, when a contributor provides a sizeable enough gift to actually shape the agenda of a philanthropy. In this instance, the contributor may be termed a direct producer in the sense that the contributor creates or sustains the very organizational life of the philanthropy. The extreme case of direct production is the personal founding of a philanthropic effort. This may be done formally in the form of a private foundation or in the form of contributing enough resources to establish a philanthropic outcome such as clinic, endowed chair, or hospital wing. Less

formally, even individuals of lesser means can directly produce philanthropic outcomes by "adopting" specific individuals (including family members), organizations, or causes that they assist in a sufficiently large manner as to "make a difference."

As we shall see, this structural distinction between consumers (or indirect producers) and producers of philanthropy becomes especially important for distinguishing types of philanthropic individuals among the wealthy as well as the different types of philanthropic involvement combined in an individual philanthropist. Yet to fully set the structural context of philanthropic activity, a second dimension of the positional structure of philanthropy must be addressed, namely the complex array of positions within a philanthropic organization including variations in types of producer positions. We term this array the class structure of philanthropy.

The Class Structure of Philanthropy

Within each philanthropic enterprise, just as in the business firm, there is a more or less elaborate array of positions constituting a hierarchy in the spheres of authority and production. Erik Olin Wright (1978, 1984) has elaborated a complex conceptual framework for understanding precisely this organizational arrangement of positions within an enterprise (see also Schervish and Herman, 1986). According to Wright, the axis on which real divisions between positions turns is effective control over productive assets in an enterprise. Such assets include physical capital, money capital, and human capital (both physical labor power and mental skills). Effective control entails the capacity to determine the application of these assets to the production of goods and services.

Positions within the enterprise are defined according to the extent to which they grant incumbents of the position the ability to determine the mobilization of these assets. Actual ownership of the assets, of course, provides for the greatest potential effective control. The simplest instance occurs in the case of a position of self-employment where no other workers are engaged. Here the notion of producer and owning director of philanthropy converge most fully in contrast to the situation where where a sponsor produces philanthropy but is not directly engaged in effectively controlling the application of assets to produce outcomes. Whether a mason, attorney, or hairdresser, the incumbent of the self-employment position controls the application of all three forms of capital.

As soon as other non-owners are engaged in production, the positional structure becomes more complex. It now becomes appropriate to refer to ownership as a small-employer position and to speak of a range of employee positions. In addition to personal self-direction in the application of one's human capital and control over financial and physical capital, the ownership position now provides for direction of the human capital of others holding employee positions. When the employee position is constituted, in the extreme case, by the absence of effective control over either organizational or skill assets, we can speak of a worker position.

Finally, in larger, more complex enterprises, two further evolutions of the positional structure occur. The first is the separation of legal ownership and control. The position of legal owner no longer resides actively within the enterprise, as in the case of public corporations. As in the example of philanthropic sponsorship just cited, the executive power derived from ownership gets delegated to the position of chief operating officer which now executes effective control over assets. The second development involves the further

delegation of proprietary rights to a range of upper- and lower-level managerial positions which generally exercise relatively little control over financial capital but greater control over physical capital and over their own and others' human capital. The extent to which such positions exercise effective control over organizational assets determines their rank in the managerial hierarchy. The extent to which such a position allows an individual independent control over the disposition of their skills, determines their place in the professional hierarchy.

Together, the character of philanthropy as a production process and the array of consumer, production, and class positions related to that production process constitute the social structure of philanthropy. Each person engaged in accumulating, distributing, controlling, or working on the financial, physical, personal, or cultural assets of the philanthropic production process should be understood as situated within the social structure of philanthropy.

The Social Structure of Accumulation

Although the structural world of philanthropy sets the parameters of practice and meaning at any point in time, it is not static. There is a systematic relation between changes in the social structure of philanthropy and the historical development of the broader institutional relations within which it is set. Following Gordon, Edwards, and Reich (1984), we term this broader institutional setting "the social structure of accumulation." This is the specific political-economic environment composed of all the social practices and meanings, that affect the "possibilities for capital accumulation" (22) and determine the viability of a particular era of economic production.

In a market economy, the leading or organizing institution providing income and social welfare is the private economy of production and employment. Despite its importance, this economic structure of accumulation is not automatically capable of reproducing itself over time because of the dynamic pressures of economic competition and labor struggle. As a result the continued viability of the accumulation process requires developments in the social organization of production itself as well as new forms of support from the political, social, and cultural institutions. Each phase in the development of economic relations coincides with an interrelated development of the social structure of accumulation.

As one of the major institutions devoted both to mitigating the failures of the private economy and to forging a better working society, philanthropy plays a prominent role within the social structure of accumulation. Despite the importance of analyzing how philanthropy helps to reproduce society, we focus here on a much narrower aspect of the relation of philanthropy to the social structure of accumulation. This is the way philanthropy, as a production process, develops in a specific way congruent to the evolution of the organization of production in the private economy.

Briefly, this has meant that as the economy moved from being organized around small-scale competitive firms to being structured around giant oligopolies, so too did philanthropy. It is not by accident that the birth of the major foundation and community funds such as the United Way as an organizational form coincided with the evolution of the modern corporation. In terms of the array of positions described above, the growing private concentration of resources accompanying this shift contributed to the greater relative prominence of producer and owner positions in philanthropy. It also led to the creation of a full-blown class structure of managerial and

professional positions within philanthropy.

Today a further evolution in the organization of production is underway, again reshaping the structure of philanthropy. Heightened international competition, the movement away from manufacturing to service industries, the restructuring of labor markets in the wake of three major recessions in the course of the past decade, the dramatic reduction in personal income taxes, and high levels of deficit spending have all contributed to unleashing what could be called the second entrepreneurial revolution. In the service sector and in certain manufacturing industries such as telecommunications, electronics, and computers, where barriers to entry are lower, individual entrepreneurs have thrived, making the independent small firm the cornerstone of growth in the American economy and creating a new cohort of wealthy individuals. In addition, there are new forces supporting the preservation of more directly controlled businesses. Even amidst uncertainty concerning the effect on businesses of the most recent revision in the tax code, it is becoming recognized that it provides substantial incentives for smaller public corporations to return ownership to fewer stock holders by restructuring as limited partnerships.

As an ethos and a practice, this second entrepreneurial revolution has been translated into a series of transformations in the social structure of philanthropy. Most obvious is the growth in the number of individuals with a substantial enough level of accumulated assets to enable them to move from being supporters to producers of philanthropy in the sense we discussed above. Second, the form of philanthropic organization produced in these efforts tends to move away from more formalized corporate models where the reigns of effective control are handed over to managers and professionals and toward more innovative, smaller-scale organizations where the funder remains directly involved. Finally, as wealthy women become more interested in directing their

own finances and businesses and in holding decision-making positions within philanthropies, there has been a decline in the number of women willing to hold non-paid worker positions within philanthropy. This has been referred to by more than one respondent as the "end of volunteerism."

The Logic of Philanthropic Practice

We conceptualize modes of philanthropy as logics in order to emphasize that each type of philanthropic activity is an articulated unity of meaning and practice that makes sense of and orders the world as a progressive series of events. The notion of social logic, in contrast to the notions of modes or types, denotes the presence of an ordering principle over time and space. As such, we define a social logic as the set of strategic meanings and strategic practices according to which an agent organizes a series of discrete events into an ordered trajectory in time and space to accomplish a goal. As a form of consciousness and practice, a logic provides the mental and behavioral linkages between a sequence of events so as to construct a coherent teleological process.

For example, the various logics which will be discussed shortly constitute the manner in which wealthy individuals construct a course of action in relation to where they have been and where they wish to go. Each logic of philanthropy is a distinct way the wealthy conceive of and use their money for public purposes.

The Elements of A Social Logic

Each social logic is constituted by a structural starting point, a view of the way things work, a plan of action, and a goal to be achieved. These elements combine to form a unified or articulated approach to the world. In more formal terms, these four elements of social logic are (1) structural position, (2) strategic consciousness; (3) strategic practice; and (4) desired goal or teleological focus of attention.

Structural Position. An individual enters into or becomes attached to a social logic by virtue of being an incumbent of a social position. The position is the seat or structural starting point that links an individual to the particular set of institutional constraints and opportunities associated with a specific social logic. The position connects an agent to an ordered agenda, that is, to a given social structure as we have discussed this above. Within the world of the social logic, each position provides a vantage point that simultaneously limits and extends an agent's view of the world and provides a set of behavioral responsibilities and opportunities. In addition, every social logic orders a sequence of meanings and practices not just for one structural position but for an array of positions; and by doing so, it orders the relation of these positions to each other as well. As we will see, each logic of philanthropy provides an array of positions in relation to which individual philanthropists play out their unique contribution. Each position, then, is the structural locus from which individuals receive and carry out the strategic consciousness strategic practice, and goals or a particular logic of philanthropy.

Strategic Consciousness. As we have stated, a social logic provides an ordering principle or trajectory for social action. As such, a social logic is not only a behavioral prescription but a cognitive map, a personally appropriated set of meanings or cultural understanding of the world. Each social logic, then, offers a strategic consciousness or meaning or way of understanding how the elements of the world are interconnected and get played out in a causal sequence. The cognitive map of the strategic meaning of each logic is not is not simply static. It is also strategic in the sense that it sets forth a trajectory of causal linkages explaining how outcomes come to pass and what specific social forces are most crucial for setting in motion the chain of events that make the world the way it is. Therefore, a strategic consciousness is simultaneously existential, normative, and utopian. It explains the way the world works, the way way it ought to be, and the way to transform it. As such, every social logic is a cultural logic explaining how and why things work and what to expect.

Like all logics, it provides an ordered array of meanings, an understanding of how one thing follows the next. But unlike the rationality of syllogistic logic that appeals to the deductive properties of the mind, cultural logic offers a rationality that makes sense of and orders the world in a way that appeals to the intuitive subjectivity of a particular individual or social group. For instance, the social logic of the American dream entails the strategic meaning that hard work will produce fortunate outcomes, that virtue is rewarded. It is rational in the sense that it explains the world, how it should work, what must be done to become successful, and what is wrong with those who are not successful. It is a strategic meaning, a logic in the fullest sense of the term.

But clearly the connections that move us from one proposition to the next are different from those of Aristotelian logic. In the case of a social logic of philanthropy, each logic's strategic meaning comprises the existential, normative, and utopian beliefs about the social needs that require attention, the way to address these problems by the application of voluntary contributions of time and money, the self-understandings of one's role in attending to these problems, and the pattern of social causation that make one's and other's involvement efficacious.

Strategic Practice. If strategic consciousness is the cognitive framework of a social logic, strategic practice is the behavioral pattern. A social logic is not just a way of thinking, it is a way of acting and actually carrying out the strategic meaning on behalf of a goal. Every social logic entails, then, a set of specific practices that are called for by the strategic meaning and the particular purpose to be accomplished. As a strategic pattern of action, this behavioral component must be understood as the designation of the types of practices to be carried out, what individuals are to carry out which practices, the order of these practices over time, the organizational setting for the practices, and the relations of production and authority directing these practices. Based on element of strategic meaning of a social logic, a strategic practice is the step-by-step execution of the behavioral and organizational action that puts into motion and gives social presence to a particular effort of world construction. As will be seen, the notion of strategic practice in a logic of philanthropy, is less concerned with specific amounts of giving or the causes supported. Rather, it concerns the kinds of activities carried out in the relation to philanthropy by the givers themselves, the kinds of related philanthropic practices set in motion for others, and the specific organizational forms and involvements that are made part of the philanthropic

production process by virtue of the other three elements of a philanthropic logic.

Teleology. The fourth element of a social logic is the teleological focus of attention, what is being accomplished. The teleology of a social logic is the complex array of outcomes focused on by the strategic meaning and accomplished by the strategic practice. The teleological focus cannot be reduced to some single stated purpose, motive, or end. It entails not only what one wants to do, but how one does it, and how one is shaped by or involved in the doing. The teleological focus is not an isolated goal but in fact a legacy; what is left behind or accomplished in its totality. Each philanthropic logic, depending on its specific teleological focus of attention, directs the philanthropist to address one interconnected configuration of ends rather than another. As we will demonstrate, a philanthropic logic that entails the complex teleology of both the financial support of a particular social service agency as well as the personal involvement with its clients differs dramatically from a philanthropic logic that entails the complex teleologic whereby monetary giving involves the funder as a recipient or consumer of specific benefits from the supported institution, e.g., giving to a school in anticipation of their children's acceptance. We must caution immediately, that the different teleological focuses of the philanthropic logics are not the basis for arranging logics in a hierarchy of moral quality. Rather it is to emphasize that every logic has as its teleological focus, not simply the giving of certain amounts to certain causes, but rather a complex array of ends having to do with what happens to the philanthropist, other individuals, and the cause or people being supported.

SPECIFIC LOGICS OF PHILANTHROPIC PRACTICE

As we stated above, we call particular modes of individual philanthropic practice "logics" because they are an articulated combination of elements which possess a certain coherency. Logics of philanthropy represent an ordering of motivations, resources, and goals; they make sense of and order individual agency in the social structure of philanthropy as a progressive series of events. In what follows, we set out nine social logics of philanthropy among the wealthy. This is not an exhaustive list, however, and we are in the process of elaborating six or seven further models. But the review of the nine logics presented should be sufficient to indicate both our theoretical argument and an introduction to one aspect of our empirical findings.

Theoretically, we argue that philanthropic practices among the wealthy should be conceived as internally coherent social logics of production rather than as merely descriptively different types. As a social logic, each mode of philanthropy is a unified arrangement of a specific set of positions within the organizational hierarchy; a strategic consciousness setting out an existential, normative, and utopian understanding of the way the world works; a strategic practice setting in motion a causal trajectory executing the strategic understanding of reality; and a complex teleology comprising a unified array of outcomes whereby what comes about for the philanthropist, the cause supported, and society in general are inextricably linked. In turn, our empirical findings indicate that philanthropy among the wealthy is constituted by a finite number of well-demarcated internally-coherent social logics. There is neither a myriad number of practices unique to each individual nor one single form with only accidental differences.

As we turn to the exposition of the nine logics, we must note that for many individuals their philanthropic practice is multiplex, often evidencing more than one logic of philanthropy. Nevertheless it is most often the case that one particular logic tends to be the predominant mode of philanthropic practice for an individual. Also, we caution that no evaluation of the moral character of any of these logics should be read into our exposition of them.

Entrepreneurial

Just as the catalytic and innovative influence of entrepreneurship has become increasingly important in the social structure of accumulation, so too has an entrepreneurial logic of philanthropic practice in the social structure of philanthropy. The strategic consciousness associated with the entrepreneurial logic is shaped by the same phenomenological dispositions that characterize the entrepreneur in the social structure of accumulation. Indeed, it is often the case that the individuals who most strongly and clearly manifest the entrepreneurial logic are also entrepreneurs in the business sector. Yet it is not necessary to occupy an entrepreneur/owner position in the social structure of accumulation to be a philanthropic entrepreneur. What is necessary is a framework of strategic meaning which emphasizes creativity and innovation in the organization of philanthropic production and/or the teleological outcome or product of the philanthropic production process. The philanthropic entrepreneur scans the terrain looking for particular areas of social need which are inadequately addressed by extant philanthropic practices and products. The philanthropic entrepreneur takes great pride in developing new ideas for philanthropic practice and initiating projects in undeveloped or underdeveloped philanthropic terrain. One person described the entrepreneurial logic as being that of a "social inventor", of one who "gets a big kick out of creating

something or making something possible, making something happen that wouldn't have happened".

In order to make things happen the entrepreneurial philanthropist takes up the position of producer and owner, investing both their monetary and human capital in generally small-scale organizations which are expressly organized to carry out their ideas and create innovative new solutions to social problems. Thus, the strategic practice of the entrepreneurial logic involves an active, hands-on engagement of the individual in the production process. While the extent to which an individual is committed on a daily basis to a particular project varies, the entrepreneurial philanthropist will always exercise at least effective control over the major purposes to which the productive assets of the organization are applied. Nonetheless, several individuals have argued that the success of philanthropic innovation requires almost a full-time involvement on the part of the entrepreneur. As one person said who had initiated a number of innovative philanthropic projects said, "one of my tenets is that nothing ever changes without a focal point of full time energy."

Further, the entrepreneur creates small-scale projects not simply to ensure effective control or facilitate active engagement but also because it makes the capital contributions of individual all the more effective since it is in small organizations that have relatively narrow goals that smaller contributions can have the most impact.

Programmatic

The programmatic logic of giving involves a conscious effort on the part of the individual to strategically choose and unite a number of philanthropic activities in order to achieve a coherent program of philanthropic outcomes. In programmatic philanthropy, the achieving of a complex telos is made explicit. The key element of this particular logic is the strategic consciousness which explicitly links together capital, practice and telos. The general goal to be achieved is invested with a great deal of affective importance and the array or range of strategic practices are carefully chosen so as to maximize the impact of the individual's contributions on achieving the strategic goal. Such goals are generally broad in scope, and phrased in social, political, or religious terms. We have seen programs of religious evangelicalism, community development and social change or empowerment of subordinate groups in society.

Since programmatic philanthropists are involved in a number of different philanthropic activities, the nature of their capital contribution, the positions that they occupy as well the specific nature of their practices will vary according to the particular project or organization. In relation to some activities they may only be a supporter and contribute monetary capital while in relation to others they may occupy producer positions and contribute their skills, status, and time as well as money. The key is that the programmatic philanthropist is engaged in an array of practices with different degrees and types of involvement, all or most of which are oriented around a particular desired outcome.

A telling example of the programmatic logic is provided by one respondent whose explicit social agenda was oriented around exposing and counteracting the links between private and corporate wealth and the governmental decision-making process. As he put it, he is "maniacal about money and politics." This person has made a full-time philanthropic career out of strategically pursuing his program through an array of philanthropic practices including establishing and running a public interest organization, creating a fund for investigative journalism, and making executive decisions in his family's foundation. Thus, this logic of philanthropy is characterized not only by its strategic coherency but also the systematic unity imposed by the philanthropist onto a wide range of specific philanthropic practices.

Productive

The logic of productive philanthropy is characterized by a strategic meaning system in which the distinction between one's business activity and philanthropy is erased. For the productive philanthropist, his or her business is itself a philanthropic practice and organization. Consequently, there is convergence of the types of capital invested in the firm, the position one holds (an owner or managerial position) and daily practices and the product of the business with those in philanthropy. All of the elements of philanthropic logic which produce individual agency in the social structure of philanthropy are immanent in the characteristics of one's agency in the social structure of accumulation. The precise nature of an individual's productive philanthropy thus depends upon specific way in which the view both the product of the firm and their own strategic business practices as being philanthropic.

Three examples will suffice to demonstrate the range of different ways in which productive philanthropy can operate. One individual, an entrepreneur/owner, argued that his business, and any other business for that matter, was philanthropic simply because it was a business. As an owner of a successful company, he was philanthropic because he was providing jobs and income for a number of people as well as fulfilling a demand for specific goods in the marketplace, all of which enhanced the quality of social life in general. In this case, there need not be any explicitly special or progressive characteristics about practice of the business or its products in order for it to be considered philanthropic by the owner.

However, in most cases there is something special about the product or strategic practice of the firm which makes it philanthropic in the eyes of the individual. For a second individual who occupies a managerial position within the firm but is independently wealthy, he is contributing his human capital to the enterprise which is philanthropic because its product, religious books and literature, is spiritually and socially uplifting. As says, "there is not a bifurcation that says this is a ministry (his philanthropic activity outside of the firm) and that this isn't (the firm itself). Now it wouldn't be as easy for me to work myself as hard as I do for Exxon as it is for (this company), because in (this company) there is an exciting overlap of some of the missions of our company with my overall mission for my life in the world and that no doubt is what makes this work appealing". Finally, For a third individual, who is an entrepreneur in philanthropy as well as business, the very nature of the organization and practices of the firm as a working environment is shaped so as to "influence my people's lives in a positive manner, both individually and collectively". Thus, the firm's assets are mobilized in such a way so as to maximize employment security, employee participation in decision-making and to enhance worker loyalty and commitment through profit-sharing. As this individual put it, his company is a form of productive philanthropy because it is a "people-oriented company"

Consumption

The logic of consumption philanthropy is characterized by a framework of strategic meaning which emphasizes the personal utility of a particular philanthropic product or outcome for the individual contributor him/herself. The types of capital invested, the position one occupies as well as one's strategic practice are predominantly oriented around the production of a

philanthropic good that one will consume either in the present or at some point in the future.

In general, consumption philanthropy involves capital contributions of monetary, human and cultural capital to extant organizations and institutions. The position a consumption philanthropist holds can either be supporting or producing but in terms of the latter they are generally managerial. We have not come across anyone occupying an owner position in order to produce a philanthropic outcome mainly and explicitly for their own consumption. The principal philanthropic products that one finds involved in consumption philanthropy are predominantly educational and cultural/artistic. Further, the logic of consumption philanthropy is most evidenced by those from inherited or "old money" backgrounds. A prime example of consumption philanthropy revolves around the common practice of the inherited wealthy to contribute to the private grammar and high schools which they attended and which will also be attended by subsequent generation of family members.

Managerial

The essence of the managerial logic of philanthropy is a strategic framework of meaning which places preeminent value on enhancing the rationality and efficiency of a particular philanthropic production process. The position assumed by an individual in this logic is, of course, managerial and thus involves a strategic practice oriented around rationally organizing the mobilization of a philanthropic organizations assets in order to produce an outcome in the most effective way possible. Accordingly, the focus of an individual's involvement is not the product itself per se, but the process by which it is produced. While it is possible to make contributions of monetary

capital in order to aid in rationalization(one individual funded the computerization of an organization's data base), the managerialist predominantly contributes her or his own skills as a manager or managerial consultant to the organization. As with entrepreneurial philanthropy, managerial philanthropy is one of the clearest cases where an individual recapitulates their position in the social structure of accumulation in the social structure of philanthropy.

A prime example of the managerial logic of philanthropy is one individual who is a top corporate executive for one of the largest corporations in the world. While involved in what he called corporate "missionary" work(what we call productive philanthropy) he saw the necessity of organizing and mobilizing philanthropic assets as if the task was a "business proposition". No matter what the particular product was being produced by the variety of philanthropic organizations he was involved in(which range from summer camps for underprivileged youths to Third World housing projects), there is an emphasis on enabling people who want to good for others effective by giving them effective organization. As he says, "You have to spot and select the people that...want to something for other people. They are usually pretty ineffective in what they are supposed to be doing but they can be damned effective if you channel them right, if you make them do what they are supposed to do". And the key to "channelling" is "competent organization" which the managerialist will endeavour to provide.

Derivative

As its name implies, the logic of derivative philanthropy derives from the position the philanthropist holds outside of and independent from the world of philanthropy. The strategic meaning and practice of philanthropy emerges from the responsibilities of the individual's position as a member of a particular

community or corporation. The key defining characteristic of derivative philanthropy is that the teleological focus is on the strategic practice of philanthropic involvement, not as an end in itself, but as a means of fulfilling the responsibilities of one's position in the larger social structure. The result is that there tends to be a certain tone of disinterestedness or unengagement with the specific product or service of whatever philanthropic organization they are involved in. This is not to say that such goods or services are unimportant to the people who exemplify this logic but rather to emphasize that their philanthropy results from the imperative of obligation resting outside of philanthropy rather than an attraction of producing a particular philanthropic outcome. We have seen this logic manifested in two ways: first, by individuals who become philanthropically engaged because of expectations attached to their position in a firm or in the business world in general and; second, by individuals who enter into philanthropy on the basis of their position as women of the upper class.

In the case of business-derived philanthropy the impetus for philanthropic involvement can come from either a firm-wide ideology of community responsibility or from a requirement for upward career mobility. In most cases both of these pressures are present. As one member of a prominent accounting firm stated, not only does his firm allocate about 5% of its earnings for philanthropy but that each partner is expected to be involved in some leadership role in the philanthropic community: "We really believe as a business philosophy that we have an obligation to give back to the community....[W]e also believe that if the partners and some of other others here do it...it's tremendous for their personal development...[and] states something about us in the community that's good for our business....I think what it states too... that [our firm] and it's partners are people who are anxious to be involved and if they are

involved, they will make a difference."

Secondly, the derivational logic of philanthropy is often found among what is probably a dying breed of wealthy-women of inherited wealth whose adult vocation is volunteer work in traditional areas of philanthropy (e.g. social services, cultural/artistic institutions, etc.). Such individuals make a career out of the charitable duties expected of women of their class so that the work of philanthropy as practice becomes a primary source of self-identity, efficacy and empowerment in their lives since work in the business world was a route implicitly or explicitly denied to them. Further, it is the daily practice of this kind of derivational philanthropy that the traditional sexual division of labor in philanthropic organizations is most evidenced. While women may occupy a variety of structural positions within philanthropic positions, they are largely excluded from ownership or managerial positions which exercise effective control over the overall mobilization of assets and the purposes to which they are applied. As women put it, they form a "network of good little indians" who recruit other volunteers, organize fundraisers and plan events for purposes decided by the "real" board as opposed to the "women's board".

In light of the changing economic and vocational positions of women in the social structure of accumulation, these women recognize themselves as dying species. Some forecast the end of volunteerism as younger women of wealth become philanthropic involved in more entrepreneurial and creative ways as well as occupy more positions in the workplace. For others, this causes resentment as they view their volunteer career not so much as a waste but as an activity which is undervalued by the philanthropic community. As women said summing up the end of a 50-year volunteer career: "I've done community work all my life, and if I would do it again I wouldn't do it for free...I would get more respect. You appreciate what you pay for".

Therapeutic

The therapeutic logic of philanthropy is one of the most unique logics that we have discovered to date. In this logic there is a convergence of strategic meaning, strategic practice and philanthropic outcome as the focus of attention becomes the self-development and empowerment of the wealthy individual as an explicit part of the philanthropic practice and organization. This logic is almost exclusively found among a younger generation of inherited wealthy who are actively engaged in progressive politics and alternative "social change" philanthropies. Such individuals have often had a difficult time with the dissonance between their egalitarian politics and their privileged position in the class structure. The possession of wealth, and the freedom and power that it provides, often becomes an obstacle to self-development and individuality. Fortune becomes a burden, a negative social signifier which interferes with personal and work relationships and "sin" to be expurgated.

In therapeutic philanthropy the strategic practice involves a dual thrust of empowerment and self-development. First, the manifest outcome of alternative philanthropy is the empowerment of subordinate groups in society and the active engagement of the individual in the process of social empowerment enables them to deal with their own privilege. Secondly, an explicit part of involvement in producing these outcomes, which requires an investment of time and skills as well as money, are support groups, retreats and the like which address the issues of self-esteem and political dissonance. The organization itself provides a "nurturing" atmosphere which enables the individual to develop a reflexive development of self in the company of peers. In therapeutic philanthropy, individuals occupy positions of collective and cooperative producers as the organizations are democratically structured.

Noblesse Oblige

Although the term of noblesse oblige often refers to the codenscending attitude held by the wealthy in their charity toward the less fortunate, we use the term in a much less judgmental and pervasive sense to characterize only one distinctive logic of giving. As a social logic the key aspect of noblesse oblige philanthropy is not a configuration of attitudes about the relation of rich and poor but a strategic understanding about the interrelation of family and money. It is not by accident that we have encountered the logic of noblesse oblige mainly among inherited wealthy because the strategic meaning shaping noblesse oblige philanthropy revolves around the strategic meaning of money as a family resource reconstituting the lineage from generation to generation. "We made our wills back in highschool when we turned 18," recounts one woman of inherited wealth, "And you begin to think in terms of what you have and how you're going to pass it down....The responsibility has always been told to my sister and I, by our parents, that we have the responsibility to take care of the family after us, that money can be spent...as long as you put aside for the next generation, their security, because you didn't earn this, it's a gift, and it's a trust" (027: 19).

Money, according to this and numerous other inherited respondents, is a trust not only in the obvious legal sense but in a deep social sense as well. From childhood, the inherited learn not only that money is passed on to them but that this money has a three-fold character. One part, "the interest," can accrue to their parents and later to them as an allowance for living at the family standard. The second, more fundamental part, "the capital or principal," is an inviolable keepsake that creates the family over generations and is thus just as sacred. The third part is either "charitable funds" composed of both interest and growth in the principal or a foundation. In either case, the

important point is that the amount for charity tends to be a carefully limited or formally demarcated sum specifically devoted to philanthropy. Indeed, the sum may be considered residual in that the primary purpose of money is extension of the family over time. The same woman says, "I feel I will inherit a great deal of money and I plan to set aside a good portion of it [for charity], particularly since my children are going to be taken care of [by existing trusts]. My immediate concern in the next 10 to 15 years would be to first make sure my grandchildren have [company] stock, or if the company's been sold, capital put aside to assure that they will be safe....Then I will address what I want to give of my fortune to charity and who's gonna run it, and how you do it....That'll be another project, I'll get involved in that. I like projects" (37-38).

But if the sum is residual, engaging in acts of philanthropy is not. Here we part company with those who use the concept of noblesse oblige in its more derogatory connotation. As we have just seen, along with learning the meaning of money as a family trust, the inherited understand their money as unearned, a fortune of birth, and therefore a responsibility or social trust as well. The strategic meaning that shapes their philanthropy then is that their responsibility to assist the needy and to support civic works is an extension of their guardianship of money in the family. It is not the absolute amount of time or money devoted to philanthropy that characterizes their consciousness but the somewhat contingent and limited commitment.

"I don't feel at this point, that I have a right to give away what capital and income I now have to outside charities because, if I were to die, my family would need that money to live on....I would not want to have given mine away and then prematurely and have them have nothing" (44). Perhaps what has been seen as a condescending attitude is in fact this very circumscribed third priority

accorded philanthropy. The implications for the strategic practice of philanthropy are direct. Just as money is dispassionately set in motion to preserve the family, it is dispassionately set in motion for social causes. Although not all inherited family members subscribe to the logic of noblesse oblige, the tendency of the select group pursuing the logic of noblesse oblige is to engage in regularized contributions to certain favorite charities as part of sense of community citizenship but to regard the causes themselves in non-ideological ways and to limit their involvement to discrete fundraising.

For instance, one inherited man, responding to a direct question about the the agenda of his city's major philanthropic association replies: "Well, very simply I guess the agenda is to be useful....to stretch the philanthropic dollar....and to also leave some seed money for for innovative approaches" (O18: 34).

Again, the focus of attention is not first the production of particular worldly outcomes but a responsibility to extend the family in the world as an outgrowth to extend the family in time across the generations. In this way, the key structural position setting the agenda of constraints and opportunities is not actually one located in the social structure of philanthropy but in the family. Although within the logic of noblesse oblige we may find individuals both supporting and producing philanthropic activities, the wealthy agent remains defined throughout as guardian of a family trust in time and in the world.

Catalytic Philanthropy

The logic of catalytic philanthropy revolves around efforts to mobilize the affective engagement of third parties on behalf of a cause rather than simply around the contribution of time or money to achieve a specific organizational or social task. Since efforts to mobilize the involvement of others is a common element of many forms of philanthropy, the distinguishing characteristic of the catalytic logic cannot be mobilization per se. It is, instead, the way the strategic consciousness of this logic combines three specific qualities of this mobilization. These strategic practices are (1) the rallying of a non-wealthy constituency, (2) the attempt to imbue this constituency with the same affective motivation held by the catalytic philanthropist, and (3) the generation of a strategic practice directed toward the creation of popular support to accomplish the desired end.

First, the teleological focus of mobilization is not just other wealthy philanthropists but a broader popular base as well. For instance, brokering philanthropy (not treated in this version of the paper) is defined by the attempt to mobilize the contributions of other philanthropists. In the respect that brokering philanthropy also strives to elicit the active participation of others, it is similar to catalytic philanthropy. The two forms differ, however, in that brokering philanthropy engages in the horizontal mobilization of other wealthy individuals while catalytic philanthropy adds the vertical mobilization of the non-wealthy.

Second, the strategic consciousness ordering catalytic philanthropy dictates that the vertical mobilization be characterized by a certain affective or ideological quality. This clearly distinguishes the mobilization associated with catalytic efforts both from simple fundraising activities such as those

carried out by the United Way and even from many forms of popular social mobilization. As we said, instead of dedicating time or money directly to the organization or people working on a particular cause, the catalytic philanthropist dedicates time or money to get others to contribute. However, the strategic meaning that sets this network of contribution in motion centers on the belief that the contributors being rallied must be made dedicated to the ideological perspective of the cause. Thus what in the end distinguishes catalytic philanthropy is the distinctive affective quality of the type of mobilization taken up by the catalytic philanthropist. The philanthropist seeks to rally others' participation by communicating to the third parties being rallied the same special urgency or enthusiasm that embues the philanthropist. Philanthropy is a political or ethical vocation aimed at eliciting an equally ethical engagement of a broad constituency. Hence it is not any one topic or substantive cause that characterizes the catalytic logic; mobilizing the elderly, organizing contributions for women candidates women voters, or simply getting the public to contribute money to a cause may all be pursued within the catalytic logic.

Third, the strategic practice of catalytic philanthropy revolves around setting in motion a trajectory of action in the form of a social movement. For instance forestalling military intervention in Central America will be achieved not by direct access by the philanthropist to foreign policy decision makers but by a broad mobilization of a constituency who will then pressure the targeted official through public opinion, voting, and other forms of social mobilization.

Thus in the catalytic logic, the position of philanthropist is not engaged mainly in contributing money to an organization to achieve the desired mobilization but takes on that action of mobilization as the central form of contribution. The catalytic philanthropist is personally engaged in the direct appeal to the mobilizing constituency. As a result, the most important asset available to the catalytic philanthropist is one is directly related to the philanthropist's structural position. The catalytic philanthropist, to be effective, must hold a position not primarily in a family, corporation, or within a philanthropic organization, but in society itself. It is the public status of the philanthropist that is the major resource for obtaining the attention and rallying the engagement of the public in the goal. Consequently, we find that catalytic philanthropy is populated largely by public figures including entertainment stars, sports figures, and other media celebrities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bremner, Robert H., American Philanthropy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Giddens, Anthony. Central Problems of Social Theory. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.
- Herman, Andrew and Paul G. Schervish, "On the Road: Conceptualizing Class Structure in the Transition to Socialism," Sociology of Work and Occupations 13, 2 (May 1986): 264-291.
- Schervish, Paul, Rhenisch, Lynn and Andrew Herman, "Towards a General Theory of the Philanthropic Activity of the Wealthy," Independent Sector Spring Research Forum Working Papers (March 1986): 219-227.
- Wright, Erik Olin, Class, Crisis and the State. London: New Left Books, 1978.
- _____, Classes. New Left Books, 1986.



SOCIAL WELFARE RESEARCH INSTITUTE
BOSTON COLLEGE
MCGUINN 515
140 COMMONWEALTH AVENUE
CHESTNUT HILL, MA 02467
TEL: 617-552-4070
FAX: 617-552-3903
EMAIL: swri508@bc.edu
WEBSITE: www.bc.edu/swri