

**The Scholar and The Feminist XIX
Women as Change Makers:
Building and Using Political Power
Saturday, April 24, 1993**

Afternoon Panel:

11. Women and Philanthropy

Eleanor Brilliant, Rutgers University: Let me introduce each of our panelists before I talk. I will also be presenting on the panel, but I also have the double job of introducing everybody. So, where do I start? Which way? Whoever comes out first, I start.

Cathy McCarthy -- this is not, I think, in alphabetical order, but -- I've known Cathy longer than I have actually known Alison who I just met. Cathy is probably known to many of you. She is a very, very distinguished writer, author, scholar in the field of philanthropy and women in particular. She got her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and has now the position of Associate Professor in History, but also Director of the Center for the Study of Philanthropy at the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York. So she is here in New York where she has come to roost. Her books are, among her books I should say, are Noblesse Oblige, Charity and Cultural Philanthropy in Chicago -- which I guess is where I first met you. We first met actually at a seminar in philanthropy at Columbia, not far away. She's also written Lady Bountiful Revisited: Women Power and Philanthropy, and I guess the newest one is Women's Culture, American Philanthropy and Art. Since I'm married to an art historian that book might even appear also in our house. Numerous presentations, I won't go into all of them. Many of the conferences we have played footsie at and been in some of the same places at the same time. Among other professional activities though that I think you may enjoy knowing, she is on the governing board of the Rockefeller Archive Center -- which I thank you for since I use -- and she's first vice-chairperson of the Non-Profit Academic Center Council. And I could go on and on with her distinguished record, but I will not take any more time except to say that when she does her speaking we'll all be very fortunate to hear her.

I'll introduce both speakers, all of us, and then we'll go back to Cathy. Now, we have Alison Bernstein, who I have met for the very first time. In fact, I was chasing descriptions of her to find her today. She is feeling, if it's alright to say, somewhat under the weather, so she will speak first, and then there will be questions? Actually, Cathy will go first then we will do Alison. Alison will field some questions then I will speak and we'll save the questions for Cathy and me afterwards. She's holding up and this is good. We'll help.

Alison is at, as you all know, the Ford Foundation which puts her in an enviable position in any panel because I remember when I worked for the United Way everybody said to me, "Oh, here comes the United Way." I don't know if they say to you, "Oh, here comes the Ford Foundation," but we have to admit there is a certain aura. It would be less than honest if we didn't admit that. However, she has very fine academic credentials as well. She has a Ph.D. in History at Columbia University, so I'm surrounded by historians which is alright. Her professional position is Director of the Education and Culture Program at the Ford Foundation where she is responsible at the moment for the overall design, implementation, and assessment -- this is a lot to say quickly -- of the Foundation's work in the United States in higher education, primary and secondary education, and arts and culture. I seem to be the only one concerned here with the human services, but never you mind. She's interested in cultural diversity and encouraging creativity in the performing arts. This I found very interesting because I did not know this; that you were Associate Dean of the faculty at Princeton University. We like to see women in those positions, Associate Dean and up, because that's management as well as academic responsibility. And a variety of other things. And in addition, because she hasn't had enough to do in her various administrative activities, I'm happy to say that Alison has written two books: The American Indians in World War II, which is kind of interesting, Toward a New Era in Indian Affairs, and co-authored The Impersonal Campus, which I think I would like to read as a matter of fact and have to confess I have not read. So I think you can see we have two very distinguished panelists.

Now I'm in the awful position. I should have told me first because by comparison I won't look as glamorous and you can't tout yourself anyway.

McCarthy: Would you like me to read it?

Brilliant: No, I didn't even bring it with me and I won't remember what I did, for godsakes. Well, I'll start. I graduated from Smith, I'm a real woman's product. I went to Bryn Marr where I got my Master's in Social Work and I have a Doctorate from Columbia University across the street. I've had a woman's career in the sense that I had many years out [while] I was having children, but I did go back and worked at the United Way in Westchester County for many years where I did planning, allocations, evaluations, everything but fundraising.

And I think I will tell you at least this much: That I really am an example of somebody who was in a place too soon. They at that time did not encourage women in large United Ways to go into campaign. If you did not go into campaign in a United Way, you really could never become an executive director of a large United Way. So I left, not encouraged. I got back at them by writing a book on the United way just before the scandals hit, so I became a little more famous than I intended. It was an academic

not a pop book, but in any case that is the true story. It was a case where they did not encourage women to get their hands on the money. Planning and allocations was considered alright. So I've written a book on that. I've written a book on the Urban Development Corporation which is a planning and public authority in private interests in New York State and numerous articles, a recent one on women and fundraising activities, actually, which has just come out. So I guess I should say, I teach at Rutgers University in the School of Social Work. I teach policy, planning, and administration, and at the doctoral level organizational theory, and at the undergraduate level, my favorite course, which is Citizenship for Women, which has been a great, fun course to teach.

So with that, I think...

Q: I didn't get your name.

Brilliant: Oh, Eleanor Brilliant. Okay. You will have it I hope on your panel material and I apologize. I'm not used to introducing myself. Eleanor Brilliant, unfortunately, like it sounds. Well, you know the jokes, I don't have to tell you. Somebody had a dinner party for the Smarts to meet the Brilliant. The Dumbs lived around the corner. And so on.

Okay, with all of that in mind I will now pass us to more serious things that you really came to hear about and we'll start with Cathy who will talk on... I made a list that I'm not going to read you so that we can get to our discussion. About a full-page just of all the questions I could think of in 5 minutes about the field of philanthropy, how to define it, where it comes from, who's involved, and what does it mean for women. And Cathy is going to start with her own set of those questions.

Cathy McCarthy, City University of New York: Yes, with historical perspective. I was asked to give it with historical perspective.

Brilliant: That's good because that gives me wrap-up.

McCarthy: First of all, I want to thank you for your introduction, Eleanor, and also for the kind words about the Center. I do have propaganda about the Center for the Study of Philanthropy and since I hauled it up here I would be delighted if you would take it so I don't have to take it back with me.

Eleanor was very stern with me yesterday telling me that I could only talk for 15

minutes and if I didn't she suggested that a large hook would come out and draw me away, so I will try to get through this very quickly.

Brilliant: Now, if that's how you do your history...!

McCarthy: This is like a whirlwind tour.

So what I want to talk about today are three things: First of all, the historic impact of women's philanthropic roles, then a very brief outline of some of the strategies they used over time, and finally some conclusions about the implications of these activities in the historical record for current issues and trends. So let's start with the historical record.

Six years ago the center that I direct at CUNY had a conference on women and philanthropy that drew together scholars from the United States and from some developing nations like India and Brazil to try to come to some conclusion about whether there were any common threads among the various kinds of philanthropic activities that women have been involved in. Eleanor raised the issue of definitions. "Philanthropy" is a dreadful term. There was an organization a few years ago that did a poll, a man and woman on the street interview, to find out what people thought it meant and how many people were familiar with the term. The majority decided that it had something to do with stamp collecting and many of the rest thought it was an incurable disease. The way we define it at our center, we look at people who donate both time and money to the creation of non-profit services or governmental organizations in developing nations to try to effect social reform. So the donations of time and money for non-profits and social reform.

The result of the conference, one thing we could agree on, was that the common denominator, whether you were to look at women's participation in the suffrage movement or social settlements or Third World non-governmental organizations, was that participants, donors, volunteers and organizational entrepreneurs had historically provided one of the main ways in which women were able to exercise power in the public arena. Well, what does that mean? Let me give you an historical example: In the 19th century under English common law the doctrine [was that] women could neither own nor alienate property. They couldn't control their dowries, they couldn't control their inheritances, they couldn't control their earnings. In many states if a contract was signed by a woman it was invalid. But when women got together and developed and chartered non-profit organizations they could buy and sell property, they could build institutions, they could participate in public policy making debates, they could help engineer reallocation of municipal sources, they could conduct business under the rubric of non-profit entrepreneurship, they could even change the

Constitution in an era before they had the vote.

Which brings me very quickly to my second point: What kinds of strategies did they use to achieve these kinds of ends? My most recent book, Women's Culture, looks at three different ways at which women built institutions in the visual and decorative arts. One was through separatist organizations; women working together with other women. Another was through assimilationism; women working within male dominated institutions. Believe me, before 1930 especially, the major museums like the Metropolitan were most certainly male dominated institutions. And then as individualists, mainly donors, who had the opportunity to use their money to create new kinds of institutions that could change all sorts of things, including the way in which women artists were regarded.

Now, if you look at what women historians have done, a lot of the research over the last 20 years has focused on separatist institutions: Social settlements, nursing schools, women's medical colleges, the suffrage and temperance movement. And we know a lot about women's goals as volunteers, but we know a lot less about their activities as donors and fundraisers. When I started the Center for the Study of Philanthropy a friend of mine, a woman who had started the New York Institute for Research in the Humanities, said, "Cathy, I don't understand why things are written the way they are. It's like money arrives in the middle of the night on the door step in a basket." I wish it worked that way, but scholars like Eleanor and some others are just beginning to look at the role of women and money.

Now, one of the findings that I come up with in Women's Culture, and this is no surprise I don't think for any of you, is that women's organizations have historically operated on a shoe-string budget. And the interesting thing is that when some of these groups began to amass some money, men began to pay attention and attending went up and there was a real threat of take-over. If you got enough of an endowment there was a chance that men would come in and say, you know, "Well, you know you've got a great institution here, but you little ladies can't manage all that money and let us take it over for you." So it's a real double dime.

My next book is going to be on women, power, and money and I was interested in some of the things that people were working on. This will look at women philanthropists in the 20th century from the turn of the century up to the present in a whole variety of fields including social work, probably, not just arts. I'm finding that women made tremendous achievements in very badly under-funded institutions. If you look at the suffrage movement, it's absolutely extraordinary. There were times when they didn't even have enough money to buy stamps and they still managed to coordinate a national campaign. Figures like Susan B. Anthony and Carrie Taffer Patt who were leaders in the suffrage movement, they often wound up subsidizing it out of

their own pockets besides volunteering their own time. If you look at Jane Adams, the noble laureate who founded Hull House, she kept that thing running from donations from herself and help from two friends primarily. Very, very few donations. Women have accomplished miracles over the course of their history in this country with very limited funding. In effect women built their asylums and settlements and national reform movements through small donations and heavy infusions of volunteer time, operating essentially in an economy of time rather than money.

While many, probably the majority of women, participated in separatist organizations in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, some got involved in male dominated institutions instead. It's interesting to see the kinds of institutions that men and women found. At least before the '30s and '40s women are not very active in founding the large museums like the Metropolitan. They find more specialized things like the Whitney, the great research universities like the University of Chicago, foundations, think tanks. There are real implications from this because these are the organizations that were setting the cannon and were setting professional standards. And it's very interesting that in some fields like medical education where women had built women's medical colleges in the 19th century, they get squeezed out when foundations come in and begin dumping money into medical education reform because they can't raise enough to meet the standards that are being set by the foundations. And when they go in and ask someone like Abraham Flexner for a grant, he turns them down because he doesn't believe in separate medical schools for women. And at the same time women were not being treated very well in coeducational schools. The first woman on the faculty of the Harvard Medical School is appointed in the 1920s. It's Dr. Alice Hamilton, she's the leading expert in the United States on Industrial Medicine. She earns her reputation working out of Hull House. When she comes in as an assistant professor she is told not to expect any of the privileges of the regular faculty and so it goes.

So there are a lot of interesting questions about the implications of the fact that women did not generally set up these legitimating institutions. And when they did they usually turned them over immediately to the stewardship of male boards and trustees. Elizabeth Milbank Anderson, who built this hall, started Milbank Memorial Fund basically to systematize her charities, but she appoints an all-male board, and after her death they not only take it over, but they run off in their own direction, going off with things that she had not necessarily been interested in in the beginning herself.

The history of these organizations, once again, of institutions, foundations, think tanks, research universities, and organizations primarily founded and managed by men. For example, the first woman to sit on the board of the Metropolitan Museum of Art is invited to do so in the 1950s. When I came to the Rockefeller Foundation in 1980 after graduate school, the Foundation was still overwhelmingly male. And the most striking thing about the assimilationists is that the women who gave money to institutions like

the Metropolitan Museum or the University of Chicago, or Harvard, or Yale, did very little to ear-mark their grants, to use the money to make a change. Margaret Rossiter, who's another historian, coined a term, "coercive or creative philanthropy," and her example was Mary Garrett. Johns Hopkins University in the 1890s launched a \$500,000 fundraising campaign for the Medical School. They couldn't raise the money so they went to Mary Garrett, who was a railroad heiress, and said, "Will you give us some money?" And she said, "Sure, I'll give you a lot of money with the proviso that you open the Medical School to women as well as men and they be allowed to take the same curriculum." And for \$307,000 they said, "Yes," and one of the best medical schools in the country was opened for women. But that's coercive philanthropy.

In museums, for example, even the most firey feminists and many of the donors and collectors were feminists. Lucy Havemeyer -- I don't know if you've seen the Havemeyer exhibit over at the Met -- was a feminist. In fact, in her old age after her husband died, she actually managed to get herself arrested for helping to burn Woodrow Wilson and effigy in front of the White House gates. Olivia Sage, the founder of the Russel Sage Foundation, Bertha Palmer, Mrs. *** Palmer in Chicago, were all strong feminists. But once they crossed the museum doorway, they very neatly handed over the money, they didn't ask for anything in return. They didn't ask for more wall space for women artists. When Havemeyer donated that collection in 1929 and she put it together with Mary Passat's help, there were two Passats, 14 Degas, about 7 Manets, 7 or 8 Monets, but very, very few works by women artists. They didn't ask for improved professional opportunities for women curators, who were basically at the bottom of the curatorial row. They didn't ask to be put on the boards themselves. They just handed it over and said, "Please take my money," or "Please take my collections."

The third category that I looked at in women's culture and that I'll be looking at a lot more in this book are the wealthy women who had enough money to rewrite the rules of the way the game was played. Once again very few women, at least in the early part of the century, started foundations of research universities or public policy research institutes which had very important implications for women's professional gains and their ability to maintain those professional gains. Instead, they often scattered their gifts to a lot of charities and institutions in which they were involved.

And so, some of the questions I'll be looking at in my next book are: Why this double standard? Why are women willing to bleed and die and donate large amounts of time to an organization that helps women, but when it comes time to give a large sum of money they hand it over to organizations that tend to bolster the professional aspirations of men? The other question: Why these lingering prejudices against women running heavily capitalized institutions? And I would argue that these are prejudices that are just beginning. And what did all this mean for understanding the amount of public, and professional, and political, and personal power that middle and

upper class women especially were able to wield in their society? Although these things are rooted in the historical record, many of these issues I think still have resonance today. I hope so. I see some of you nodding in agreement. So this is my third point.

In terms of assimilationists in 1980 there were very few women in the big foundations. Today over half, approximately 52 percent of the paid professional staffs of foundations capitalized with assets of a hundred million or more are women. Why is it then that so few foundations have made women's issues a stated priority? Women, after all, constitute the majority in this country. We're not talking about some isolated group. What can be done to inspire more creative or coercive philanthropy, not just among women donors but also among women professionals, including women professionals in foundations? And I should add that Ford really is one of the most advanced. Ford really does have a strong commitment to women's issues. What inspires wealthy women to give in ways that increase funds or services and opportunities for other women? The center that I direct just received some grants for case studies of organizations that have managed to raise funds, women's organizations, that have managed to raise substantial funds from women donors, like the Wellsey campaign. To look for what creates the cultural comfort that encourages women to give to women's organizations.

I know that my time is pretty well up, so I will finish very quickly by saying that it's important to emphasize that whether you're looking at politics or education or social welfare services, one of the key questions is how we can begin to leverage the gains that we've achieved over the past 30 years. Almost every woman in here, all of you, are professional women. We've all benefited from the women's movement. How can we leverage this more fully? How can we encourage the women who are now enjoying increased educational and employment opportunities because of the women's movement to, as Susan B. Anthony put it, "change the world now that we finally are beginning to control a purse of our own"? Thank you.

Alison Bernstein, Ford Foundation: Well, I knew Cathy would do the context setting. And I want to apologize to you because within 24 hours of feeling fine yesterday afternoon when I left the Ford Foundation, here I am today hardly able to speak. And I think there's some 24 hour virus or cold. So with apologies...

Let me share an anecdote with you: Eleanor had mentioned that I had been Associate Dean of the Faculty at Princeton. I worked at the Ford Foundation from 1982 to 1990 as a program officer, as a staff member recommending grants. That's the terminology: Program officers are the people who have the frontline responsibility for grant recommendations. Then I left in 1990 to go work at Princeton for a variety of reasons, a chance to teach which I missed deeply, to work on my books, and a number of other

things. And so I found myself on your side of the table, not on this side of the table. And I had an idea that really mattered to me. It had to do with women in the military because, as Eleanor mentioned, my book was about American Indians during the Second World War and I was very interested in issues of race, class, and gender in the military. So I went back to my old philanthropic friends and I started calling saying, "It would be wonderful to have a conference around this theme." Nobody called me back. That was the first thing. Once needing philanthropy, I might as well have been dead in the water. I mean, it was a very inventive lesson for me as a "philanthropist," or a "philanthropoid" as somebody once established. My friends whom I had worked with and co-funded projects on, they were terribly busy, they didn't want to return phone calls when they knew probably they weren't going to fund these projects. I was very frustrated. Two and a half years later, by some really odd set of coincidences I am now back and the same people who were not answering my phone calls are calling me. They want to play.

And so I want to preface my remarks by saying it's not easy for any of us to approach philanthropists and succeed. And let me just say a few words about the Ford Foundation as a case study and I'm very glad Cathy said what she did because of all the major philanthropies in this country, there is no question that Ford is exceptional in its concern for women's rights and issues related to women. It is exceptional. Nevertheless, it is very difficult to get money for projects that [we] might call, if you will, the kinds of projects that we typically get from women. And so I'm going to give you both a kind of descriptive sense of what the Ford Foundation is and what it does. And then I'm going to give you for both provocative reasons and reasons for discussion, some observations I had about women and how they approach philanthropy with the understanding that they may not hold true for all situations but it might give you some food for thought.

First off, the Ford Foundation: It is the world's largest philanthropy. The current corpus is about \$6 billion which enables us to spend -- and these are rough figures -- about \$200 million a year in the United States and \$100 million around the world, largely in the developing world. We have one office in the United States and 16 in the developing world and we're about to open an office in South Africa. So it's a very exciting thing.

Now, in the Ford Foundation there are probably in New York, give or take, about 125, 140 program officers who are grants officers and our figures are very much like Cathy's. Now over half of those people are women, about 25 percent are a minority. The Ford foundation has a very firm sense of diversity and has had an internal policy of staffing and program development that emphasizes the diversity of the staff. And so when I joined in 1982 there was only one director among 7, now there are 12 directors of whom half are women. That gives you some idea of the change in the Ford Foundation.

There are probably 6 thematic themes, areas, that Ford funds and that have a direct bearing on the roles and status of women. And I'm just going to mention them very briefly because Eleanor said you would like to know them. They're the obvious suspects, so to speak. Women's legal rights. Ford Foundation is probably one of the principle funders of one of the major national women's legal rights organizations. Women's health, especially reproductive health. We're not a science foundation, we don't do science funding. We fund in the social sciences primarily, but when we think about reproductive health, it's not about basic research. It is about, if you will, practitioner driven service providing, especially in the developing world, but also in the United States and the public debate over reproductive rights. Third, what I call women's studies and that was the arena that I had the most to do with in my first incarnation with the Ford Foundation.

Instead of quoting from this I'll just cite it for you. This was an issue of *Teacher's College Record*, which I'm sure Cathy knows, and the title of this special issue is called, *Philanthropy and Education*. And in this issue there are several different articles about the role of philanthropy in education, one of which -- after we beat up on the woman editor -- one of which was not originally planned, was called *The Emergence of Women's Studies in Philanthropy*. And it was an article I co-authored with my predecessor at the Ford Foundation, a woman named Marilyn Chamberlain, who had a lot to do with the funding of women's studies at the Ford Foundation. This is Spring '92 and it's a good case study of how philanthropy works in the particular area of women's studies.

So, I've mentioned three. The fourth I want to call poverty alleviation, poverty alleviation for poor women in terms of new income generating activities and that means that there are program officers at the Ford Foundation who are particularly interested in employing women here, around the world, and how to alleviate poverty and looking specifically at women's employment and women's economic positions.

Fifth, what I would call gender equity in specific fields where women are under-represented. In the '70s and '80s Ford was one of the sort of pioneers in funding projects having to do with women in construction, women in the military, for example, women coal miners. In those fields where women had been under-represented and where there were structural and other discriminatory barriers to women's full participation. For a time Ford was very involved in the issue of pay equity. It's interesting to me that pay equity has sort of sunk beneath the waves. It's not even a topic here at this fine feminist [conference].

And last but not least I'll use the general rubric we use, called work-family issues; the whole nexus for work and family and how family responsibilities for women and for men related to work responsibilities and Ford spends a lot of time and some money

thinking about sort of enlightened policies in that arena.

Those are the 6 arenas that Ford has what I would call a substantial interest in, but by no means are those the only areas we work in nor is it the only way we express our concern for women because if you think of our other areas, such as international peace and security *** sustainable development or issues having to do with housing, there is a gender lens at the Ford Foundation that asks a number of questions about what is the project and what difference is it making differentially with regard to men and with regard to women. So there are, if you will -- I liked Cathy's phrase -- there are assimilationist themes at Ford which are not women specific to which we bring a gender lens those of us who work there. For example, the church and social sciences and we ask the question how much attention is being paid to the roles and contributions of women. But there are also women specific themes and I gave you the 6 that I think are largely women specific.

Having said of all of that and trying to give you a sense of what the Ford Foundation looks like and how it works and our staffing, let me give you some more difficult observations about women and philanthropy. And I want to give them from two vantage points: One of being a program officer, that is as one of these people who had a staff responsibility to recommend grants; and the second one was that for a time it was on my resume during the mid-70s through the end of `70s I was a program officer in a government philanthropy called FIPSE, Fund for the Improvement for Post-Secondary Education. So I've had an unusual vantage point in that I've been in both public philanthropy and private philanthropy and they're very different animals.

Let me make a point about public philanthropy, which is in fact that most government agencies that give away money operate with a peer review system of some kind, establish criteria for funding, point system when you submit your proposals, farming them out to panels or individuals or experts or what have you. And then the program officer is basically a paper manager. In private philanthropy the program officer is a much more creative individual in that he or she has the opportunity to negotiate grants with individuals who come with ideas or send a proposal over the *** and get an answer.

So I'm going to talk about my observations and some of these hold true for both settings. These observations are what I call glass-half-full-glass-half-empty observations and I want you to realize that. What may sound negative in the way I put it may also have a positive, okay? So I'm going to put it in a phraseology that might sound negative, but I'm going to quickly counter by saying there's a positive side to this. And Eleanor and I started talking about this.

It is my experience that when women submit proposals to national philanthropy, to national philanthropic organizations like the Ford Foundation, or Carnegie Mellon, or what have you, they tend to be really small scale. They tend to think small. They tend to have a very localized impact, they don't tend to sort of ask the ratcheted-up questions of public policy. It is because the principle experience -- and we can debate this -- the principle experience is often a volunteer in a local setting. And the principle request is, "Help us, we don't have any money." Nine times out of 10 it's been my experience that those kinds of request get a polite but firm turn down. In national philanthropy the obligation of the national organization is not to serve a local service responsibility. Those organizations, which all of us have been volunteers in locally, should first and foremost address those kinds of questions to the local philanthropic community, to the corporate community, to the local and community funders, to the United Way, to those organizations that have a regional or local or neighborhood responsibility. But often, and in education we get it all the time, the local Spokane Girls' Club is looking to do something about math for girls. It's a totally worthwhile, I'm sure, project, but the Ford Foundation will not fund the local Spokane Girls' Club to work on girls' education. But in Spokane, I suspect, at least I hope, there ought to be enough corporate interest, enough interest from a local United Way. So one is thinking small based on immediate experience of local conditions. Those national funders will not pan out.

Secondly, women are in one sense -- and this is a gross generalization, but I'll say it anyway -- in one sense extraordinarily prudent in their spending of their money. Another way of saying it is, they don't spend the grants they get and worry a lot about sort of micro-managing those grants. That's very interesting to me. I've had more examples of projects that are not going well when the money was available because people weren't sure, and often it was women, how they wanted to spend it. Getting money and using it is not something that women are very comfortable around and in some sense they don't really hold onto it. Now the positive side of this is that I don't see nearly the levels of sort of wild, inappropriate expenditure when I monitor a grant. And my favorite example is a grant that I made when I was at FIPSE to Shelia Tobias when she was at Wesleyan University. This was in the early days of her deanship there. And she was looking at the subject of math anxiety in women and I think the whole grant was maybe \$22,000 and she kept it for 5 years. I mean, she drove it away, step by step. Now the good news is that kept her in business a very, very long time. Of course, it didn't pay for her salary. And also we got \$22,000 worth of p.r. and activity and what have you. But there's a problem here, I don't know what to call it beyond the notion of familiarity with dealing with large sums of money. It's not something that most women who apply to grant organizations deal with.

Now there are always exceptions and, I should tell you, the Ms. Foundation is getting pretty damn good at asking for big bucks and having grant visions and wanting to spend a lot of money. Similarly, the Children's Defense Fund. I want you to know

the Children's Defense Fund doesn't have any trouble with large and ambitious goals, with large and ambitious visions and so on. But in general, it's the case that women are much less likely to come up with those themes that are beyond the local context from them. That's not all bad, but it is a phenomenon.

Third, there is an incredible attention to detail in the projects that women run. So much so that I think there's some micro-managing that goes on and then women themselves don't then get to ask some of the broader questions even after they get the money. And nor do they see themselves [at the] bully pulpit that men often see once they get private philanthropy. In other words, they're mostly more likely, women are mostly more likely, even when they have the grant, to have some man be the principle p.r. person, the principle outsider, the principle to do all the... And I find that [to be a] really interesting phenomenon. All of which, by the way, is socially constructed. I don't think... It doesn't have anything to do with ideology, it's about our social roles.

And last but not least, I think, too, -- now I work in education so this is particular to education and also to the arts -- women tend not to have regular positions. I mean, in education it's very unlikely that our grants go to tenured women professors. They often go to administrators who are not on tenure track or people who've been hired to do special assignments or what have you. I mean, some person in the administration is fronting, but then the woman who's responsible for running doesn't have a line position. Now, in one sense that's fine and, in fact, I would argue, you can do some reading from the margins every bit as well as you could do some reading from the so-called mainstream. But when you ask yourself the question what's going to happen to this grant and what's going to happen to the principle investigator, the individual who's project director, that's a more difficult dilemma because they don't have the regular as frequently as the men. Or they're in the number two slot; they're running the show and they're not getting the credit and they don't have the administrative clout.

So those are my observations. Now let me just turn around and end with some observations about what women are like as philanthropists because there are similarities and differences between them. I have to say women philanthropists tend to be in the women's fields. They tend to be in education, in social service, in culture and the arts, and they tend to have that framework. And often many of us -- and I include myself in this as an historian -- are not terribly comfortable with technology, with the sciences and with public policy and so it's interesting to me that many of my colleagues at the Ford Foundation who are women work in the arena of urban poverty, but when it comes to working on public policy related to urban poverty it's the men. And so the philanthropists who are women tend to be in the "soft fields," and there's a lot more philanthropic dollars, by the way, in corporate philanthropy around science, technology, and engineering than women have been able to access. And most of those philanthropies -- I see Cathy's shaking her head -- can be very male dominated. So the women in philanthropy are not necessarily in those corporate philanthropies nearly as

much as they are in the kind of philanthropy that Ford, Rockefeller, or Carnegie represent.

Let me also just add, in some very interesting way -- and I haven't quite figured this out -- Ford is deeply exceptional in this regard. Women have become more prominent in philanthropy. There is no question that the field of philanthropy has more women in it now in 1993 than when I joined in 1982, but I don't think that's because they have an exclusively feminist agenda. In fact, I would argue that there's a very deep -- and I like Cathy's phrase, again -- assimilationist trend; that is, women are in philanthropy, but they are not necessarily advocating women's issues. Now, Ford is an exception to this, I think, because we have a vice president for all programs that is the single most powerful program person at the Ford Foundation is a.) a woman, b.) made her career in part by supporting women's concerns. So Ford is not typical, but typically I would argue women are in philanthropy now, but they aren't in philanthropy with an explicitly, if you will, feminist agenda to work on women's concerns. And I don't know if Cathy would agree with me.

So, how does this all wrap up for what you do? Final comments: One, I think it's very important to see yourselves, if you're interested in philanthropy both as a career but also in getting money from philanthropy, to ask sort of the more fundamental broadly based questions from your individual vantage points and think collaboratively because individual projects, individual locations, typically don't get funded at the national level. They may get funded at the community based level, they may get funded from corporate philanthropy as individual women, but they won't get funded necessarily unless they are about a project or a program that has national demonstration possibility built in from the very beginning. And secondly, I would say that whatever work you try to do in philanthropy, increasingly we're going to pay attention to the issues of differential impact on men and women whatever work you're doing. And so you don't need to call this a woman's project. If you're interested in housing for the homeless, for example, maybe this is just an idea about camouflage. You might be interested very much in women's housing, but the overall question having to do with homelessness needs to be seen and advocated in terms of a problem statement that has a gender lens. And I think that might be a more successful approach than asking for funding for women per se. Let me stop there.

Brilliant: Okay. I have a presentation, but Alison has asked, is that correct...?

Bernstein: I can stay for a brief period. *** before my voice goes.

Brilliant: That will leave me... I will then do my presentation somewhat condensed, but we'll still have 20 minutes or so for questioning. I would like to cut your questions

off at 25 passed. Leave when you like, but in all fairness Cathy and I need to have some time...

Bernstein: ***

Brilliant: Yeah? Well, let's see how it goes. Let's say until 20 passed, questions for the Ford Foundation and we will save Cathy's and mine until later. Okay? How about it for Alison?

Q: I'll start with a question. What is the average sum *** Ford Foundation *** is there a *** ?

Bernstein: Wow.

Brilliant: No matter what you bring with you, you never bring enough, right?

Q: I think the highest grant we ever made was \$60 million?

Bernstein: I think that's probably right. It's so unusual.

Q: I think the lowest I've seen...

Q: Let me ask you, how many are given the low ***?

Brilliant: Oh, that's the real ***

Bernstein: Well, let's wait. Your low may not be our low.

Q: A point of clarification: Are you speaking internationally or domestically?

Bernstein: I'm speaking domestically. Thank you. Yes, internationally is another matter entirely. Let's stick with the domestic agenda. I think it's a very good question and let me see if I can give you my ball park figure to be corrected by Cathy and Elizabeth. It almost doesn't pay the Ford Foundation to make a grant of less than \$25,000. In all of the staffing costs to pull a grant off from that, it almost doesn't pay. It's probably the case that in annual amounts the average is somewhere between

\$75,000 and \$150,000 a year. We do have something that's called Officer's Discretionary Grants. When I left in 1990 they were at \$50,000, they're now higher, they're up to \$75,000, but there are very few of those. And they tend to represent new arenas that we're exploring as a possible next generation of grant making.

So, for example, let's take education just to give you... A typical smallish grant is to invite a group of people who are interested in a topic such as funding inequalities with regard to school systems and get them to spend some time together, commissioning papers, and finding what the state of the practise is to see whether or not we want to get involved. Once we decide on a topic that we care about then we will be making grants in the \$100,000 range per year. We seldom make grants of more than three years of duration. In other words, you might get a grant for three years and then a renewal for another three years. There are probably a hundred organizations, maybe even less, that are continuing grantees of the Ford Foundation, but even those organizations we try very hard how to finally step away appropriately from Children's Defense Fund, Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, the King Fund, for example, those are the ones that come to mind, Ailey, the Dance Theatre of Harlem in my program. There are no colleges or universities, however, that get money from endowment from the Ford Foundation, nor money for bricks and mortar. We don't do endowment funding and haven't for many, many years. We have what we call program-related investments which are loans, but they tend to go to community development corporations and organizations that are not colleges and universities. I can't remember the last program-related investment our office gave and I've been in and around the education side of things for nearly a decade.

Brilliant: Next question. Anybody *** Cathy ***?

McCarthy: The largest block of grants Ford ever gave was \$80.2 million for symphony orchestras in the `60s and it did go for endowment. And I should say that now that I'm on the other side of the table, especially for women's organizations, endowments are tremendously important. That's not a criticism. Not just as...

Bernstein: No, and in fact it's sad historically. When Ford was in the endowment business it was not funding women's organizations for endowment.

McCarthy: Absolutely not.

Bernstein: It hasn't been in the endowment business for a very long time. But I should...when, since the `70s, when feminism probably ***?

McCarthy: Since the `70s. But I would say two other things about that...

Bernstein: I mean historically you've got to remember it. I think it's true. The only organization I now know that has been trying to get some help with endowment is the Children's Defense Fund. And Ford might do a special initiative for the Children's Defense Fund, but we'll never do a special initiative for women's colleges. Although, in the `60s and `70s it did when it was giving endowment money to places like Barnard, just like Harvard and Princeton.

Brilliant: Money to really put in the bank.

Bernstein: Money to really put in the bank.

Brilliant: Very rarely endowment money from national philanthropy, not just Ford, from most national places.

Q: I have another question.

Brilliant: Okay.

Q: You just mentioned education as being the area possibly, you said, of discretionary funding. That sort of implies to me that there is some sort of vision behind the types of grants the Ford Foundation is looking to give out. What other areas would you say are areas that would be immediately areas to look for grants in?

Bernstein: I think I might have been misleading. I didn't mean to be. I just gave you an example of what a discretionary grant activity is. It generally means a smallish grant to explore a topic and in each program area of the ones that I mentioned there would be programmatic topics that we may not be working in now, but we might wish to work in in the future. And so, education isn't singular in that we make discretionary grants, but smaller grants, grants from \$25,000 to \$75,000 typically go to explore a topic that we're not currently working...

McCarthy: Alison, let me ask you a question if I can. One of the questions that we've always had when we're asking for grants or that I've often been asked by people who are seeking grants, is how much discretion does the program officer have? Now the discretionary grant area has usually been the place that I have found where the program officers have some thousands of dollars where they have more discretion or at least there's a lower level of approval than would be required at a higher level.

Bernstein: Absolutely true. In fact, let me just say something about discretionary grants. There are a couple of things. Number one: Discretionary grants now at Ford do not require the signature and discussion of all officers. They only require the director and the program officer's approval, but they have to be in categories the Foundation is willing at least to look at. So, what does that mean in terms of some of the issues that you might be interested in? It means that you go to a program officer not with a proposal. In fact, if I have one categorical suggestion to make to everybody: Do not send fully blown proposals to any of the major national foundations unless you currently have one of their grants and you're trying to renew it. If you've never had a grant from any of these national foundations, your best bet is always to write a letter and say, "Look, this is what we're engaged in and this is the problem we think is generic and this is why if you fund us you're going to get some better answers to this, maybe." And then ask the program officer to respond. The program officer has in 99 out of 100 cases a letter that says, "That's a great idea, but we're not funding in this area." I mean, we have them like Congressional offices. That's the first time I discovered the form letter rejects. Push a button. You want money to get an individual scholarship? "Sorry, we don't do individual scholarships." Foundations do have that.

But every so often a letter comes in that says, "Look, we know the Ford Foundation isn't working on issues of domestic violence in the United States, but we know you are in Latin America. We want to try to understand what these issues are. We want to try to bring together the best thinking about it and see if we can persuade the Foundation to pay more attention to it." In a situation like that, a program officer might say, "Uh huh, this is interesting. Maybe at least I'll give it discretionary..." It's a lower threshold of approval which means there's more risk taking. That's the way I would [describe it].

Q: I wanted to ask a question about women as philanthropists. You spoke a little bit about women as proposal, money seekers, that they are not thinking big enough when they might be asking for money. From your point of view, do you see a difference in the way philanthropy, the philanthropists are operating on a professional level between large and small foundations? And then between the professionals and the actual donors, if there's more *** giving away who may or may not be working with staff? And then on the other hand the professional program officer or people at the large foundations. How do those women function in a different way at all than men?

Bernstein: I don't have very good first hand experience with a new network called the Network of Women's Funds.

Brilliant: I'm going to talk about that actually.

McCarthy: We'll give Eleanor that shot. My impressions in general are the following: Women as professional program officers don't differ very much from men professional program officers. And what most of us worry about is a topic and how to make a strategic difference in that topic. If the topic we are hired to work on is women's legal rights, terrific. If the topic is, let's just say housing, for example, or education, there's a lot of discretion on the part of the individual to have a gender lens. So if the women in philanthropy spent more time thinking more explicitly feminist on the one hand there might be more work around these themes. On the other hand they have to buck quite important systems which say women's specific projects are not what we do. At Ford that's not the case, but you know there are very few philanthropies that have what one might call specific lines of work focused on women... I mean, I don't know if the Foundation Center agrees with that.

Q: Oh, yeah, no it's... I think we've identified 12 percent of foundations either explicitly catered to women or girls in their corpus or that they have a substantial history of giving to *** projects. It's a very small percentage that even identify themselves...

Brilliant: I have actually to give out afterwards -- which you can take home -- something that came out of another study about women and philanthropy, but based really on some information from the Council on Foundations, which gives a breakdown and actually indicates some of the patterns of giving, including women's causes, health, and a variety of others.

Q: I would like to ask just a brief question which may be answered by you later. I'm interested if there's a difference in the size of the grants that women program officers or donors are giving as opposed to male program officers?

Bernstein: I don't have an answer for that. I really don't because it depends upon what you're performing with. A colleague of mine at Ford, a female, gives major grants to the Allen Fittmacker Institute or to Planned Parenthood and they are in the 6 to 7 figures. But it depends upon the organization's relationship to the philanthropist. I wouldn't say it's gender specific, no.

Q: I just want to mention about something you said before about large and small foundations. Women are... At Ford we often say, "Don't think about Ford, think about *** when you think about things," because it sounds like you're talking about France or something. It's so big. I think that more than 90 percent of all foundations have no staff. I'm not sure, I'm very bad at remembering numbers, but most foundations have zero staff. There are 34,000 private foundations, there's one Ford and they have by far the largest staff of any foundation. Most foundations are run by

small groups of people, boards, they're volunteer, they receive no compensation. Sometimes they have people who are very knowledgeable in their topics, sometimes they have the donor's son-in-law and the son-in-law is very knowledgeable about his subject, too. I don't mean to demean that, but they vary incredibly...

Brilliant: There are large numbers, in short, what we call family kite foundations.

Q: Family kite foundations where the decisions are based on, you know, who knows what. They're not going at it in what we call *** organized giving, that's one of the ways to put it. They're not necessarily going about it as organized giving.

Bernstein: Can I actually... I didn't say this, but I want to say this. The fastest growing giving...

Brilliant: But I am going to ask you three minutes on that.

Bernstein: The largest growing field in private philanthropy, I believe, is community foundations.

Brilliant: That is correct.

Bernstein: Not major financial foundations. And if you're asking me where the money is going or where the funding is, it is not in places like the Ford Foundation...

McCarthy: Or Rockefeller.

Bernstein: ...for individual projects. It's in your local community foundations which are becoming less restricted in their donor activities and more possibly available for these types of projects. But I will just underscore a point I made about camouflage. I think it's terribly important to try to understand what the foundation believes it wants to accomplish and then look to see with that kind of gender lens how you can both address that question and advance opportunities for those.

Brilliant: Okay let's take the gal over there.

Q: I'm curious to know about you're own personal experience. And what are the fields, what are things that you feel are most important in helping you fulfill your job?

Bernstein: I play a mean game of poker.

Brilliant: Well, that is important. Anybody who has ever worked in male dominated arena...

Bernstein: I was going to say a couple of things. First of all, whoever said that philanthropy careers are idiosyncratic, I cannot tell you the root of a philanthropy career, I can only say to you some people get into philanthropy from the bottom up as secretaries, as assistant research assistants and move through. That has been the experience of the woman who is vice president of the Ford Foundation. She has been there literally since she graduated from college with one or two years in the Lindsey Administration. For some of us who were in education, there is a kind of back and forth with the academic world. At the Ford Foundation at the moment you cannot stay forever if you come as a program officer. There is, in fact, a kind of 5-year rule that is fairly rigorously applied.

So in the old days philanthropy was seen as a career. Nowadays I think it's fair to say that except for some of the old guard who are not going anywhere, most of the younger guard who go to philanthropy do not expect to spend their careers there. How do you get involved? I think the single biggest way is to be involved by a project sponsored by the philanthropist, to be known by the philanthropy, have your work understood by the philanthropy is often the first step into becoming a consultant. A colleague of mine who was working at Columbia School of Social Work and somebody knew of her work and asked her to be a consultant and that's how she got the job as program officer.

Brilliant: Okay, last question.

Q: I noticed *** staff assistant is available and I'm wondering what their role will really be. At what point in conceptualizing projects you might want to approach them about and it would be appropriate to talk to them about...?

Bernstein: I think it has to do with following the initial letter. When the staff member calls or writes and says, "Look, this looks interesting. Let's talk about it." There's much more, if you will, negotiation and iteration of what to do and who to involve and how to do it at that stage, but the first step with any foundation I know of, which is a national foundation, is not to call because you won't get your phone calls answered. People are just swamped. But to write a brief letter trying to say, "Does this organization care about this problem? We recognized that there are a lot of people who care about it, but here's why we think we can do it better." And then see what happens.

Brilliant: Alright, alright, but this really is the last one. Okay, go ahead.

Q: Is there some kind of -- and anybody can answer this -- a resource, a book or library, where women can go to find out information about what foundation...?

Brilliant: Thousands. The Council on Foundations in New York City. There's grant-makers book. You know, I was going to do a list of this now I'm sorry I didn't. There is a grant-seekers book for more liberal foundations which is also available, but I'm sure you have it in the library. A first source would certainly be the Council on Foundations' library that should have at least enough leads to give you...I'm sorry, Foundation Center. I'm talking about the Council on Foundations [later].

Bernstein: By the way, the Ford Foundation just made a major grant to the Foundation Center to make sure that information was available to grant-seekers. So use it.

Eleanor, I'm sorry I won't get to hear you. Good luck everybody.

Brilliant: Alright.

McCarthy: Feel better.

Brilliant: The...yes?

Q: *** public service announcement, because I think we're a little confused.

Brilliant: Alright ***. But it is the Foundation Center and it is in New York and you put it on the board, so maybe that's... And it is a library which is readily available.

Q: We have literally thousands of books on foundations, corporate giving, non-profit management, volunteerism, history of philanthropy.

Brilliant: I have to tell you that in the last talk I gave I did a master class on philanthropy and I xeroxed everything on sight from the Foundation Center and brought it with me. Yeah, even the forms on how to track what kinds of organizations, that is what kinds of grants you might get from which granting organizations, and so on because there are actually forms in which you can actually private fit yourself into and

they have those forms. So that there are systems by which you can look at, really make a systematic cut of the interests you have against the interest of foundations.

Because I'm going to say something...I'm sorry Alison's not here because I want to say it in front of her and not behind her back, but it's on tape so I guess it's alright. No, I mean in the up and fair thing. But in any case there are ways and one of the things that the Foundation Center does have is selected files; that is to say you can pull out by category of your interest the kind of information you want about which funding sources, which foundations, will be interested in your topic. So it's not just looking down a long list starting with "A" and going ***

What I'm going to say partly has been covered by Cathy and because of the time I want to leave you some time for questions, I'm going to talk serendipitously and not as organized. I did write out a talk, but I'm going to try and get some highlights in so I don't repeat material.

But the one thing I think you should know is that it is very important to look categorically at what you are interested in funding, and that is, what your purposes are. So it is a question, as Alison said, of matching your interest with their interest, but you can't do that by looking at a long list. You really have to call, not only call other foundations and agencies and talk to people, but you can also get these selected databases which will tell you what the grants have been in your area. So I heartily recommend that. And as I said I have actually a wonderful packet which shows you the way to do that, but I didn't bring it today.

I have one slight difference with Alison. I don't think it's as easy -- now she didn't say it was easy -- but I have been a person requesting grants when I have been unknown and I have been a person requesting grants when I am known, and I hate to say it, but it's a lot easier when you're known. It really is. When somebody is interested in what you are doing already you have a track record, you have a connection, it just makes your selling case. Your letter gets more attention, your phone call gets more attention. I don't know how you can eliminate that. It is a particular problem for women's organizations.

I'm going to read just briefly not this whole thing a recent report in a minute that was put out by the Chicago Foundation for Women called *Short-sighted*. Interestingly enough, now the Chicago Foundation for women -- I don't know how much they're actually giving out -- but they are at least a well-know organization in Chicago and they claim that they got very little publicity. They had a great deal of trouble getting attention to their own report on how difficult it is for women and girls to get funds. Now I heard them say this so I believe it. They distributed lots of copies of this report.

Unfortunately, I only have my own so I cannot give it to you, but the report is available and the barriers and resistance that they talk about... Well, maybe I should just read it now since I said I'm not going to do the same kind of organized report.

Here are some of the things they say: They surveyed 109 groups, at least 109 groups responded, small, large, and old organizations included. An analysis of the revenue of the women's organizations that they did shows that existing funding is at best gradual; two thirds have budgets under \$250,000, that goes with what's already been said; and a majority receive half of their annual operating budgets from a single source.

Short-sighted also found that all women's programs and organizations face unique fundraising disadvantages. Over and over again spelled out by the women and let me just read a couple of them for you. "Many foundations and corporate funders lack an understanding about the issues and problems affecting women and girls. They do not see a need to see their funding decisions in gender specified terms." That goes over and over again in the literature I have been reading. In other words, the denial that there is a need to have [a] gender lens. Another... And you know the denial that women and girls have special needs and I'm going to read you a few figures at the risk of being boring to show you how women and girls do have special needs.

"The competition for boards of directors of non-profit organizations surviving women and girls honor a commitment of women helping women and reflect the reality of most women's lives." Which is, guess what? "They have less money than men to give, less access to those with money to donate, and less experience in asking for money for others."

I'll give you one or two more: "Funders increasingly want to see programming components that include men." Now this is just a recent study. Here we think women have made progress and there are real signs of progress, but funders they found "increasingly want to see program components that include men, but this compromises the very reasons that domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers, women's economic development programs, and others were established in the first place."

"Most funders lack interest in supporting advocacy programs." That's a double-edged sword. They also -- I'm going to say this from my own knowledge without even... -- they also are not too happy about funding small service projects if it doesn't have, what I wrote down was "a big grab." I think funders like to do projects... I was a funder so I can talk from my own personal experience. In United Way I really wanted to fund projects, not the routine everyday things we were funding, but things that would give us some real sex appeal, both for the organization and because I thought they were meeting new needs. They were really doing something important. Time and time

again in my interviews with corporate philanthropists that [said] they want to do new things. They enjoy that part of their job. It's not just organizational even, it's really a source of satisfaction. But in any case they found "most funders lacked interest in supporting advocacy programs, programs seeking to change systems and policy. This impacts strongly and adversely on women's organizations since most of the groups in that category work to change public government and social institutions and systems that hurt women."

I'm not sure, again, how much this is just Chicago, but Chicago is a fairly large center of philanthropy, so I think it may have some ramifications beyond. And the last one I'll read you: "The vast majority of foundations and corporations do not have specifically identified funding categories through which women's programs can apply and be funded." You heard the Ford Foundation is different and I think to some extent that may have changed. You are tracking, I know, women's...

Q: It didn't used to be track.

Brilliant: It didn't use to be track, that is correct. And in fact I looked at a book on women's sources in literature, research sources, published about two or 3 years ago, it didn't even have a section on philanthropy or funding or anything you would call like it. And it had hundreds and hundreds of entries on materials. So I guess we're at a point where we're really changing rapidly.

Okay, I just want to say one or two other things, maybe, before picking up on one of the pieces in here. I have...I'm very interested in the relationship between public and private sectors. And so I have been very concerned about the fact that we have domestic violence and sexual harassment obviously growing. We have clearly issues of rape. I mean, you may know that 680,000 adult American women were actually raped in a given year, I think, it's 1991 -- I turned the page too fast -- which was over 5 times the official count. Poverty -- I mean, I'm just picking some figures that are women-related figures -- poverty among women and children, the fastest growing group in poverty in America, over 75 percent of all poor people in our country [live] under the poverty threshold, a little under \$12,000 for a family of three, minority women clearly hit hardest, people of color, over 50 percent of children in female headed households live in poverty, and about 50 percent of Hispanic women who head households and 56 percent of African American women who head households live in poverty. We spent \$25 billion on welfare for teenage mothers in welfare, yet our policies are really in disarray.

And you might ask me why -- I mean, I've gone on and on. I've got even more figures -- why I bring that up in the world of philanthropy and it's because I'm deeply

concerned with the question of how can we relate the world of the non-profit with the world of the public sector and the real change. And we're in a peculiar situation because in the 1980s, indeed, we had a government which glorified this non-profit sector. It did this thing with the thousand points of light, it did the thing also, however, of load shedding. It shed the problems of government -- to the extent that it could and you can't quite do it -- but to some extent the Reagan and Bush Administrations did attempt to shift off of government and into the private sector both profit making and non-profit making problems which really belonged in the public sector. So I who -- and I'll be personal. I have figures on breast cancer and everything else we didn't, we haven't funded until very recently paid much interest. They thank the new administration, perhaps, for interest at least in what is a major women's health problem of breast cancer.

And you may ask me why I bring this up. And that is because I personally teach a course on women's policy. I teach two courses: One is an open women's policy course and the other is a social policy course on families, *Women, Single-parent Families and Work*. On the one hand we're talking largely about public sector solutions and on the other hand I find myself talking largely about advocacy and private sector solutions. And I somehow think we need to keep that in mind and see the ways that they cross because indeed it is terrible if what the Chicago study found out is true; that advocacy is very difficult to get funded. And we know that there are even guideline in our federal IRS regulations which have from time to time been raised as barriers to advocacy organizations. And I think as feminists, as women, as people concerned about social policy, that causes some problems for us which need to keep in mind.

Now, one other thing that I am reacting to, what has been said by my colleagues. And that is the changing nature of women in philanthropy I have to tell you has been skeptically, as skeptics have said, may reflect the fact that the field is losing stature. That sounds funny but I called the United Way and I asked them how are they making out in their balance because the United Way has been under great attack on a number of issues, but the women's role and the women's funds in the United Way has also been a great problem. And it was extremely interesting to me that they said they'd started gathering in more minorities and more females in top executive positions and that, after all, is where it counts in the large metro United Way organizations. And then they began to worry that they would lose stature vis a vis the corporate world. They didn't say the corporate world. They began to worry about their stature. So, well, here is our self-esteem problem. Here is one of the roots. So they immediately, I gathered, almost put a halt to infusion of more women at the top levels. They didn't quite say it dramatically, but I can promise you that that was the implication. We will watch the balance of women and men...

You have your hand up.

Q: Would you mind if the door were opened?

Brilliant: It's very hot in here. No, I would not mind at all. What ever secrets I'm saying are on the tape.

Okay, now, lest you think I am barking -- I want to go back to the public/private issue in a moment -- lest you think I'm barking up my own individual tree, which if that's a mixed metaphor forgive me, I do have because of my nature in a school of social work and the issues that I teach, it's more than that. Julian Wilford, who is a well-known, I guess, political geographer, at Princeton, who Alison would probably know, recently did a report talking about the difficulties of -- a paper actually -- on decentralization, which is after all the way the private sector generally operates. It's not mostly Ford Foundation and large central foundations, although they give money and then they give money to local organizations even if it has a national impact. Somebody somewhere is doing it, but when you get down to services and smaller foundations and federations like the United Way, you are really talking about a highly decentralized non-profit system of all kinds. And he pointed out in a very careful analysis that the findings were, in fact just what I would have suspected and not very palatable to many in the foundation world and the non-profit world, that there isn't the redistribution taking place. I mean, Terry Odendall, who wrote a book on women in charity, was correct. This is not a place where major -- major? forget major -- where redistribution of funds from rich to poor for the most part takes place. That's a dilemma I want to leave you with. I'm not going to try to solve...I'm going to raise some issues which I'm not going to try to resolve.

It is endemic to the system, however. I was at the Barnard dinner last night, talking to Barnard fundraisers, and talking about this, thinking about what I was going to talk about today and I said, "Now, what do you do with this situation? Do we want to withdraw funds from Yale or Barnard?" Since we were at Barnard. When I raised this issue some people who were from Yale said, "Well, look at the situation of New Haven, which has become a very dangerous, conflicted city." And I said, "No," because that belongs to the public sector. What the private sector has to do is carve out a role in which it will influence opinion and in fact be an advocate for that kind of change. Now how you do that so that philanthropy not only funds the opera -- which, I have to say, I enjoy as much as any wealthy woman does and I don't want the funds withdrawn -- but we have to think about how to increase the pie, I presume, so that we can get both the system, the non-profit sector, the organizations, the foundations which make it up, depend for their livelihood, for their purpose, I should say, for their function. It's defined in terms of the variation and the choices And we may not always like the choices. So what I propose is that we will consider working on the choices we are most interested in and I personally would like to see, not the opera suffer, but more money going to the advocacy organizations which would affect... My classic example is that nobody protested about an act that took place on some of the

welfare reform, which I think is absolutely horrendous in New Jersey, and I think the NOW Legal Defense Fund will leap in on a basic issue where women are being deprived, children are being deprived of money. But if the non-profit sector doesn't do it who will do it if we do not get that kind of consideration on policy?

Anyway, I had a slightly different definition of philanthropy than Cathy and I had similar issues about who they are and where they are, which I just can't resist just sharing with you before I kind of rap this up because I don't want to deprive you all of time. I'm very interested in the notion of empowerment of women through fundraising and allocation, that's been my track. And I started thinking about also where women in philanthropy are located and I just want to share with you... I also came up with rich women as individual donors, but then they could write a check to Smith; they don't have to have a foundation. I also came up the Wellsey figure; hundreds of thousands of dollars in a 5-year campaign. Number one in the country for fundraising. So just on the side you should think why is it so difficult for some causes, but for colleges Wellsey was able to raise more than any other university for that period. I have some thoughts about why that is so, which if you're interested I will share later.

Rich women with funds and foundations, that's a second category. Rich women who have incorporated for a variety of reasons in those small family foundations. Women's funds and federations, grassroots organizations, and here social action organizations are a major player in a minor league way. That is, the National Network of Women's Funds, which is an organization which has been created since 1985 which includes now approximately 60 organizations of various kinds. Now the thing is that some of those women's funds in the second category are indeed also in the National Network of Women's Funds. There are literally organizations, I went out to interview one in Minneapolis, which consists of a woman and a part-time staff member who is her friend. And they give out grants as they wish, but they are incorporated and they are a foundation. On the other hand, you also have Ms., you have Hastrea, which is the first national lesbian organization, you have Women's Way, which is the most famous federated organization and that's not a fund, it is a federation. It is like the old United Way in which the funders come to the table and share in the divvying of the money and share in the responsibilities for raising the money, but in a women's mode around women's issues, in fact. If I can say this politely on the tape, they beat the Hell out of the United Way in a number of campaigns. They really scared them because they were so effective raising money in the workplace and this is not a lesson on raising money in the workplace, but that's what Women's Way has done extremely successfully. The Sojourner Fund in Chicago, sorry, Detroit. I wrote Chicago, but I know it's Detroit. The New Mexico Women's Fund...

In other words, tremendous variety in place, geographic area, size, purpose, all around women's issues. And I have to say, some of them even struggle with the issue of can we ever fund a men's organization. Even there. But they are dealing with women of

color, they are dealing with rich White women, they are dealing with lesbian and gay issues, they are dealing with the disabled; an extremely rich, complicated group of people, who are unfortunately meeting today in Dallas, Texas. That's the first conference of their's I have missed in many years, I'm sorry to say. And they are concerned with not just raising money, but with something called unity and diversity and they are very seriously dedicated to this and it is not easy.

I could go on because I have a number of anecdotes I have published already and I'm working on the relationship between very rich women, who on the one hand feel constrained in terms of their power. They feel in this playing field that they do not have a kind of power, that they feel in a sense almost powerless. It sounds funny. On the other hand you have African American women, Hispanic women, who also say, "We have been" -- and they really have been -- "oppressed in the world at large. We have never had our chance." People with greater wealth are not going to overwhelm the organizations. So it's a very creative tension, which I'm happy to say has worked very successfully despite moments of ups and downs, but which has increased its amount of money from approximately \$1 million to \$5 million in about 8 years, that is the grants given, which I have the exact figures, but just to rush through...

Q: Can you say the name again, please?

Brilliant: National Network of Women's Funds. I have something here which I think at least refers to it. They are in Minneapolis, Minnesota. I personally have the great dream... There is none in New Jersey. There is no women's fund in New Jersey. I'm trying to think of a way to get students to organize it without getting in terrible trouble.

Anyway, these are problems. Moving on: Women in other foundations as staff, we've already talked about corporate, community, private, foundations of all kinds. And finally women raising money in all sorts of other organizations as staff and as volunteers and they do that in two different ways in these organizations. So the interest in between what is the staff role and what is the volunteer role, and any of you who have had both roles as I have, it's kind of interesting to compare what is up and what is down.

Okay. Lot's of questions and an answer, somebody I think had asked about this before. I have the Junior League down as an example of the traditional organization which in fact is trying to change it's role, but has always done some fundraising. And we know all about the variety. Very little study, in fact, as we know.

Okay. I think I will stop here except to say that I had a slightly different figure about the location of corporate figures because I had that the women CEOs -- and maybe this

was it -- were up to about 43 percent. So they've obviously risen in the last year, which is very good. But I have that they were concentrated still largely in the under \$10 million assets. So that I had to locate it largely in the smaller organizations, which is what one would indeed expect. Okay. Thirty-four funds reported raising 5.5 million grants is the exact figure for the national network last year.

Alright, I think enough because it's getting late and I want to give you some chances to ask us questions and to... Yes?

Q: When you were [speaking] of the history of philanthropy, have there been many examples of private philanthropy leading to or being catalytic for large public philanthropy? Or is it usually public philanthropy which sets the stage and is followed by private philanthropy ***?

McCarthy: Well, the whole idea of the development of the modern foundation was that it would serve as an incubator for new ideas for public programs. And the idea that surrounded the development of the Sage, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations in the 1910s was that the best philanthropy defines the problem, tests possible solutions, turns the best over to government, and then moves on to a new field. The Reagan Administration was really the first to attempt to reverse that and say, "No, you're not going to spin off programs. We're going to cut back funding and you should take up the slack and keep the organizations going."

There are lots of examples. Perhaps the most significant example is that of the Ford Foundation's grey areas, Great Cities Programs, which provided the template for the Great Society Program which was [during] the Johnson Administration and people like Paul Overstock actually went down and wrote the legislation. Johnson wanted to do something significant really quickly after Kennedy was killed and there just weren't that many models around to test ways to deal with growing minority populations in cities and draw people into decision-making programs. Headstart is one of the things that comes out of this, just to use a familiar example. These were being tested by Ford and the government just gobbled them up. But that's [an] old pattern; the idea that private philanthropy pioneers the solutions and those solutions have been taken over by government.

Q: Before today I didn't realize how rare it was for foundations to fund women's issues. I think that's one of the things that's come out today and so I would like to share the name of a foundation *** that right now is specifically women-involved and it's called the Sister Fund.

Brilliant: Right. That's an example where several rich women have established a very

valuable fund.

Q: And it's...they used to be funding different kinds of community based things. At last call I think they made a decision to just strictly focus on women and girls.

McCarthy: Well, the thing that has to be said about the Sister Fund, though, is that they are not capitalized at the level of the Rockefeller or Ford certainly and their grants tend to be quite small. That's not a criticism, it's just that the funding that does exist for women tends to be smaller.

And just as a little follow up, because there is a lot of interest in how you figure out where to go for grants and I used to be on the Rockefeller Foundation staff for two and a half very long years. It was a corporate foundation. And besides going to the foundations that are getting a come search list, which are the print-outs for various fields, read the annual reports themselves. I used to write the annual reports for ***, but read the annual reports, look for signs that they are giving grants to similar sorts of organizations, read the copy very carefully, and then make your pitch for why your organization is the best one to do this grant. I know it sounds like an idiotically simple thing, but when Alison was talking about how people will come in and say, "Please fund my girls' club," they obviously haven't read the annual report.

Q: I work for a corporation. I get some applications from *** for money that we have and I'm amazed at how they haven't done their homework.

McCarthy: Absolutely.

Brilliant: Before they come in?

Q: Before they even call me and they call and I tell them to write. You have to understand what the corporation [is funding], what their interests are, and what their guidelines are because they are not going to fund *** in Germany.

Brilliant: But do you take the time sometimes to give them help?

Q: I do.

McCarthy: Most corporations wouldn't though.

Q: No, I don't know what my colleagues think, but it's something that I care about. In general I found that, no, I've given my address, you know, I've told them ***. But they're not going to get anywhere with any company if they don't...

McCarthy: My favorite grant request when I was at the Met Life Foundation was someone submitted a proposal for the Hannibal Project. He wanted us to subsidize his pay purchases so that he could take Eleanor's course.

Brilliant: I hope you did it.

McCarthy: I was tempted, but I didn't think the board would go for it.

Brilliant: Yes?

Q: You've repeatedly referred to rich women. How do you define them ***?

Brilliant: Okay, I took...actually I used rich women though I had written in my notes not to because Tracy Gary, who has been very instrumental along with Helen Hunt in the National Network for Women's Funds -- I mean, they're both deeply involved. Helen is always at these meetings -- usually talk about themselves as women of wealth. That seems to be the expression they use and it is self-defined. Tracy Gary has a figure and I honestly cannot remember, but it seems to me that it was a gift of over \$5000 a year, the capability of doing that, but it may have been larger. But it is basically self-defined and it is a group of women who are capable of giving large money.

Q: I mean, you've repeatedly said "rich women"...

Brilliant: I have really used it in the loose sense in which it is used as women who give large amounts of money to philanthropic causes, the women who are donors in large amounts to colleges, to the art museums...

Q: What is "large"?

Brilliant: I would say if you can give \$10,000 a year out of money which is not coming out of your pocket that you have. Now you want to pick a figure? You know, we're at \$200,000 now. Isn't that where the debate is for the tax cut for the President? That figure has sliced. An individual who has over \$200,000 income doesn't seem very rich anymore. So, you...you know...

Q: Using our standards of trust companies *** some would say, most trust companies at least they say \$1 million in liquid assets and *** private bank is \$595,000.

Brilliant: You see, it's a sliding figure I think. In terms of giving money, if you give \$10,000 a year that's beyond what most of us, I think, in this room would give, but \$5 million is a lot more.

McCarthy: Yeah, one thing that I... The nice thing about being an historian is that you can be very particularistic and really look at individual cases. And when we're talking about wealthy women, you have to be so careful because someone like Isabella Stewart Gardner, for example, who started the Gardner Museum, built most of that with money she had inherited from her father. She ostensibly inherited a very large fortune, but when you begin to really dig into her records you find out that the trustees, a bunch of male trustees...

Brilliant: Owned the money?

McCarthy: Owned the money. She couldn't get at the principle at all. She had limited access to the income. So with women you've got to be very careful when you talk about wealth because they may look good on paper, but they may not have absolute control of the money.

Q: I have a two part question: The first is that I think something that I haven't heard here and that I think is really important and an area of activism for all of us is the feminization of business and the example [that] Ben & Jerry's was able to be very successful while putting 7.5 percent in a Ben & Jerry's Fund and the notion of you get from the community and you give back. And I guess I wanted to ask you if you think that's a trend, that we're going to see more or are these aberrational examples? I'm hoping that it's a trend that we all should be pushing for because I think as long as women are marginalized we're never going to get at the big money.

And the second question along those same lines is: What has been your experience in terms of obtaining funding for, for example, within the existing legal curriculum to have more of a sensitivity to women's issues perhaps in a contract class, for example, *** legalistic? That we have cases that bring into focus some gender eye, as Alison was referring to. One of the problems is that women are getting into positions but they have no feminist sensitivity. And I for one wrest with someone as a horrible example of going through 5 and a half years with the Justice Department in Washington and 5 and a half years in the international legal arena on the private side without any sensitivity to the fact that there were no other women in the office, when there were no lawyers in the office, female lawyers. And other kinds of things. So I think we need

to mainstream and I guess I'm wondering is there any funding going on in that...?

McCarthy: In answer to your first question about feminization of business, if you're talking about women starting businesses and then giving money, you need role models ***, you need more...

Q: I apologize. The values that we particularly associate with the feminine, the notion of giving back to the community, the environment where there would be money available for corporations planning to establish foundations ***. More than just the existing foundations, but the private sector ends up financing the non-profit as opposed to relying on public funds.

McCarthy: Well, corporations do fund non-profit organizations. In corporate philanthropy until just a few years ago it was the fastest growing sector on the philanthropic pie, but, for example, if you're in an organization like Met Life they were not interested in funding controversial issues. So they would not have gotten involved in funding a pro-life or a pro-choice organization; it's not in the interest of business to do that. So if you're looking for money for advocacy of controversial issues, I think we have to look to individuals or foundations but not corporations.

Q: But for non-advocacy, non-profit projects...?

McCarthy: Once again, women are the majority of the population in the United States, but how do you convince people that that should be a major priority? As women get more earning power they become more important. We'll see a corporation trying to make an impact on the Hispanic community where they want to do more business, suddenly they're funding Ballet Hispanico. Right? So if women become more important as consumers and begin to make it apparent that they're socially conscious consumers, that's when corporations are going to begin to pay attention to women as well as minority groups of various sorts.

Brilliant: Let me just say that women's study departments have really been thriving in a relative sense. They've had their ups and downs, but at Rutgers, for example, we have a very large women's center and a women's studies department, which has actually not been a women's studies department, but which is thinking of moving in that direction and which is getting larger grants. I mean, it's a hard, hard road, but it can be done and is being done. We are certainly all being sensitized to gender issues in the curriculum throughout the University along with minorities. In response to changing demographics, I mean, you have to be aware that that's what's driving it in the academic world as well as in the world of work

Q: I just wanted to bring up Kim Klien who has done a lot of writing on raising money for non-profit organizations and her research and her findings are that most non-profit organizations make 95 percent -- some figure, some high *** like that -- not from big foundation grants or wealthy people, but more from just the general community, you know, from \$10 and \$15 donations and things like that. And, you know, that's kind of my experience with now in New York. You know, that you really have to establish a fundraising base and constantly be looking for that type of support from a broad range of people. [To] concentrate all your efforts on the main money people is, you know, while, yes, if you eventually get the money it's certainly worth your time to do that, but I think more effort should be spent on ***

Brilliant: I'd like to comment on this first. The National Network of Women's Funds has exactly placed great emphasis... I mean, they give out manuals, they actually have manuals that are available, and they teach organizations, they train them, they do workshops, teaching organizations how to do grassroots fundraising. And there is a growing -- obviously -- emphasis on that. One organization -- and I think this might be of interest to you -- in New Brunswick, a woman's shelter that had been for years dependent on a variety of sources, I think including the United Way, needed money very much this year, had a cut back in funding. And put an add in the paper saying, "We need help to raise money." No kidding. And they got an answer from somebody who spent time, donated time, and within a month they had raised \$13,000. Now it's small money, you have got to remember, but it was an amazing story because it took place very quickly, all grassroots.

McCarthy: One thing you have to realize is that approximately 90 percent of all money that's given in this country is given by individuals. Foundations give about 6 percent and corporations about 4 percent. And also there's a great difference between the kind of money that you get from a broad base of small donations like that which is operating money, which is what pays the staff and the kind of project support that Alison was talking about. Big foundations will give you money for a start up grant, but after that it's project support. And I've got to tell you that my experience as a woman fundraiser...I direct the only major center in my field that's run by a woman.

Brilliant: That's true. That's absolutely true and I'm sorry I didn't say that in the introduction.

McCarthy: And we get less money even though our programs have been very successful and are considered among the 4 best programs in the country. And the one thing they always want to cut is the money for staff. You know, it's the idea that you're going to make up the short fall. So anything that brings in operating funds is terribly important and you're not going to get them in adequate amounts.

Brilliant: That, by the way, is also why the workplace funding issue, which we didn't discuss although it's my real area in a way, has been so important. It has been, you know, once an organization got tied into the United Way they could guarantee themselves year after year a certain amount of money and that was core support for the most part which is also very hard to get not only program support. So that was another reason. The women's funds have to some extent picked up the slack in that area, too, because they are doing some core support, not just program, but they're struggling with both, but at United Way traditionally a major thing was core, some program. So the changes that are happening to them have ramifications for all kinds of organizations who have been depending on that money that campaign is obviously down. Yeah?

Q: *** Foundation, I think I've heard that there are some *** over there, who are really going to help underwrite the Fundraising Center, a small organization help them help themselves by helping them *** underwrite a fundraising position for a couple of years so they can begin to grow their own efforts.

Brilliant: I will tell you that many I know do not want to do that. Now some are doing it I understand, but that has been a very reluctant position. Am I right?

Q: It's a very small number of foundations that will fund that kind of activity. There is some, but it's not very much.

Brilliant: United Way used to have a form... Oh, sorry.

Q: *** that they're very interested in that there's a... That's not the only thing they're interested in doing for these people is their fundraising. There are also things called technical assistance grants that can range from *** fundraising program to *** planning and that kind of thing. There's probably -- I don't know what percentage -- there's a high percentage certainly that would fund technical assistance then there are that would directly fund a fundraising program.

Brilliant: Some...I think Lily Foundation has, for example, given some grants that it calls capacity building, but my guess is that they would mostly be United Way organizations for their capacity building if they have some spread. The United Way was always reluctant. They actually had a form which we developed -- I mean, because I was the person in charge of doing that -- which shunted out the fundraising costs so we would be sure we weren't paying for it.

Q: Are there community developments who help people sort of wanting to get grants for projects...?

Brilliant: Absolutely. She probably has the director. I was thinking immediately of two I know who have gone to work for organizations that are now the fundraiser for. But there are reputable consultants in this field.

Okay. Other questions or we should bring this to an end? Alright. Thank you.