



2009

Independent Sector and
Council of Michigan Foundations
ANNUAL CONFERENCE



Luncheon Plenary: "Fashioning Our Future Together"

November 5, 2009

Moderator:

- ALBERTO IBARGUEN, president and CEO, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

Panelists:

- BEN HECHT, president and CEO, Living Cities
- STEPHEN HEINTZ, IS board member, and President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund
- WENDY PURIEFOY, IS board member, and President, Public Education Network

Speaker:

- DIANA AVIV, president and CEO, Independent Sector

MR. IBARGUEN: Thank you, Diana. That was an inspiring call for so many good things, for civility, for collaboration, for engagement with the whole community, for building a cathedral of engagement, for the benefit of the people we serve, a combination, a rope I love the visual aids, particularly since you have this foreign accent.

MS. AVIV: No, you all have a foreign accent.

[Laughter.]

MR. IBARGUEN: The visual aids were wonderful.

MS. AVIV: Thank you.

MR. IBARGUEN: The rope, the rope of business, of government, and of our nonprofit sector. The purpose of this panel is to try to put some more meat on the bones of the outline that Diana has put before us and try to surface some of the opportunities and some of the challenges that we might face in building such a cathedral.

Joining us, of course, Diana herself. Next after her is Ben Hecht, who is the President and CEO of Living Cities; Wendy Puriefey who is President of Public Education Network and an IS Board Member; and Stephen Heintz, President of the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation I almost got a call from Judith Rodin from the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation and also an IS Board Member.

I want to remind everyone that there are cards on the table. This whole conference has been I hope you have enjoyed how much this whole conference has been interactive in a very practical kind of way, engaging the audience, and we intend to not wait. So we will be taking your questions all the way through the panel.

I would like to ask each of the panelists to give me a quick response to the cathedral part. I don't want to skip over the civility, the call for civility, because I think it is so much at the core of how we in the nonprofit sector act, and you look at what's going on in Washington and it doesn't need to be Washington because you have the same kinds of divisions in Tallahassee, the same kinds of divisions all across the country, and your example of people not even being willing to have political discussions in order to maintain civil relationships is unfortunately very, very true.

But I think what I'd like to start with today is this call for some kind of organization or some kind of movement that brings together government, business, and the nonprofit sector, that cathedral that you talked about. I wonder if our panelists would like to start there and maybe give some impressions.

Ben, would you? Would you take the first crack?

MR. HECHT: Sure, I'd be happy to.

I think the idea of a different type of institution about meshing up interests and institutions together in new and different ways is critical, and I think it's not just rebuilding the cathedral; it's building a different cathedral.

And the challenge, there was I forget. Everybody has taken credit for the quote about a crisis is a terrible thing to waste or whatever, but I do believe that there is a hunger in our country and I think around the world if you look at the President's Peace Prize for people to say, "We know we've put off making these hard decisions for too long," but what they're looking for is leadership, and I think they're looking for leadership that's saying we're going to build these new and different cathedrals, maybe with very different partners, maybe playing very different roles, but I do believe it all comes down to leadership, providing the leadership we need to show that right direction.

MR. IBARGUEN: So are we talking about really new organizations, or are we talking about changing organizations like IS or like Common Cause or like many of the organizations that are represented here today?

MR. HECHT: No, I think it's using the power of networks that I think are broadly understood today, to say how do we bring people, institutions, individuals together in ways that are actually going to get people what they need, get policies enacted that need to be enacted, but I actually think it's about networks.

MR. IBARGUEN: Wendy, what's your thought?

MS. PURIEFOY: Well, I would say that in a crisis, you have it's not an either/or challenge that we're dealing with. You have to address the crisis, but you have to have a big enough vision to really create a future that people can move toward.

And I was thinking about this in terms of what's been going on and in terms of public education, and you've been talking about networks, Ben. The crisis that's going on in public education is structural. That's what's producing low performing schools, and that's what's producing the outcomes that we are having for poor, disadvantaged children.

So the only way that we're going to be able to address that is if education organizations come together and are able to work collaboratively and collectively and leverage change. We can't do it individually, and this is what Diana was talking about in the speech.

We have tried the individual teaspoon, making sure our cup is full. What we have to do now is figure out how we work together.

MR. IBARGUEN: You know, I love this idea of having the questions come up because you can't program this.

In the first set of questions, to your point, is there a danger of too much emphasis on nonprofit collaboration with business and government? Isn't it often the case that nonprofits in the sector must prod and even confront business and government? So how are we going to build that rope with people that we're confronting?

MS. PURIEFOY: Well, let me give another example. It's an example from my own organization. These community based organizations were created to help improve public schools. They've been around for 25 years, since the Ford Foundation started the first ones.

When we were celebrating this twenty fifth anniversary, we had fabulous individual stories to tell, redesigned, teacher training, professional development, increased test scores, but, at the end of the day, we couldn't talk about the collective impact of our existence.

And so now we have been engaged in developing a plan that essentially says we have to put our intelligence, our work, our resources, our expertise together and focus on a singular outcome. It doesn't mean you can't do a lot of things along the way, but we should be able to say that we have done something about the graduation rate in this country of poor and disadvantaged children, and we cannot do it alone. So we are doing it together.

MR. IBARGUEN: Stephen, you've built organizations over time. You've run large organizations. How would you start doing something like this? Would you start with a subject matter focus, or would you start with an organizational focus? I'm just trying to maybe I'm jumping too far ahead, but, if you were going to try to build this cathedral or weave this rope, how would you start?

MR. HEINTZ: Well, let me, if I could first of all, I want to congratulate Diana. I thought it was a terrific speech, and there's a lot there for all of us to think about, but let me talk about the cathedral metaphor for one second because I think there's something very appealing about it, which is that every building block is important, and you may have expertise in shaping one stone and somebody else may be able to craft the cornerstone and somebody else can do the flooring, and everybody has to work together to create this larger inspiring edifice.

But the challenge with the metaphor is that we should keep in mind that the people who started carving the first blocks of the great cathedrals in the world were not alive when the cathedrals were

finished, and we now are in a period of great urgency when we need to build the cathedrals in our lifetime because we are facing some fundamental challenges to the future of our planet in the form of climate change which also then will exacerbate the other great challenge of our time which is growing inequity, both at home and across the globe.

And we can't wait to build the old kind of cathedrals that take too long. We have maybe 10 years in some respects to do this work. So I think it's got to be pretty radical, and I think that the questioner that you referred to already, Alberto, put something very important before us, which is, yes, I agree completely with Diana that we need to work in a new set of relationships with the public and private sectors, but I think we also have to recognize that what's happened in the last 30 to 40 years is that there's been a growing imbalance in our society between the value we place in each of those three sectors.

It has tilted, frankly, to the private sector. It has reduced the capacity of government to function well because we've decided, in the immortal words of Ronald Reagan, that government was the problem. So we've shrunk government. We've privatized public services to private companies, not just private organizations but to for profit companies. We have said that we want to get government so small that we can ground it in a bath tub, and what's left of government, we want to force to operate more like a business. We've also said to the nonprofit sector that we all have to operate more like a business.

Now, I agree we need to be more rigorous, we need to measure, we need to set expectations, we have to hold ourselves accountable, we have to be transparent, but there is something distinctly important about the unique nature of our sector to mobilize people for larger societal change, and I think until we rebalance our society and recognize that we need a society that promotes the role of government in our lives otherwise we're going to see the Hurricane Katrina syndrome played out in all kinds of ways, where government can't respond when we need it, and we need the nonprofit sector to be the place that restores the balance.

We have to be that fulcrum that creates a more level playing field between these two mega sectors of the public and private sector and helps them join in the cathedral building, because right now I'm not sure that they are such willing partners.

MR. IBARGUEN: There's a question here that says

[Applause.]

MR. IBARGUEN: There's a question here that says as charities work more closely with government, how long will it be before a charitable gift feels more like another tax?

I wonder, to your points about revisiting what we think government is supposed to do, it seems to me that I agree with your analysis that we have insisted on smaller and smaller government. We have insisted on a more businesslike approach in the nonprofit sector, and I wonder how many people would respond if you and, in fact, I think one of the reasons the health care debate is so difficult for so many people, I think they are simply not prepared to trust government in the way that I think two generations ago we certainly were prepared to trust government to handle an increasing number of things.

How should we begin to talk about that, Diana? Because, if you're going to build that cathedral, you've got to have, I think, some kind of consensus on what the roles of each are going to be and where we're going to be willing to go beyond merely what is practical and what is affordable in the market and what is expensive but necessary for the whole society.

MS. AVIV: Well, you know, in a speech you can't say everything that you want to say. Otherwise, it would be like Fidel Castro, and you'd be here for 40 hours and then some.

I didn't talk in my comments about our respective responsibilities vis a vis government and that we have to beg each other's keepers. Government has a responsibility of oversight in a variety of ways, but so does the sector to mind the excesses of government and to hold government's feet to the fire. So I think that those kinds of roles and relationships is the subject for another speech at another time.

I think that the attitude that we have towards government are better. I think that we are at a point in time where the public may be open or at least they were 6 months ago or 10 months ago when this administration came in, were open to the idea that government could be part of the solution and not part of the problem. And I think part of our responsibility is to have a clearer construct of what we think government should do.

If we give government mixed messages on the one side saying, "All you're good for is taking care of the homeland and making sure that the country and the people are protected or whatever that means," that's one construct of government. If we say that government's responsibility is attending to the most vulnerable citizens in our society and should have sufficient resources to meet those responsibilities, then that is their responsibility.

So I think that what we need to begin by doing is having a clearer idea of what our expectations are, and then we the citizenry should go out and elect leaders that reflect those priorities.

[Applause.]

MR. IBARGUEN: Ben, did you want to comment?

MR. HECHT: Yeah. I think there's two other issues, too, about the government. One is, I think over that time when there was a severe focus on limiting the size of government and what it is that we decimated the capacity, and what you see now from any of us who are working with the Obama administration or State and local governments that are trying to turn around systems is they literally don't have the capacity to act.

And I think one of the things that we have to do is say we're not going to invest in the nonprofit community along to take up the slack that government should be doing. It is we actually have to help government get there because they can help build that.

Literally, today, I don't think they can help to build the cathedral. So I think we have to have an intentional focus on helping government to actually do stuff.

And then the other one is we have to give them a road map on what we think they should be doing going forward. I mean, if we believe that you need to tie child care to pre K through 12 to getting

people into jobs, those are great ideas. No one knows how to do it, and so I think part of what we have to do is literally give the government a road map and say these are the regulatory changes you need to make, these are the flexibility that you have to give to vendors, these are the reimbursement.

Bottom line is these ideas have to be turned into practice, and I think a lot about how welfare reform came, whether you like it or not, the process was innovation took place in the public sector for about 10 years, maybe more, and different States asked for waivers, and they said, "We're going to do things differently." And they had nonprofits act differently. They had the private sector act differently.

And after that time, there was a road map that people were able to follow to bring about the larger scale reform, and I think that process is, unfortunately, at its early stage, and it's going to take a while, but we have to intentionally invest in that.

MR. HEINTZ: Can I just add a point here, Alberto?

MR. IBARGUEN: Sure.

MR. HEINTZ: Because Jim Wallace said something yesterday in the plenary that I think we need to keep in mind and address, which is that even with an extraordinarily able and well intentioned and visionary President now in the White House, Washington is hard wired, as Jim says, against change.

And why is that? It's because the political system has gotten so tied up with money, we have had a system of redistricting around this country to create safe seats, which means we have incumbents who are elected for life. We have people who are excluded from the voting process and marginalized in the world's, quote/unquote, "greatest democracy," and unless we all put some effort into political reforms, fundamental political reforms about getting money out of politics, getting young people into politics, and bringing the marginalized and excluded into the civic space, we're not going to get the change in Washington we really need.

[Applause.]

MS. PURIEFOY: So Stephen just outlined a structure for reminding people that they are the government.

So, you know, I think about us talking about the government as though it's something over there. We are the government.

Today is the anniversary of one year anniversary when this country decided to make a monumental change, and we the people came out and did this.

So I think one of the things that happens in this privatization that's gone on in the sector and that has gone on in our world is that people think of government as a service. They think of their schools as a service, and they wait to see if the service is working. They don't ask how could I make this service better. They don't ask what their role is.

And so we are going to have to go through, I believe, the painful task of reinvesting and trusting our neighbors and working to rebuild our democracy because now what we have is something that looks like a democracy, but it isn't a fully functioning democracy.

MR. IBARGUEN: That's a fascinating

MS. PURIEFOY: And one of the roles

[Applause.]

MR. IBARGUEN: That's a fascinating concept.

So, if you how should I think about government, if not as a service? I agree with you that that's how we've come to think about it. It's a service that provides any number of things, from school lunches to education to, in some cases, health care. What is it? What is the right way to think about it and not as a service?

MS. PURIEFOY: You know, Diana and I have talked about this, and I talk about this with everybody I get a chance to talk about it.

MR. IBARGUEN: I didn't think this was the first time you had had this conversation.

[Laughter.]

MS. PURIEFOY: So, when you walk out on the street, that's the government. It's your tax dollars at work. When your house is on fire and volunteer policemen and fire people show up, that's a function of the government.

I think about the role of government in the individual lives of members of my family. I had a brother who was born mentally retarded, and he was one of the first people to work and be mainstreamed into work. Who hired him? The government.

So I think one of the ways in which we have to think about government is personal. We have to think about it as functional, and then we have to think about it as aspirational.

This is, you know, you take yourself back to 1789. What we tried to do, what happened then, the fashioning of a constitution of freedom, to say that all people were created equal, that just wasn't happening in the world. I mean, you think about what was going on in the world in the 18th century.

So we have a big tradition in this country to keep up. We founded this country on freedom. We have struggled and worked to make sure more and more people have it. That is a continuous struggle, and we have to look at the kinds of things from our schools to the way we live to the way businesses function to ensure that people never lose sight of themselves.

MR. IBARGUEN: That's interesting.

In this year of the Lincoln Bicentennial, I have been reading an awful lot for the first time in a long time about Lincoln, and one of the things that has been interesting is reading about his, in effect,

rediscovery of the Declaration of Independence and bringing it to the fore. Whereas, for the previous number of decades before Lincoln, the focus had been on the legality of the Constitution. It had been a legalistic kind of argument, and it was Lincoln who brought back the aspirational nature of that declaration.

But I think, Stephen, going back to your earlier comments, I'm trying to remember a time when people didn't structure, in your lifetime and mine, when people in power didn't structure things to stay in power, when people when we didn't say that we needed to have more engagement.

I'm not sure that I see this time as different from when you and I lived in Connecticut 30 years ago, in that sense.

What I do see is different and I see as really important for this conversation is that the tone that was set at the top, to use a popular business phrase, the tone that was set at the top, the aspiration that was set from the President, as you pointed out, was no government. That's really the ideal. That if we could somehow figure out how to not have government, then we would all be happier. We'd all ride our horses into the West.

And the tone that is set at the top is of a responsible government and a responsive government in this administration, and so I think even in a totally different way, it seems to me, than Clinton, who certainly would have been sympathetic, I think this is a bold declaration of a different way of looking at government, and, therefore, this is an incredible moment, as you pointed out, Diana, an incredible moment of opportunity.

MR. HECHT: Alberto, can I ask you something now? Can I switch the role and play your role for a minute? Because I think the other thing that's happened in the last couple of years has been the power actually of the populous.

MR. IBARGUEN: The power of?

MR. HECHT: Of the populous, of people.

Well, a large portion of the populous. If you look at the way that the Obama campaign was able to organize people and a lot of young people and call you on the telephone and say would you do these 10 things and would you show up here and there and really excite people and I know you guys have invested a lot in what is the 21st century civic engagement, but the other way to define government is actually by the people demanding it.

And it's one thing for the institutions to try to push, and it's another for the people to demand. And are you hopeful from the investments that you all make at Knight that there is this emerging new opportunity for civic engagement that's much more distributed?

MR. IBARGUEN: I am tingling. What do you mean am I hopeful?

[Laughter.]

MR. IBARGUEN: This is my favorite, favorite line in Diana's speech, "From the furthest corners of the planet, smart phones and wireless connection are linking people to information and

opportunities previously behind reach." This is a fantastic moment for engagement, and anybody, starting with John McCain, who wasn't paying attention

MR. HECHT: Right.

MR. IBARGUEN: to what the Obama campaign was doing in social media got what McCain got; that is, he lost.

MR. HECHT: Right.

MR. IBARGUEN: I think for us, the key issue in media right now is to ensure that there is universal digital access. I cannot stress strongly enough how urgent this is because 40 percent we're not talking about people in third world countries. We're talking about 40 percent of Americans who do not have access to broadband who do not have broadband digital access. The barriers are wealth, rural location versus urban, and age.

How can you possibly talk about telemedicine and think that 40 percent of Americans aren't going to be involved?

How can you possibly talk about equality when to apply for a job at Walmart or McDonald's today, you need to do it online? And so a kid can't even get a job frying French fries unless he has digital access.

Well, that's just for starters.

MR. HEINTZ: You got him going, Ben.

MS. PURIEFOY: I set him off. I did. I set him off.

[Laughter.]

MR. IBARGUEN: Think about the power of Meetup.com. They have hundreds of thousands of people getting together because they have somehow connected on the Web. The numbers are phenomenal.

And then the other side of this and we talked a little bit about this on the panel last year at the IS convention in Philadelphia, and there's a part of me that also says be careful what you wish for because we now have a President and a White House that is really savvy. We have a chief.

I met with him the other day. The title, I think, is probably the coolest title in the world, the Chief Technology Officer of the United States of America.

MR. HECHT: Yeah, it sounds like a big job.

MR. IBARGUEN: It is a big job. It is a big job.

So this is also a moment when we need to be very, very careful because, in the hands of somebody power tend to wants to control, whether it's good people or less good people. Power tends to want

to control, and I think it is easy to imagine somebody saying, gees, Barack would love to do this, but that Diana Aviv is an obstacle, what shall we do. And then everybody goes over to Diana.

This is nothing but opportunity here, nothing but opportunity.

MR. HEINTZ: I guess one of the questions on my m individual about that I agree with you, and I think it's very exciting, and I've come to learn how much I need to learn about all of this, but how do we find a way that we can employ all these new tools and this new way of working together in a way that builds the social movement that we need to really fundamentally change our society for the conditions of the 21st century?

I don't think the technology and the social marketing does that on its own. I think people need to be inspired to connect up with each other in the purpose of big social change.

MR. IBARGUEN: I think I don't agree. In the first place, the first thing that needs to happen is you have to have access, and access must be the same as walking into a public square or into a store. I think it absolutely must be. That's where the world is going, and to keep somebody out because of

MR. HEINTZ: I agree with that. I'm just assuming let's say there are setbacks. Let's say that's done.

MR. IBARGUEN: Well, I don't think it's that easy, but let's say that it is.

MR. HEINTZ: No, I don't think it's easy.

MR. IBARGUEN: Let's say that it is. The nature of the technology changes, it seems to me, and creates opportunity for engagement. It changes the newspaper reader of the past, who passively read news and might write a letter to somebody and might go down to the store the next day and buy, reacted in a very different sort of way than the user of information today, than the user of technology today who owns information. It is an ownership engagement opportunity that you just simply didn't have with the previous media.

MS. PURIEFOY: But engagement is also grounded in values, and I think this is, in part, what you're saying.

I mean, sure, we should have access to everything. The issue becomes what's the culture of accountability that we create, what's the social contract that we have between and among ourselves to ensure that we use the tools for our deeper betterment.

MR. HECHT: I mean, I get frustrated when I see the iPhone ad or whatever it is, and they're like, "There's an app for that. There's an app for that." Why aren't there apps for the critical things that we believe people need in the world, especially low income people?

MR. IBARGUEN: As a matter of fact but wait. As a matter of fact, there are.

MR. HECHT: But I think the key is that there's been an under investment in that.

MR. IBARGUEN: Yes.

MR. HECHT: And that our world is way behind, and part of it is because there's not the profit behind it, and the innovation has to come from, you know, the foundations like the folks who are here on the stage, but the key is that we have to invest an equal amount in how people can directly use technology to help themselves as we've invested and how institutions can help them help improve their lives.

MR. IBARGUEN: We just funded a wonderful thing called the Extraordinaries, where it is an app on an iPhone, where you can volunteer your time while you're sitting waiting for the dentist or on the bus. There are, and there are going to be many, many more.

I think the thing that I don't want to gloss over, Wendy, is that I think when you're dealing digitally, you need to allow for a different kind of reaction. You need to allow for far less control, and I think I agree that we should be focusing, that we should be thinking about what that means for the civil society, but I am so concerned that 60 percent of America is moving at lightning speed away from the other 40 percent of America, and it really, really bothers me that there isn't more of a sense of urgency, even in the administration, for ensuring that everybody has access.

MS. PURIEFOY: And I think we all share that concern.

I think the issue that all of us are raising, including you, is how do we have, continue to have a society in which people see that they matter, the institutions that they create matter and are responsive to them and to our nation.

MR. IBARGUEN: Ben, you should not have done that because this is my favorite subject, but, to get back on track, we have a number of similar questions, people asking us to get more specific about how we would begin, in this case, this one writer says the thousand mile journey starting with the first step, and someone else says, "How can we come together? What are the actual concrete steps that we should begin to take in figuring out some new kind of organization?"

Diana, what did you have in mind when you wrote that speech?

MS. AVIV: I have many, many thoughts about this, and, Alberto, you and I have just recently had a conversation about this. Stephen and I have these conversations all the time.

I think that, partly, I'm quite struck by the odd relationship that we have with the business community. It seems to me that more examples come to mind of ways in which there are adversarial relationships that the charitable community or different organizations have with how business has contaminated or otherwise affected, infected, or constricted people, and that the stance of organizations is to stop those practices, as they should.

What we haven't seen for a very long time are leaders in the business community taking responsibility for the larger social issues, the point that I made in my speech about business has as much of a vested interest in the natural resources on which they rely and the people that they employ to serve the public good, and we have allowed that larger stance of them being indifferent, except through the corporate philanthropy programs, to continue.

So, for one, for starters, I think that leaders within this sector ought to be engaging and inviting leaders in the business community to sit down and to look at our communities and our societies and to see how together there are things that we may want to address.

I think that we shouldn't wait for the White House to call us and invite us around our particular issues and talk to them about a specific thing that they want to do in advance, but that we should decide among ourselves the couple of things we want to talk to them about and come together as a collective community and then work together to achieve those kinds of things.

[Applause.]

MS. AVIV: I also think and now I'll put a challenge back to the audience, and this is one that I really do think if we did this and this alone, it would transform us.

I challenge everybody to go back to your board meetings and to make sure that you have at least one meeting in the next year in which you ask yourselves the question not only are you achieving your mission in the specific form that you talk about, the particular activities, but what is your organization's responsibility for the world around you, and what are those broader issues that you also have a responsibility for?

I am concerned that we talk and complain about silos, but we don't do anything about it.

[Applause.]

MR. HEINTZ: I've got a specific idea coming out of this particular meeting, which is here we are in the City of Detroit, which has been devastated by the economic trends that we've all seen, perhaps more than any other individual city in the country, and what if the people assembled in this room were to come together to organize the kind of conversation that Diana has just talked about in Detroit?

Because what has to happen in Detroit, it seems to me, is not about economic recovery. It's about economic reinvention, and why not start that here? Why not gather the business leaders, the philanthropic leaders, the scholars, the grass roots activists and build this multi sectoral effort to reinvent this economy as a model for how the national economy needs to be reinvented?

MR. IBARGUEN: Well, the Community Foundation of Southeastern Michigan, in fact, did pull together \$100 million, so called, "New Economic Initiative."

MR. HEINTZ: That's great.

MR. IBARGUEN: I think there would be a lot of interest in having that kind of a session.

We, because of the nature of our jobs and points of view, are probably looking at this from, let's say, a 20,000 foot or 30,000 foot level.

I have a comment and a question from someone who disagrees. We don't need a cathedral. We need a part time staff to answer our toll free help lines and enough money to keep the door open.

[Laughter.]

MS. PURIEFOY: That's practical every day.

MR. IBARGUEN: This is really quite serious. If someone is suicidal, they don't call and get a recording saying to call back tomorrow. How do we get foundations to not forget about funding the basics while we're doing this? This is a very tough question to answer, and so I'm going to throw it over to the panel.

[Laughter.]

MR. HECHT: I'll take it. Maybe I'll answer a different question, but I think it's not an either/or, and I think the challenge is that the systems we rely on, whether it's education or health care or economic development, were either built in the '30s or they were built in the '60s, but, either way, they don't at all meet the current needs.

And so, as long as you allow those dead systems to survive, you're wasting huge amounts of money on stuff that doesn't work, and then you have to deal with the challenges that the vast majority, especially in places like Detroit, are not even getting the basics, and you can't answer the phone for the suicide line.

So I think you can't ignore the current, and, certainly, right now the current is really severe, but, as long as we continue to ignore and not build the cathedral, however you want to define it, taking on a specific issue, I think Steve is totally right. It's like let's take one thing. Let's bring all these folks together. Let's figure out what are the obstacles, whether it's flexible financing, whether it's private sector capital, whether it's leadership in all the sectors, but you've got to show I believe you've got to show what's possible, and you've got to show with something real, intangible, and while you deal with the current, you're also dealing with the fundamental reengineering of these problems.

MS. AVIV: But, Alberto, I have a problem with that question, and this is the problem that I have. It feels to me that if we do this issue by issue, foundation by foundation, problem by problem, problem solving, the way we've been doing it, it will be like the proverbial Dutch boy with the finger in the dyke. There aren't enough resources to go around to attend to all of those issues.

We have to think of a different model to get there to solve the problem. The same old, same old, just a little more money, isn't going to get to solving these problems, and my argument is that if we work together, even within the sector and across the sector, even if we did that, if you don't want to work with government, it will be better than if we work alone, but I also think that the big money is in government.

You add our collective resources together or at least there were last year I don't know about this year, but what we spent last year was around about a trillion dollars. Government in one year's budget is around about \$3 trillion. It's three times our size, but that's our collective spending.

So that's where the big money is, and I think that part of our responsibility is to get them to meet this and not to think that the foundations are going to solve every problem. Foundations account for about 2 percent of the Sector's budget.

MR. IBARGUEN: Get them to mean their responsibility, according Wendy just told us that "they" is "us."

MS. AVIV: We.

MR. IBARGUEN: We.

MS. AVIV: Me.

MR. IBARGUEN: Okay.

You probably would say something similar to another question. My impression is the independent and nonprofit sector is very reluctant to take the lead with advocacy and initiating systemic change. Is that adequate? Do we wait too often? Do we too often wait to be invited by government or private sector?

I think that's true.

MR. HEINTZ: Yes. Totally true.

MR. IBARGUEN: And so what do you do about that?

MR. HEINTZ: Well, I think that it's about a call to action.

Diana talked about how there have been moments of real leadership in our country coming from the President of the United States, but we don't have to wait for that either.

MS. PURIEFOY: Right.

MR. HEINTZ: We can be the call to action, and I think we have to be. I think we do wait too long, and if we wait much longer, the problems will just be that much worse.

MR. HECHT: And I think you are seeing that here in this town, where the leadership really has come from the local foundations here, both community foundations and national foundations, and they're saying we need to do this. It's actually been hard to get the government's attention at the local, State, and Federal level.

MR. IBARGUEN: We are actually just about at the end of this, and let me just sort of ask this, one more. There are so many questions, and I thank the audience.

I think what I am going to do is I am going to have these typed up and sent to the shared with the panel because it really is a very interesting response.

MR. HEINTZ: Why don't we put them on the website and kind of create a blog around them and use all of that wonderful technology?

[Laughter.]

MR. IBARGUEN: That's a great idea. I'm assuming the Independent Sector website has that kind of interactivity. If not, we'll just do it at the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation.

[Laughter.]

MR. HEINTZ: If not, you'll give them a grant to build that kind of capacity.

MS. AVIV: Alberto is going to give us a grant to do it.

MR. HEINTZ: There you go.

MR. IBARGUEN: And Rockefeller Brothers will match it.

[Laughter.]

MS. AVIV: That's what's called "fund raising."

MR. IBARGUEN: This is a very profitable panel for you.

What's the most important thing that foundations and nonprofits should stop doing in this regard? Should we stop? I guess one thing is we should stop waiting to be asked. We should step up and take action and prod.

MR. HEINTZ: Yeah. I think we should stop being shy. I think we should stop being afraid of engaging in the, small "p", political process. I don't think we have to be partisan, and, obviously, legally, we cannot, but we all too often hang back from what is legally possible to do in terms of lobbying and influence the political process, and I think we should stop doing that.

[Applause.]

MR. IBARGUEN: What do you think, Wendy?

MS. PURIEFOY: Stop doing, but I think I would recommend that more foundations join in partnership with their grantees around the work that is being done because, in fact, as these organizations and the foundations partner with each other, they can cover more territory. They can innovate together, and they can provide a level of legitimacy to what they're proposing.

MR. IBARGUEN: Ben?

MR. HECHT: I think it really is stop looking solely to the nonprofit sector to bring about this transformational change and say it's really going to be about the private sector, which is really where the real money is, and if you get certain companies who employ a huge number of low income people to change the way they provide benefits and the like, you're going to have a massive change in the lives of the people that we care about.

So I think we have to look beyond just the nonprofit sector and say these other stone whatever you call them stone cutters have to be able to stone cut, and we can't just hope that it's going to happen.

MR. IBARGUEN: Diana, you get the last word.

MS. AVIV: Stop doing what's only safe and familiar, and take some risks and try some new things.

MR. IBARGUEN: Thank you all very much. We really appreciate it.

[Applause.]