

Duquesne University

Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Summer 8-7-2021

Inviting Friendship: A New Approach to Nonprofit Communication

Stacia Glenn Wetherington

Duquen

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd>



Part of the [Other Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wetherington, S. G. (2021). Inviting Friendship: A New Approach to Nonprofit Communication (Doctoral dissertation, Duquesne University). Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/etd/2030>

This Immediate Access is brought to you for free and open access by Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection.

INVITING FRIENDSHIP – A NEW APPROACH TO NONPROFIT
COMMUNICATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to Duquesne University

Duquesne University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

By

Stacia Glenn Wetherington

August 2021

Copyright by
Stacia Glenn Wetherington

2021

INVITING FRIENDSHIP – A NEW APPROACH TO NONPROFIT
COMMUNICATION

By

Stacia Glenn Wetherington

Approved April 30, 2021

Ronald Arnett
Professor

Janie Harden Fritz
Professor

ABSTRACT

INVITING FRIENDSHIP – A NEW APPROACH TO NONPROFIT COMMUNICATION

By

Stacia Glenn Wetherington

August 2021

Dissertation supervised by Dr. Craig Maier

Beginning with Greeks' concept of virtuous friendship philanthropy has been part of society. Metaphors of civitas, caritas and social responsibility dominated man's understanding of charity until the explosion of neoliberal thought in the 1980s. The Band Aid movement in response to the Ethiopian famine permanently changed the way we view philanthropy. This movement created an environment of extreme commodification of charity which has created a highly competitive nonprofit sector and a loss of the collective spirit upon which it was founded. This competitive atmosphere has led nonprofits to chase dollars at the expense of their missions while also relying heavily on the ethos of celebrity advocates and overly emotional pathos laden messaging. The logos inherent in the nonprofit mission itself has too often been lost. This work explores how the historical metaphors of philanthropy coupled with the communication and rhetorical

theories of Lilie Chouliaraki, Kenneth Burke, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin can provide direction in finding that inherent logos and building the sustainable relationships necessary to fulfill their mission and for longevity.

DEDICATION

This dissertation was made possible by the love and support of my husband friends and family who always believed in me and my ability to conquer each challenge that presented itself along the way. I could not have done it without the patience and time of my advisor took to process my ideas and enrich this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 – In Search of a Collective Spirit	1
Chapter 2 – The Spirit of the Collective	54
Chapter 3 – Constituting Relationships	93
Chapter 4 – Finding Logos	133
Chapter 5 – Inviting Friendship	173

Chapter 1 – In Search of a Collective Spirit

After serving some of Chicago's most vulnerable populations for 122 years, Jane Addams' Hull House closed its doors in January of 2012. One might wonder how this could be possible with more than a century of work and a strong reputation. The answer can be found in financial management practices, but also in weakened leadership and, most importantly in mission drift (Flynn and Tian). Hull House was originally founded as a neighborhood settlement house. The settlement house "movement", if you will, was first conceived of in the 1860's by a group of prominent British reformers that included John Ruskin, Thomas Carlyle, Charles Kingsley, and the so-called Christian Socialists. They were idealistic, middle-class intellectuals, appalled at the conditions of the working classes, and infused with the optimism, moral fervor; and anti-materialist impulses of the Romantic Age: people who read the soaring poetry of Wordsworth and Tennyson, the conscientious novels of Dickens, the liberal political thought of the Utilitarian philosophers Bentham and Mill. They were alarmed by many aspects of industrial capitalism: the growing gulf between the classes; the materialist *ethos* of the Industrial Revolution, and the emphasis on self-interest in classical economics; the terrible poverty of the average factory worker, and the brutal routinization of work, as the factory system replaced the individual craftsman (Bheel).

While there was some diversity in role and activity of the settlement houses, based on specific local conditions, these settlement houses were originally conceived of as an outpost of culture and learning, as well as a community center; a place where the men, women, and children of slum districts could come for education, recreation, or advice, and a meeting place for local organizations. Settlement houses were run by two or

three residents, under the supervision of a head worker. They would live at the settlement and involve themselves as fully as possible in the life of the neighborhood, studying the nature and causes of its problems, and developing rapport with community leaders—teachers and clergy, police, politicians, labor and business groups. This was all to facilitate the development of its independent life and culture. The internal structure of a settlement consisted mainly of the various clubs, civic organizations, and cultural and recreational activities—such as lectures, classes, and child-care—that convened under its roof (Bheel).

Over the years Hull House, changed and adapted, however, by the 1990's bolstered by the economic boom of the time and overly influenced by various levels of government the organization switched focus to foster care, childcare, domestic violence counseling, and job training. By the end, Hull House had become a network of multiple community "centers" serving more than 60,000 people. By narrowly focusing on services deemed important by government, Hull House reduced its role and essentially became a subcontractor for the government, where it received 95% of its funding. This limited the organization's attractiveness to private and corporate donors and reduced its' functionality as a community "center" serving as a central location for a variety of helpful social programs. While it took nearly a century, weak leadership facilitated dramatic mission shift precipitated by the quest for dollars. While nonprofits must be responsive to the changes in community needs, venturing into new service lines should be well thought out, not dependent on one funding source and remain true to the primary mission. Shifting from essentially a community center to a government subcontractor of social

services is too great a leap particularly when it abandons the original mission (Flynn and Tian).

Unfortunately, the story of Hull House is not unique. The problem of chasing dollars has become ubiquitous in the nonprofit industry and began in earnest with The Band Aid movement of the early 1980's which forever changed the way the world views and interacts with philanthropy. This movement in the 1980's pushed the nonprofit sector into a neoliberal market-based approach that has commodified the sector forcing it into levels of competition never before seen in the nonprofit world and enhanced a quick fix philosophy to social problems. This competitive environment has led nonprofits to rely on the *ethos* of celebrity advocates and the overuse of *pathos* driven messaging instead of relying on the *ethos* and *logos* inherent in their missions and internal works. The significance of this is that it puts nonprofits in a position to chase money and not focus on mission or messaging leading to mission slip and off mission messaging.

Furthermore, the spirit of the collective has been lost and we no longer get a feeling of reciprocal generosity from the sector. This becomes a vicious cycle of more commodification and competition fueling misguided communication that dissolves stakeholder trust making it necessary to compete for new sources of funding. The inherent ideas in rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication can help guide nonprofit communication that increases stakeholder trust, keeps nonprofits on mission focused activities and mission true messaging which generates an *ethos* around mission and not an outside source as the primary focus and resists overly *pathos* driven messaging that creates "compassion fatigue" (Chouliaraki).

As a veteran nonprofit fundraising professional, I have encountered on numerous occasions in which nonprofits of every size have sought funds that were a qualifying stretch for the organization. In these situations, the fundraiser takes on the role of program developer creating a separate program that aligned with the funding source. An example of this is a large food bank in a major metropolitan area requesting funds from Homeland Security wherein the organization was stretching itself beyond its' mission to appear as a source to secure food supplies in the event of a terror or other attack on our food supply. The proposal requested extensive security devices and increased physical and organizational capacity while also weaving in language that supported the current mission. This process reminds me of Congressional bills that add in unrelated items on a big-ticket proposal simply to get them passed. The funding was not approved. It is my speculation that Homeland Security saw the overstretching nature of the request and felt insecure with the possibility of fulfillment. This was a blessing in disguise as the organization did not essentially become a government subcontractor, as did Hull House, and was able to stay true to the strong financial supporters it already had. What determines mission slip versus organizational and service growth is not a one-size-fits-all answer. The purpose of this dissertation is to explore the relationship between the phenomenon of nonprofit mission slip and the ubiquitous nature of neoliberal capitalism's infiltration of the public sphere through the practice of philanthrocapitalism. Furthermore, an exploration of the historical metaphors that have defined philanthropy along with rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication can provide a guide to the nonprofit industry that can help answer the question of mission slip or organizational or service growth.

By prioritizing the private, individual freedom and the elevation of the individual as a competitive market actor, neoliberalism has directed the social inward which is destroying the heart of the collectivist mindset where the voluntary sector pursues the public good through relationships (Asen 331 | Dewey 28). As governments around the world are increasingly permeated by neoliberal corporate interests the philanthropic sector is increasingly important as the guardian of social welfare and change. The neoliberal attack on the philanthropic sector constitutes an existential threat to nonprofit's role as a representative of marginalized groups and its ability to harness the power of difference through networks and associations.

Staving off the neoliberal tendencies pervasive throughout our social and economic environments will preserve the heart of philanthropy. It is the philanthropic sector that helps to build trust among citizens, set the public agenda that defines problems and proposes solutions to those problems through collaboration and negotiation (Payton and Moody 157). In fact, a case can be made that philanthropy is the very safeguard of democracy. Democracy is not only a political circumstance but is embroiled in the heart of culture because it aids in defining what constitutes the "good society". Since the exclusive purpose of both democracy and philanthropy is to guard the voice of the collective, there is no place for the purely self-reliant individual esteemed by neoliberalism. Philanthropy works to establish justice, general welfare and secures the "blessings of liberty" as an embodiment of "freedom of speech" and within that the right to assemble (Payton and Moody 159-161). Milton Friedman, a prominent and revolutionary economic theorist in the mid-20th century, essentially rejected the historic perspective of philanthropy as a public investment and societal responsibility. Friedman

touted the neoliberal philosophy that the business of business is business and not societal/community investment. He believed that by forging forward with hard work and production it would trickle down and help those in need. While large corporate social responsibility programs are now the expected norm there is a self-interested component based on the idea that the public interest is not a concern of business, but individuals. It is thus essential that the nonprofit sector find ways to return philanthropy to concepts of public investment by staying true to their purpose and resisting the neoliberal influence of competition and market forces and provide the clear and empowered voice of the marginalized and “unmarketable”.

This first chapter will begin by illustrating the unique position of the nonprofit sector as part of the public sphere and explaining the infiltration of neoliberalism into that sphere in the form of philanthrocapitalism. Once the nonprofit sector is logically situated in the public sphere the chapter will explore how the neoliberal corporate ideology has generated an unprecedented level of competition for resources and exigence within the nonprofit sector which has forced nonprofit leadership to switch from a mission orientation towards a professional orientation that is more concerned with self-preservation (Ryan, 2). This chapter will also explore how this shift has forced many nonprofits to overuse *pathos* laden appeals, creating a level of emotional fatigue among stakeholders and generating distance instead of closeness and immediacy characteristic of Aristotelian friendship (Chouliaraki, *Ironic Spectator* 28). Additionally, the chapter will explore how market-based results have driven nonprofits to generate manipulative *ethos*-centered appeals around a variety of celebrities rather than relying on the *ethos* generated internally by the good works of the organization itself. This chapter will also at explore

misguided use of *logos* in attempts to quantify the qualitative aspects of social welfare, social justice and other human services delivery programs. Finally, this chapter will highlight the role the media has played in furthering neoliberal ideology and perpetuating the problems of nonprofit messaging used to compensate for the competitive market thusly generated.

Neoliberal Invasion of the Nonprofit Sector and the Turn Towards

Philanthropiccapitalism

Alexis de Tocqueville recognized and elevated the importance of voluntary associations as the antidote to several potential problems of democracy such as despotism and tyranny of the majority and ultimately the impulses of individualism (Payton and Moody 161). Yet, it is this very individualistic mode of operation that has ushered in an era of unprecedented neoliberal thought that jeopardizes the very heart and soul of the philanthropic sector. Neoliberalism is the idea that market exchange is an ethic itself and can provide a guide to all human action (Harvey 2). Neoliberalism is a political economic theory that promotes the idea that “human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade” (Harvey 2). To combat inflation this ideology was plucked from obscurity and placed and placed as the dominant guiding principle of economic thought and management by Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher during the 1980’s. In a society dominated by neoliberal thought the individual and the market reigns supreme and government is discouraged from intervening in even the most minimalist way. Milton Friedman gave life to individualism

and the religion of neoliberal politics when he upheld “freedom is the ultimate goal and the individual as the ultimate entity in society” (Friedman, 20). Freedom supposedly brought limitless possibilities individuals could decide best how they would live their lives; what they valued; with whom and how they would interact and how. However, in flattening society in the image of the market, Friedman and other neoliberals restricted freedom to only that which could be expressed through the freedom of market actors. However, by seeking to bring all human actions into the domain of the market it equivocates the social good with amount of market transactions (Harvey 3). This mindset has had profound negative impacts on the division of labor, social relations, welfare provision and a whole scope of activities categorized as “habits of the heart” (Harvey 3).

Neoliberal thought has also had grave impacts on Democratic thought. Democratic connotations of freedom as self-rule or “participation in rule by the demos,” gave “way to comportment with a market instrumental rationality that radically constrains both choices and ambitions. ... No longer is there an open question of how to craft the self” (Asen 338). In this shift, freedom also dissociates from other democratic values like equality and justice (Asen 338). Unable to draw on coordinated action for social change, the neoliberal public subject may only act as an individual to change oneself in the image of the market. In this manner, neoliberalism redirects social concerns inward. Operating as a competitive market actor does not occur naturally; rather, individuals must develop their competitiveness (Asen 338). Just as the individual has developed competitiveness so has the nonprofit sector adapted and developed competitiveness to address social concerns.

The neoliberal attitude that disdains the concept of the public, prioritizes the private and promotes individual freedom above all else saw an escalation in the mid-1970's and were given new life with the Thatcher/Reagan "revolutions" of the 80's (Harvey 21). Neoliberal ideology is so pervasive today that it has infiltrated positions of considerable influence in education (universities and many "thinktanks"), media, corporate board rooms and financial institutions, state institutions (treasury departments, central banks), and in those inter-national institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) that regulate global finance and commerce, as well as the nonprofit sector. Neoliberalism has, in short, become hegemonic as a mode of discourse and has pervasive effects on ways of thought and political-economic practices to the point where it has become incorporated into the commonsense way we interpret, live in, and understand the world. The infiltration of a neoliberal market-based approach into the nonprofit sector has led to, what Matthew Green and Michael Bishop call, philanthrocapitalism. Green and Bishop first coined the concept in their 2008 book: *Philanthrocapitalism: how the rich can save the world*. Philanthrocapitalism is the idea that to do good socially one must do well financially. Philanthrocapitalism conflates business aims with charitable endeavors, making philanthropy more cost-effective, impact-oriented, and financially profitable. McGoey later mentions that the book has become a "manifesto for a new generation of philanthropists who aim to apply market strategies to philanthropic giving. Using neoliberal ideology, Bishop and Green propose that by harnessing the power of the market, philanthrocapitalism improves the welfare of the broader community. This is a recycled idea that reinforces the idea that charity is good business. This idea misplaces

the donor's relationship with the organization and turns the charitable act into an act about the individual, corporate or foundation donor and not where the focus should be on the social cause being supported. Additionally, this market mindset has exacerbated the ever-expanding nonprofit sector which now competes for an ever-shrinking amount of support both financial and volunteer. This competitive individualistic market driven environment threatens the NPO's unique role in society (Sanders 180). This competitive arena now resembles the private industry marketplace where nonprofits are creating business models that resemble wall street fortune 500 companies and are technical, quantitative, results oriented and market driven. Philanthrocapitalism further places the heart of *φιλανθρωπία* (philanthropia) at risk by taking market-based approaches that has created Giving Tuesday and Cyber Monday campaigns. Additionally, there has been a movement within the nonprofit world to find something to sell instead of just requesting gifts, thus reinforcing the market approach. In some instances, the sale of an item is prudent and helps reinforce the mission of the organization, but in others it is divorced from the organization and provides little meaning or mission reinforcement. The World Wildlife Fund has a catalog of stuffed toys, t-shirts and other items that represent the animals they work to save. Additionally, WWF offers conservation minded gifts, such as, reusable straws. When the purchaser/donor receives their merchandise it will continue to be a reminder of why they gave and the mission of WWF. However, other organizations, such as, UNICEF put forth a large catalog of hundreds of items unrelated to their mission and purpose. In fact, the UNICEF catalog confuses their message with random facts interspersed with merchandise unrelated to the merchandise on that page. In this instance the relationship between supporter and the organization is tainted as purely a market

transaction and the purchaser/donor is not left with a significant reminder of their support or the cause. Please see images of the UNICEF catalog located at the following urls:

<https://www.market.unicefusa.org/summer/clothing/> and

<https://www.market.unicefusa.org/summer/jewelry/> . In comparison please the World

Wildlife Fund's images located at the following urls: [https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-](https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-center/gifts/Species-Adoptions/Amur-Tiger.aspx)

[center/gifts/Species-Adoptions/Amur-Tiger.aspx](https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-center/gifts/Species-Adoptions/Amur-Tiger.aspx) and [https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-](https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-center/gifts/Gifts-and-Accessories.aspx)

[center/gifts/Gifts-and-Accessories.aspx](https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-center/gifts/Gifts-and-Accessories.aspx) and [\[center/gifts/Apparel.aspx\]\(https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-center/gifts/Apparel.aspx\).](https://gifts.worldwildlife.org/gift-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

The level of competition inherent in this type of marketing has created a dualistic issue for nonprofits where they find themselves needing to be results driven and quantitative while addressing issues rooted in intangibles. This incongruity forces nonprofits to find a competitive edge through appeals to stakeholders and potential stakeholders steeped in the heavy emotional pulls of *pathos* driven messaging, misguided attempts to apply logos driven quantifiers to the un-quantitative qualitative human condition and a tendency to recruit the unreliable *ethos* of celebrities in a manipulative attempt to secure support. A balance must be found that reflects and maintains the unique position of nonprofits in our society. The conundrum is finding ways to appeal to emotion, the soft side of service delivery, and provide quantitative results for things that are qualitative. Donors, from foundations to corporations and individuals are getting increasingly confused about what to expect from the nonprofit sector and in response nonprofit leadership seeks to address the multiplicity of stakeholders with a multiplicity of voice that leads to mission slip and off mission messaging (Bennett 185). In other words, the competitive environment has driven nonprofits to be all things to all people.

The Nonprofit as a Representative Component of the Public Sphere

From the earliest times human civilization has depended on kindness towards others. In fact, the word philanthropy derives from the Greek word *philanthropia* φιλανθρωπία or, simply love of mankind. Today, philanthropy can be defined as the practice of organized and systematic giving to improve the quality of human life through the promotion of welfare and social change (Payton and Moody, 5). Throughout the ages, philanthropists have demonstrated the power of giving to create powerful change. John Gardner, idealist and founder of the Common Cause and Independent Sector, stated, “Wealth is not new. Neither is charity. But the idea of using private wealth imaginatively, constructively, and systematically to attack the fundamental problems of mankind is new.” In the United States alone, the nonprofit sector is the third largest industry employing 10% of the total workforce. As part of the public sphere this sector represents a critical multiplicity of public struggles and political innovations of marginalized groups outside of mainstream discourses and recognizes the complexity of human lives. Enlivened through relationships, nonprofits as part of the public sphere, are networked for the public good and are poised to harness the power of difference and create opportunities for addressing inequalities (Asen, 331).

The nonprofit sector is highly representative of what John Dewey described as moving beyond mere association and towards consciously cultivated bonds of community where there is a collective mindset of “we” that must “do” something (Dewey 190). The nonprofit sector, both within the U.S. and globally plays a critical role in safeguarding the interests of the public sphere. It does this by helping us to answer the most fundamental questions of the human condition: “What should we do when things go wrong in the

world? What responsibility do we have for helping others? What role or responsibility do we have in making the world better?" (Payton and Moody 3). These questions all relate to concepts of philanthropy which encompasses "good works", "charity", "benevolence" and "humanitarianism" and ultimately to the question of what role these concepts play in creating the "good" society or the "good" life. The answer to this question might be found in the culturally derived moral presuppositions of a community, country or global community. Originally derived from a multitude of religious and philosophical tenets, this moral foundation has come under attack by a moral imagination ruled by market capitalism and fortified by neoliberal economic and social philosophy (Payton and Moody 132-133).

Defining the nonprofit sector in terms of voluntary associations that pursue the public good through a network of relationships parallels the purpose and meaning of the public sphere. The philanthropic sector, like the public sphere, strives to generate a public good that is dynamic, mobile, operates at different levels of society and "is open to contestation and reformulation" (Asen,331). This comparison provides clarity about the philanthropic sector's vital role in addressing public struggles and securing the political innovations of marginalized groups outside traditional or state sanctioned public spaces and mainstream discourse (Asen, 332). Furthermore, its role of championing the marginalized, the philanthropic sector plays a vital role in maintaining and reforming effective and stable modern democracies (Payton and Moody, 156).

The advocacy and civic role of philanthropic organizations are clearly linked to democratic processes and not only respond to human problems but shape the moral agenda and express cultural value. In fact, through the enactment of these roles'

nonprofits have been at the center of every major social movement in recent history, including women's suffrage, worker's rights (e.g., union representation), civil rights and, more recently, Black Lives Matter. We find nonprofits leading the way on the global playing field to improve lives of people everywhere through not only humanitarian relief efforts, but also by being the voice of change in countries plagued by war lords and other intolerant leadership. Thus, it could be said that there is a duality in the nonprofit world in their role of giving voice to multiple publics while also bringing multiple publics together in one voice. Nonprofits' role in evoking change and giving voice to societal issues puts the heart of their existence in Immanuel Kant's connection of reason to "publicity" where he states that a freedom of criticism is a precondition of reason stating "the voice of reason is not that of a dictatorial and despotic power, it is rather like the vote of citizens of a free state, every member of which must have the privilege of giving free expression to his doubts, and possess even the right to veto" (Kant 23).

Looking at nonprofit communication's rhetorical elements through lens of communication as constitutive may provide direction for nonprofit leadership. Communication as constitutive provides a framework that facilitates a movement from the concept of communication as message transmission and information exchange towards a model of communication that creates legitimacy and enforces a concept of cultural performance of care imbedded in an already existing social reality (Koschmann, Isbell and Sanders 201). In other words, a communication as constitutive framework makes an organization ask, 'what kind of relationship am I building with my donors?' and 'how are these relationships different?' Further understanding of, and guidance for, nonprofit messaging can be obtained by using Jurgen Habermas' theory of discourse

ethics and communicative action. Habermas' theory helps us rediscover through analysis positive potentials for human rationality through communicative reasoning that leads to reflection and examination of objective questions of societal norms, human values and aesthetic expression of subjectivity (Koschman, Isbell and Sanders 210). While Habermas' theories have come under significant criticism as an unrealistic ideal of power free communication, we can mitigate that by thinking of logos, Kenneth Burke's work on rhetoric as identification, and the feminist theory of invitational rhetoric developed by Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin.

The State of Nonprofit Messaging

The nonprofit sector is one of the most significant components of our human lives through its provision of education, social welfare programming, healthcare, entertainment and advocacy for social change. Over the last 50 years the nonprofit sector has seen an explosion in both its scope and impact making the sector a significant economic and social force not only in the United States, but globally. Nonprofits comprise most of the world's best hospitals and universities, almost all performing art companies from orchestras, operas and ballet companies to a significant share of theater companies; all religious congregations; most environmental advocacy and civil rights organizations; huge numbers of family and children's service, neighborhood development, antipoverty/homelessness, disaster relief, community health agencies; not to mention ` professional associations, labor unions, and social clubs. Also included among nonprofits are the numerous support organizations, such as foundations and community chests, which help to generate financial assistance for these organizations and to encourage the traditions of giving, volunteering, and service that undergird them

(Salamon 10). Nonprofit organizations are currently growing faster than both private business and government organizations and account for 12.3 million jobs paying a combined \$6.7B in wages in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics). These organizations are receiving a combined \$390 billion in donations. In fact, the growth of the nonprofit sector is staggering. According to Lester Salamon, professor of political science and Director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies, revenue of American nonprofits has increased 114% after adjusting for inflation which is nearly twice the 81% growth rate of the national economy (50). The number of registered nonprofits has increased 115% which is about 23,00 new organizations per year compared to the registration of new private business at a 76% increase (Salamon 9).

Other nations have also seen a dramatic increase in the number of nonprofit organizations. Salamon (49) reported that approximately 4,600 Western nonprofit organizations were actively providing support to 20,000 local nongovernmental organizations in Third-World countries. Thousands of nonprofit organizations currently operate in developing nations, such as Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, and Kenya. Moreover, these numbers are separate from the hundreds of thousands of nonprofit organizations functioning in the developed countries of Europe, as well as in Canada, China, and Japan (Salamon 52) the tremendous growth and influence of nonprofit organizations has been described as an “associational revolution” (60), leading Salamon and Anheier to remark that “it is organized, private, voluntary activity, the proliferation of civil society organizations, that may turn out, despite earlier origins, to represent the greatest social innovation of the twentieth century” (60).

However, this unprecedented growth has been met with a state of shrinking resources forcing a highly competitive environment. This competitive environment has driven nonprofits towards business-like models of operation and evaluation which has caused NPO leadership to switch from a mission orientation towards a professional orientation that is more concerned with self-preservation and illustrates the encroachment of the corporate ideology that threatens NPO's unique role in society (Ryan 2). Social missions are not profitable responses to social problems – how does one show “profitability” when helping the homeless – yet they are becoming increasingly focused on individualized market-based solutions (Ryan 3). This desire to quantify the human condition results in misguided or even false logos. Additionally, many nonprofits have turned to *pathos* laden appeals to move more and gain more stakeholders/supporters, but in their attempts to seek immediacy and closeness they are actually creating distance (Chouliaraki *The Ironic Spectator* 28). These trends have led nonprofits to chase funding at the expense of being true to their missions and original purpose.

Misuse of Logos – The Move to a Business Model

Nonprofit organizations perform vital functions in international, national and community life. These functions include service, advocacy, expressive/creative and community building (Salamon 4-5). These functions are defined as follows:

- Service: Nonprofits are known for identifying and innovatively addressing unmet community needs that neither the government nor the market can address or address well. This function is exemplified in delivery of hospital care, university

- education, social services, emergency aid, housing, job training and a variety of cultural entertainment outlets.
- **Advocacy:** Lester Salamon coins this function as the societal “safety valve” (13) function as it brings attention to aggrieved groups and gives voice to a vast array of unaddressed problems in almost every facet of community life from human rights violations to environmental concerns. Most of the social movements that have evoked significant change throughout American history were led by nonprofits including women’s suffrage, civil and LGBTQ rights.
 - **Expressive/Creative:** Through this function nonprofit enrich and enliven our lives and our communities through supportive clubs, such as Girl and Boy Scouts, churches, synagogues, fraternal societies and performing arts and sports clubs/groups.
 - **Community Building:** Salamon quotes de Tocqueville’s points from *Democracy in America* to illustrate this function, “Feelings and opinions are recruited, the heart is enlarged, and the human mind is developed, only by the reciprocal influence of men upon one another.... these influences are almost null in democratic countries; they must therefore be artificially created and this can only be accomplished by associations.” (13). Thus, through this function the nonprofit sector builds the collaborative spirit of trust and reciprocity and teaches norms of collaboration.

However, despite their important societal contributions, nonprofits are facing challenges to both fiscal support and existential threats about their purpose, effectiveness and their very existence in the growing competitive environment. This has

driven nonprofits to illustrate effectiveness through performance centered approach focused on accountability through metrics alone (Salamon 9). The nature of nonprofits is often analyzed in terms of economic theorizing that tries to explain their existence based on *why* nonprofits provide certain goods and services instead of *the* goods and services provided which validates their existence based on failures of the market (Koschmann 140). However, these economic theories reduce human behavior to consuming goods and acquiring services that neglects to inform the lived experience or the process of nonprofit organizing (Koschmann 141). The heart of philanthropy is the development and maintenance of relationships or, in Aristotelian terms, mutual caring of one another equivocal to a combination of *agape* and *philia*. Therefore, the communicative function of nonprofit/philanthropic organizations is how they develop and maintain relationships through their key functions of providing social capital, missioning, volunteer coordination, board development and fundraising which pay homage to the complexities of human interaction (Koschmann 139). A communication as constitutive model focuses on the concept that NPOs exist from a vantage point of collective experience where communication is constitutive and not as an answer to market system “failures” (Lohmann 310). The focus must be on what kind of relationships we want to build and with whom. Making employees, volunteers and donors feel appreciated and ‘good’ about the work they are doing for the community should always be in the forefront of decision-making thoughts. Naming buildings, displaying names on websites, social media, newsletters and annual reports are all ways to publicize help and support from those involved with the organization. This solidifies relationships by making them reciprocal. Providing recognition and invitation into the organization through special events is also a

relationship building technique. However, there is a balance the organization must maintain between donor satisfaction and remaining true to the mission as it could lead to mission drift and off mission messaging. There is a danger, particularly with large donors, for the ‘mission’ to become the supporters and what they want instead of the passion for the social goal.

Nonprofits are now forced to reexamine their reasons for existing in a market that rewards discipline, performance and organizational capacity rather than service and client impact. This runs counter to the long-standing idea that NPOs offer a distinct advantage in fields where normal market mechanisms do not operate because the consumers of services are not the same as the people paying for them trust is paramount. Since, nonprofits are not organized to pursue profits, it is argued, that they are more worthy of such trust and hence, more reliable providers in difficult-to-measure fields (Salamon 14). Even prominent philanthropic institutions are using and backing the corporate results focused model. As early as the mid-1990’s, The United Way of America, for example, launched a bold performance measurement system complete with website, performance measurement manual, and video to introduce member agencies to the requirement of performance measurement as a condition of local funding. Numerous foundations have moved in a similar direction, increasing the emphasis on evaluation of both their grantees and of their own programming. Indeed, a new foundation affinity group, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations (GEO), was formed from a “venture philanthropy” model (Whetten and Godfrey 175). Venture philanthropy, angel philanthropy, enterprise philanthropy, impact philanthropy, catalytic philanthropy and strategic philanthropy are some of the names that are being used to describe philanthropic

models that go far beyond the writing of checks and often take a deep and long-term view of what it means to invest in solving global and/or local problems. Led by studies done over the last 50 years by leading foundations, such as the Rockefeller Foundation, philanthropists are investigating new funding models that are designed to yield social impact, as well as financial return on investments (Cuniffée). Recently, The Rockefeller Foundation hosted the launch of a new report from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) on venture philanthropy which describes examples of many “hybrid” forms of philanthropy that borrow from business thinking. This approach involves intensive up-front research and moves beyond the traditional “grant-giver/grantee relationship” into capacity-building partnerships. In the OECD report there’s no one definition or model for “venture philanthropy” (Cuniffée) because it’s “more of a blanket term, an expression of a more purpose-, results- and responsibility-driven worldview” (Cuniffée) that many foundations now embrace. The report did find an “overlapping set of characteristics” that many venture philanthropy efforts share, although not all occur in every case Cuniffée highlights these:

- Strategic framing which coordinates targeted resources (grants and/or investments), so that collectively they create systemic change.
- Scales of intervention that address systems and sectors, rather than individual organizations or projects.
- Sector focuses that tend to be cross-sectoral, engaging civil society, markets, and/or governments as needed.
- Funding mechanisms that blend grants and investments, as appropriate to the theory of change

- Engagement styles that are more hands-on, using extended interactions with and sometimes between grantees
- Engagement periods that reflect the goal of systems changes, often five to ten years rather than one to two years
- Culture and capabilities that are focused on innovation and experimentation.
- Monitoring and evaluation that allows quick adaptation and focuses on outcomes and impacts. (Cunniffe)

This investment approach to grant making calls on philanthropic institutions to invest in organizations rather than individual programs, to take a more active hand in organizational governance and operations, and to insist on measurable results. This same emphasis on “metrics” as the new elixir of nonprofit performance has taken root in the social enterprise movement that has swept the nonprofit field with support from a new class of dot.com entrepreneurs turned philanthropists (Bishop and Green 15). The resulting “accountability environment” increases the pressures on hard-pressed nonprofit managers for demonstrations of progress that neither they, nor anyone else, may be able to supply, at least not with-out far greater resources than are currently available for the task. What is more, accountability expectations often fail to acknowledge the multiple meanings that accountability can have and the multiple stakeholders whose accountability demands nonprofits must accommodate. Therefore, the measurements readily at hand and most responsive to the market will be used instead of the ones most germane to the problems. This further increases the focus on price rather than benefit to the third party being serviced (Green and Bishop 17).

This market/metrics-based approach to philanthropy and fundraising which has pressured NPO's to develop business/corporate style models of operation and service delivery is misguided in that it has moved the sector away from the heart of its' purpose in developing mutually caring friendships through a sense of agape. This drift from the original purpose of philanthropy is impacting messaging, specifically mission statements and adherence. Amidst the backdrop of frenetic American life, where concern for alleviating social inequities takes a back seat, nonprofits are additionally faced with declining sources, declining public trust and increasingly diverse stakeholders (Lewis, Hamel, & Richardson 401) who identify with a variety of nonprofit organizations simultaneously further challenges nonprofits to find creative strategies for garnering support (Kramer 260). The entire process, however, rests on the ability of the organization to create a sense of identification and commitment (Wilson, et. al. 265). Effective missioning, or selling what the organization does, is an important first step in building identification with and commitment to one's nonprofit organization. Formal mission statements are an integral component of organizations' overall missioning strategies. Communicating these mission statements meaningfully to the next generation of constituents requires incorporation of prominent rhetorical frames (Ryan 10). Unlike corporations' mission statements for nonprofits are not guiding philosophical ideas about behavior or level of quality, but instead they are the purpose and the product (Ryan 12).

In the private sector few people live, breath or even know the company's mission statement and this approach missioning like other aspects of the corporate model is transferring to the nonprofit sector where the issues inherent with this lack of commitment are magnified and replaced with scarcity-driven decision making that

eschews management-centered initiatives in favor of consensus-building activities (Crittenden & Crittenden qtd in Ryan 13). What is lost is an ability to form a consistent body of rhetoric that can be transmitted throughout the organization that provides a unifying vision and rubric for evaluating organizational performance. Thus, without this unifying rhetoric nonprofits can go “off script”. In other words, becoming embroiled in chasing dollars that are not related to the core of their existence. This was the situation with Hull House in Chicago discussed earlier and with the very similar case of the settlement house, Hill House in Pittsburgh, PA. Again, deviation from the original mission and poor leadership led Hill House into land/real estate development and eventual bankruptcy and closure.

Much of the current nonprofit practice is to advocate for short and sweet mission statements:

- Humane Society: Celebrating Animals, Confronting Cruelty
- Virginia Supportive Housing: Permanently End Homelessness

However, if we look at Fairhurst, Jordan and Neuwirth’s explanation of what constitutes a solid mission statement those short and sweet statements may not be enough because they state that mission statements, “accurately reflect those organizations’ daily practices, values, and future paths” (250). The above missions imply, but don’t state the activities that will lead them to the results for which they are advocating. While Patagonia is a private company their mission statement provides us an excellent example of what Fairhurst, Jordan and Neuwirth are saying:

Patagonia: Build the best product, cause no unnecessary harm, use business to inspire and implement solutions to the environmental crisis.

Habitat for Humanity also provides us with a good nonprofit example following Fairhurst, Jordan and Neuwirth's ideas:

Habitat for Humanity International: Seeking to put God's love into action, Habitat for Humanity brings people together to build homes, communities and hope.

The problem becomes apparent, without the guidance provided within a mission statement of knowing what you do, how you do it and why, it is easy to make decisions that follow dollars and not mission. Ultimately, the mission statement and communicative message should include stakeholders as this creates an atmosphere mutual caring and concern akin to Aristotle's idea of virtuous friendship and Christian agape.

The Misuse of Pathos – Extreme Emotional Imagery

Emotions have been viewed as a universal set of internal processes that are largely hardwired, arising when an event that is relevant to the concerns of an individual occurs. Arousal of emotions is widely recognized as having a significant influence on attitude and action (Aaker and Williams 242). Thus, it is no surprise that emotional appeals have been, and still are an effective staple in advertising. The use of dramatic emotional appeals by charitable organizations to grab potential supporter attention has been steadily increasing for the last 40 years however, despite the growing need, nonprofit organization marketers have not yet fully delineated the most effective ways to position these appeals charitable appeals. The use of emotional advertising appeals can be very effective in persuading people to donate money for a good cause or to promote other helping behavior (Aaker and Williams 245). NPO communication is designed to trigger emotion because emotion leads to action. The issue is what type of emotion

should we not only portray – suffering, sadness etc., but what type of emotion should we evoke in the audience that trigger support. When I worked for a small nonprofit in Virginia focusing on housing for the homeless our emotional appeals always focused on the empowerment of those we served instead of trying to evoke sympathy for the sad and downtrodden homeless person. This was particularly in the conservative area of the south where people were leery of the homeless and of ‘giving handouts’. By using imagery and messaging that was uplifting and promising instead of steeped in sadness against insurmountable odds, donors were made to feel good and purposeful which led to strong and lasting relationships. This what Faseur and Geuens address.

Faseur and Geuens point out that emotional appeals must be carefully crafted based on audience-oriented feelings of connection or disconnection to a situation or people (510). An ad evoking a negative emotion will thus be most effective when people still need to be convinced of the need inherent in the situation and when concern for the issue needs to be intensified (510). In contrast, when the issue is already salient or when the importance of the problem is very clear, a negative emotion could make the problem look like an insurmountable one. In this case, an ad evoking a positive emotion is preferred that affirms the significance of an individual action in the solution to the problem (Faseur Geuens 510) Faseur and Geuens point out emotional appeals must be carefully crafted based on the intended audience, particularly the audience’s connectedness or lack of connection to situation or people (510). Faseur and Geuens illustrate that when help is asked for people to whom respondents feel connected, in other words they can see themselves in that same or similar position, appeals that generate positive feelings led to more positive evaluations of those advertisements and

respondents' helping intentions (511). When help was needed for unconnected people, instances where the audience can't envision themselves in the situation, appeals that generate negative feelings were more effective (Faseur and Geuens 515). Unfortunately, charitable advertising does not focus on the nature of the audience instead creating appeals that remain the same regardless of attention to audience orientation towards the situation or person. whether the audience viewing might feel connected to the situation/person or unconnected. For example, a Canadian advertisement designed garner support for Alzheimers Association illustrates the back of an elderly person's head – important that there is no face shown – and a computer hard drive setting showing that the entire disk is blank (see appendix 1). According to Faseur and Geuens, this ad would be more effective if they were positive and empowering because most people can connect with either having dementia/Alzheimers or having a parent with the disease (515). We can also look at the SPCA television advertisements that expose us to badly abused animals. The negative emotions generated in the SPCA advertisements - if used sparingly, as will be discussed later- are appropriate for garnering support because we likely can't connect with the experience of being an abused animal.

There are various types of dramatic emotional appeals, but the most common are guilt, shock and fear. There are at three primary types of guilt: reactive, anticipatory, and existential (Hibbert et. al 724) Reactive guilt occurs when one's own standards of acceptable behavior are violated (e.g., failing to point out an item is missing from your bill at a restaurant). Anticipatory guilt refers to guilt that is experienced when one considers going against one's own standards of acceptable behavior (e.g., planning to call in to work sick even when you are not). Finally, existential guilt is experienced when one

feels better off, or more fortunate than others, resulting in feelings of empathy (e.g., when seeing a homeless person). This latter type of guilt is similar to what Hibbert et. al refer to as social-responsibility guilt, whereby “guilt may result from not living up to one’s social obligations” (730). A key aspect of research into guilt appeals is the notion that when guilt is aroused there is a threshold beyond which guilt can no longer be tolerated, at this point an individual will attempt to reduce those feelings (Ghingold qtd in Hibbert et. al 725). This view is consistent with the “Negative State Model,” wherein, individuals seek to reduce negative emotions or what Hibbert et al highlight as the “law of the lightness of load” (725). Thus, while there are egoistic motives for helping to reduce guilt, this does not imply altruistic behavior that will sustain support and furthermore, as illustrated above, can backfire if the individual feels overwhelmed by too much and turns away resulting in another form of “compassion fatigue” (Hibbert 726).

To generate a larger and more diverse funding base NPOs have increasingly turned to emotional appeals driven by existential guilt. In fact, such appeals are ubiquitous and have appeared everywhere from billboards asking us to choose between a mouse or a baby (see appendix 2) or pop-up ads and commercials that beg us not to allow the travesty of birds dying from eating trash (see appendix 3 image). The constant barrage of requests to answer one injustice after another has moved much of the nonprofit audience to the threshold of negative feelings described by Smith Davies and Ireland resulting in target audiences turning away and not lending support. A *Commercials I Hate*, forum post 2008, touched on this very point in criticism of St. Jude’s. While St. Jude’s undeniably does great work, people are saying they are “tired of the guilt trip” and would prefer more informative presentations about the actual scientific and medical

breakthroughs. Again, in my experience working with the organization providing permanent homes to the homeless we focused on the information about homelessness. Asking such questions as: how do people become homeless? what issues plague this population? what solutions really work? and how does moving people off the streets benefit me and my community? This was an informative and empowering message that did not necessarily play on existential guilt about the donor feeling empathy since they are in a 'better position'.

Over the last 20 years the number of emotional appeals has escalated to an unprecedented level bombarding the public with images designed to shock, scare and evoke high levels of sadness and pity without consideration of the Greek concept of timing, Kairos, or audience thus, generating not only more existential distance between the cause/other, but also generating compassion fatigue (Chouliaraki 25). Nonprofit messaging has been driven to a point that often disempowers and removes, in Levinasian terms, the face of both the donor and the "suffering, needy other" (Chouliaraki 25). Furthermore, the shrinking feeling of our globalized world instantly connects all types of peoples with a click or push of a button. These clicks bring people from developed world and the developing world into our homes almost on a continuous basis. Technology brings us into contact with people and places that are vastly different than our own and, unfortunately, with a planet plagued by natural disasters, famine, disease, poverty and war the images bombarding us are too often focused solely on explicit suffering. This suffering becomes what Lillie Chouliaraki has coined a "spectacle of suffering" (Chouliaraki *Spectatorship of Suffering* 10).

This “spectacle” of suffering is promulgated by NPO’s themselves through messaging directed at funders and the general public that pleads for a sympathetic ear and appeals to their own sense of human dignity. In fact, what NPO’s are doing is requesting potential supporters to imagine something they have never experienced. Baudrillard helps us realize through his concept of the simulacrum, however, that as NPO’s seek to create an atmosphere of immediacy and closeness they actually create a moral distance (Baudrillard qtd in Chouliaraki *Spectatorship of Suffering* 12). Furthermore, with the disintegration of grand narratives and universal values it has become increasingly difficult to predict the emotional reaction to certain types of messaging.

Lillie Chouliaraki, professor of media and communication at the London School of Economics and Politics and formidable voice on suffering as a communication problem, asks whether these images call us to action or become banal appeals to pity that results in what Susan Moeller termed “compassion fatigue”. (Musarò 318). Chouliaraki, in her book “The Ironic Spectator” contends that this banality of pity has forced a switch in humanitarian communication away from a “paradigm of pity used to inspire grand normative moralities” to a “paradigm of irony” in which the “spectacle of others like ‘us’ is used to evoke our capacity for self-reflection” (Chouliaraki qtd. in Scott 344). The danger, Pierluigi Musarò highlights in *The Banality of Goodness*, is that the media’s commodification of distant suffering “transforms other-oriented dispositions to action into a cynical hyper-individualism” (321). Thus, what humanitarian scholars such as Chouliaraki, Boltanski, Musarò and others criticize about humanitarian discourse, and this applies to nonprofit discourse as well, is that too often it reduces “vulnerable and suffering populations to voiceless victims by reifying their condition of victimhood while

ignoring their history and muting their words” (Musarò 2013 2). It is not only media representations that foster a message of global inequality based on ideas of the safe comfortable western world and the non-western world of need and vulnerability, but the vendible communication produced by humanitarian NGOs and governmental organizations. Musarò explicates this paradox “between those who are subjects (the witnesses who testify to the misfortunes of the world) and those who can exist only as objects (the unfortunates whose suffering is testified to in front of the world)” (321). This dichotomous world view implies that politics of compassion is politics of inequality. Instead, politics of compassion becomes politics of solidarity when we recognize that moral sentiment rests on other as counterpart (Fassin qtd in Musarò 2015 321).

The Misuse of Ethos – The Rise of Celebrity Advocacy

In an effort to lend additional credibility to their causes nonprofits have turned to celebrity advocacy. A celebrity, here in, is defined as either an international, national or local person popularly recognized as a wealthy individual, performer or person of political importance. As a nonprofit professional working with a multiplicity of organizations there was always a focus when fundraising came up to recruit prominent people into the organization in one fashion or another to promote the organization and represent credibility of the organization to the broader community. In one instance an organization created a second honorary board just to have a place to list people associated with the organization. The board was considered a board of ambassadors and these members were asked to promote the organization within their circles of influence. The thinking was that this would create pathways to more funding. However, in my experience this only works if the ambassadors are vested in the mission and have a strong

relationship with the organization around the mission. Celebrities draw attention to a problem and lend credibility to the organization as the answer to that problem. Issue recognition is not as straightforward as it may appear. According to Joel Best, Professor of Sociology and Criminal Justice at the University of Delaware, social problems do not inherently exist instead they are created from “narratives of concern, justice and fear” (Best qtd in Markham, 470). Best lays out a process for moving a narrative forward that defines, or in essence, creates a social problem. The issue must be turned into a shorthand of sorts, “Blood Diamonds” equals a humanitarian cause, “The Cove” becomes synonymous with marine mammal conservation thus, making them easily converted into everyday household language. The issue must then move beyond media outlets to “gossip, fashion and television listings” (Markham, 470-472) which creates an “unboxing of the issue” (Markham, 474). Best indicates that this is where celebrity advocacy can be helpful (Best qtd in Markham 472). At this point active campaigning is required to move the problem beyond a remedial issue and this Best argues is where celebrity advocacy is not effective in creating change, but rather merely cajoles, rallies or shames those in power to affect some level of change (Best qtd in Markham 472).

Audience reception of, and response to, the celebrity in connection with the social problem cannot be fully known. Pierre Bourdieu’s work on cultural and symbolic capital clarifies how celebrity advocacy can go wrong. The symbolic capital that the celebrity maintains within their field of cultural production may not transfer to the field of social or environmental justice or humanitarianism which determines if the figure is valorized or de-valorized in the face of the audience (Bourdieu qtd in Markham 475). In other words, what is the appropriateness of the celebrity’s involvement with the issue. This is the point

I make previously with the board of ambassadors and the point at which this type of group can be helpful. It is not a matter of the nature of the celebrity's connection to the issue nor is it a matter of needing personalization or popularization, but rather a matter of understanding the distinct ways in which audiences relate to celebrities and to public issues. The orientation to celebrity is not just about amusement but an active calling forth to engage in a game whose rules are both illogical and meaningful. Perhaps it is a cliché to maintain that audiences consume celebrity culture ironically, but the point stands that there is a collective, knowing suspension of disbelief in the embrace of the celebrity that does not fit the logic of public deliberation. However, this does not rule out the possibility of forging a link between celebrities and public engagement, raising questions about what would potentially sustain such an articulation (Markham 479).

When celebrities become involved in certain issues and mobilize institutional networks attention is drawn towards one crisis at the expense of another (Richey 2). The important question is what configurations of power are taking place. This is particularly salient when looking at humanitarian efforts in "North/South relations". Celebrities tend to be aligned with the "Western-Self" advocating an "Other" which reinforces stereotypes (Richey 3). It is critical to be asking which publics are engaged. Chouliaraki illustrates that in this light, celebrities bring a theatrical dynamic of pity to an issue, thus using their symbolic capital to articulate personal dispositions of acting and feeling as exemplary public dispositions at given historical moments. Claims such as Hepburn's "The world is full, I've discovered, of kind people" and "I think every human being is filled with compassion," or Angelina Jolie's "I don't believe I feel differently from other people. I think we all want justice and equality," (Chouliaraki

Theatricality of Humanitarianism 10) illustrate how celebrities articulate aspirational discourse by proposing an altruistic disposition for all to share. This dialogue, while containing the “you should help the poor” type quotes, actually “impersonates” this disposition. Through this universal discourse of an undefinable everybody presupposes an altruistic disposition of both the celebrity and her publics. (Chouliaraki *Theatricality Humanitarianism* 10).

At the heart of the issue is that this “impersonation of altruism” relies on public image management and expertise of the celebrity in conveying the message of suffering which ends up being the discourse of the institutions and not the voice of the distant sufferer. What results is moral education through theatrics at the expense of the authenticity of the plea (Chouliaraki *Theatricality Humanitarianism* 17). It becomes apparent that there are serious communication ethics at play. The neocolonial argument situates celebrity humanitarianism within an orientalist discourse of the “white man’s burden”: images of beautiful people in stark contrast to the African poor perpetuate historical relationships of power between Western missionaries and indigenous locals, the latter, now as much as then, unable to represent themselves but subject to the civilizing project of the former (Richey 5). In so doing, the celebrity seeks to conceal a scandalous contradiction: by appearing to care for the “wretched of the earth” whilst enjoying the privilege of rare wealth, he or she glosses over the ongoing complicity of the West in a global system of injustice that reproduces the dependence of the developing world through acts of charity (Chouliaraki *Theatrical Humanitarianism* 18-20).

Avoiding the pitfall of stereotyping and in maintaining authenticity relies on narrative congruence. The narrative of the celebrity must fit the story being told by the

organization. Alasdair MacIntyre, in *After Virtue*, suggests that one is always coauthor of his or her own story, where “man is in his actions and practices as well as in his fictions” where we are not only self-accountable, but ask others for an account (12). Thus, if the celebrity advocate’s story does not make a logical connection to the story of the organization then there is a lack of authenticity or fiction in the story resulting in a negative or ineffective plea. Melissa Cook and Annette Holba, in *Philosophies of Communication – Implications for Everyday Experience*, bring us examples that illustrate narratives mistakes and accuracies. Michael J. Fox and his advocacy for stem-cell research on Capitol Hill backfired when he took part in a televised election advertisement. During this interview, Fox’s debilitating tremors from Parkinson’s disease were very visible. Many in the audience believed the plea was not for the general population of those suffering from spinal cord and other neurological disorders, but instead as a self-serving plea for himself. In fact, some went as far as to allege that Fox did not take his medicine to allow the tremors to evoke a certain level of pity and concern (Cook and Holba 19-20). The opposite occurred with Bruce Springsteen where his decades of singing “Born in the USA”, which was advocacy for the working-class man, bolstered his authenticity when he spoke on behalf of John Kerry and made his Vote for Change tour make sense (Cook and Holba 23). Thus, ethicality of celebrity advocacy falls on their past actions and knowledge of the subject.

MacIntyre’s concept of emotivism is central to understanding the role and audience reception of celebrity advocacy. The question is the celebrity viewed as truly altruistic or are their actions tied some personal self-interest i.e., personal branding? Angelina Jolie’s work in Thailand and Burma illustrates the possibility of emotivism that

calls the work into question. There is not debate that Jolie's work visiting the refugee camps help to draw attention to the crisis, she illustrates a cosmopolitan aesthetic of compassion which bolsters her personal brands the "mother without borders" and the "rainbow family" (Richey 7). Additionally, the audience of her message is the "western/northern" oriented individual which obscures the political-economic relationship between herself and the refugees thus, denying the material implications of the wealth of the star and how it contributes to the spaces where suffering takes place (Richey 7). All of this renders the refugee as a faceless recipient of care.

Ultimately, nonprofits must carefully vet the motivations behind the celebrity's act of "giving" or their public support and not take that action for granted. Extending Thorstein Veblen's theory of the leisure class and ideas of conspicuous consumption to the idea of conspicuous charity bring valuable insight to how and when to use the *ethos* of celebrity to bare on nonprofit marketing. "Helping others can knit society together or pull it apart. Without a compelling social program, charity can dissipate into transient encounters between people not equal. But without direct, mutual bonds between givers and recipients, philanthropy sacrifices practical effectiveness and moral purpose."

(Friedman and McGarvie 48) This statement shows the interplay between charity and philanthropy within the act of giving.

According to Robert Hall, 'Social Motivation' is "the motivation to do something that will not result in tangible economic or status gain—where the drive is more internal than external, and the purpose is larger than just self-gratification." (Hall 12)

This definition of social motivation can easily be used to define the motivation behind participating in charity and philanthropy as well. The idea of selfless giving with no

personal benefits is what giving should be according to some social ideals; however, many times, this component of self-sacrifice is not present in giving. Many scholars separate the idea of giving into two separate and opposite ideals. “Altruistic helping has been defined as behavior motivated by the desire to increase another’s welfare, while egoistic giving has been defined as motivated by the desire to reduce one’s own personal distress or to receive rewards for giving.” (Piferi, Jobe, Jones 171) This idea of egoistic giving can be easily applied to benevolence that is given to shape society into a specific image. Using society as a mirror to reflect your own beliefs is selfish, self-serving and exploitative; or in the words of Veblen, predatory, because you are enacting change using those who are in need to gain prestige in the eyes of society. Veblen argues that giving, especially bequests, can be considered ‘honorific waste.’ (Reisman 10) by using money and resources to further your own name, or that of a family member, it is a publicized way to demonstrate the “superiority of your soul” leaving the benefit to others as almost superfluous. “Nonetheless, motivation is not simply an academic question; it goes to the heart of any definition of charity, philanthropy, or civility.” (Friedman and McGarvie 361) By labeling giving such as this ‘honorific waste,’ Veblen is questioning the cultural motives behind the benevolence. His idea of the ‘Cultural Prism,’ motivations being more important than the outcome can be applied here (Dyer 56). The questions of why people become involved, who benefited, and in what ways are relevant to determining the moral quality of charitable and philanthropic acts. Ultimately, nonprofit leadership must be cognizant of the relationship between motives and ends and the broader societal implications to develop the right criteria for relationship development with supporters of all kinds including celebrities both large and small (Friedman and McGarvie 361).

Role of the Media in Perpetuating Nonprofit Communication Problems

Publicity is an essential component of nonprofit existence and success. Mass media channels play a significant role, not only in legitimating certain charitable causes, but also in how those causes are interpreted. If symbolic power, according to Bourdieu, is a perceived sense of value, then what is the symbolic power of the media in relaying suffering, both domestic and internationally? The question is how has media's westernized generalizations been duplicated in citizen generated media? What has the impact of these portrayals been on the messaging of nonprofit organizations or vice versa on the journalistic delivery? The heart of the issue is the interdependence of most nonprofits, but particularly international humanitarian or human rights organizations, on the media to get the message out. Satellite broadcasting has generated a widespread presence of distant suffering, but with its' ambivalence has created proximity without understanding of the humanitarian magnitude. Instead, suffering is portrayed only its' relevance to Western publics capacity for infotainment (Chouliaraki *The symbolic power of transnational media* 332).

The heart of the issue revolves around the concept of "newsworthiness" and as Pamela Shoemaker, professor of communication and gatekeeping theorist, points news can be bought, sold, traded and manipulated (106). Shoemaker points out the importance of drama in a story to attract attention or become "newsworthy" (106). Her example tells a story of a young girl running off the road hitting a tree and her car beginning to burn when two men see the crash and risk their own lives to pull her free just before the entire car bursts into flames. This version is a good story with heroes. However, if the same story was told: "girl runs off road and she was pulled out before the tank caught on fire"

is not nearly as interesting or thought provoking (Shoemaker 106). This same principle applies to nonprofit interventions. Think of the way in which the media show refugees, the homeless and abused animals all in a manner that makes the story more urgent, appealing or worth intervention by you the viewer. Shoemaker highlights the negative nature of news portraying itself as a mirror image of society, creating the conclusion that the world is not happy place (Shoemaker 108). If things are positive or routine Shoemaker points out that there is no need to report them because there is no problem (108). Chouliaraki's work on media as witnessing is valuable in this context. Even though many nonprofits can relay their causes through social media and self-sponsored "commercials" the media's portrayal of their work is still relevant. The news as witnessing can bolster the authenticity of suffering and act as a moralizing force, however, since there has been a shift "towards convergent narratives of 'dramatic action', (Chouliaraki *The Ironic Spectator* 143) as illustrated in Shoemaker, this alters claims to authenticity and "has profound implications for the performance of solidarity available today in the news" i.e., "the way we understand and visualize each other in the world" (Chouliaraki *The Ironic Spectator* 143). This may actually increase compassion fatigue and reinforce hierarchies of place and human life. While mainstream news upholds a theatrical model the 'news by all' of the internet may present a model of journalism that is therapeutic replacing objectivity with the epistemological prioritization of truth claims that relies on the presentation of suffering as a "stream of other voices" creating a "dizzying multiplicity of interpretations of experience in the hope of achieving intimacy with violence" (Chouliaraki *The Ironic Spectator* 171) pity, suffering and misfortune. According to Richard Rorty, fatigue of universalism, resulting from what Chouliaraki has

outlined above, has generated a shift from traditional conceptions of solidarity grounded “humanity as such” towards a sense of solidarity grounded in self-doubt (Rorty qtd in *The Ironic Spectator* 174). This self-doubt is about our own and others’ sensitivities to pain and humiliation and about doubt that there are adequate institutions in place to handle all this pain and humiliation (Chouliaraki *The Ironic Spectator* 174).

Conclusion

The heart and soul of the nonprofit sector, *φιλανθρωπία*, is under attack. The very question of human solidarity in compassion for others is being challenged by outside socio-economic and political factors, but also from within the nonprofit sector itself. In the last 40 years there has been an unprecedented increase in market generated competition in the nonprofit sector which has led nonprofits to respond by adopting corporate business models based in quantifiable metrics and corporate style messaging that reflects efficiency and continued growth. Lack of adequate missioning that directs, not only purpose, but action steps has led nonprofits to stray from their purpose with disastrous results for themselves and those they serve. Additionally, off mission messaging and action has generated a lack of trust and confidence in the sector leading to the generation of more corporate style approaches to organizing and service delivery based in quantifiable metrics that may, or may not, be accurately reflective of the qualitative social justice impacts.

To garner competitive edge in this corporate driven market landscape nonprofits have turned to extreme *pathos* and *ethos* driven appeals that have generated “compassion fatigue”, too much existential guilt and a lack of authenticity that further enforces stereotypes and class divides. Contributing to the difficulties of nonprofit messaging

is the media's role dramatizing events that creates a theatrical stage of pity and suffering where the viewer feels drawn to "look" but does not see. The sector has also adopted a sale/purchase mentality both literally through merchandise and figuratively as an investment or purchase of a social cause.

A systemic shift away from corporate market driven metrics and a return to the qualitative nature of relationship building at the center of serving social justice issues will alleviate the competitive environment. This will decrease the tendency to over and misuse *pathos* and *ethos* appeals that fatigue the audience into inaction. Furthermore, moving away from market driven ideology will move the people beyond the post-humanitarian activist or "liberal ironist" (Rorty 1) who remains skeptical of truth-claims of suffering others towards activism beyond pity from the comfort of their living rooms. This shift has the potential to restore the heart of the nonprofit sector and create real social justice change.

The purpose of this project will be to look at the historical metaphors of philanthropy and then dissect the issues that seem to be undermining the true meaning of what this 3rd sector is intended to do and be with a particular focus on mission/messaging and leadership. The second chapter will discuss the history of philanthropy in terms of the dominant metaphors used in any particular moment to relate to and define philanthropy and charitable action. Ch. 2 will end with the current moment and how the arena became so crowded and competitive and the importance of strong mission statements to guide both activity and messaging. Fairhurst, Jordan and Neuwirth's work along with Ryan's will be used to unpack the missioning and messaging importance in the nonprofit sector. The chapter will specifically discuss how nonprofits have responded

to the increasingly competitive atmosphere with manipulative marketing techniques which overuse *pathos* causing emotional fatigue and perpetuating a feel a victimization instead of empowerment for both recipients and donors. Hibbert, Bennett and Musarò are helpful resources in looking at both psychology of giving and leveraging emotional responses effectively.

Chapter 2 will also look at how the relationship between the neoliberal market's focus on individualism has forced a rise in "conspicuous charity" and the misuse of the *ethos* in celebrity advocacy instead of the organization itself. Veblen's work on the leisure class coupled with Chouliaraki's work on distant others and the specter of humanitarianism can help further our understanding of the positives and negatives of celebrity advocacy. Furthermore, this chapter will address the question of *logos* for social good by asking how we track that which is not quantifiable, but qualitative.

Chapter 3 will unpack theory driven guidance for nonprofits. This chapter will look first at Lilie Chouliaraki's work on spectatorship of suffering and celebrity advocacy as she clearly lays out what some of the problems with nonprofit communication. This section is followed by the rhetorical theory Kenneth Burke's identification which helps us understand what relationships we want to constitute. Finally, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin's theory of invitational rhetoric help us to understand the importance of identification and how to use it and further understand the importance of what types of relationships we want to constitute through communication with various stakeholders. Foss and Griffin give new insight into nonprofit messaging that in empowering, stays to true the qualitative nature of the human condition and reinforces mission.

Chapter 4 is a case study of three settlement houses, Hull House of Chicago, Hill House of Pittsburgh and the Irene Kaufman Settlement House which later became the Jewish Community Center of Squirrel Hill in Pittsburgh. All of these organizations were in operation for many years illustrating the importance of mission adherence while growing with the times.

Chapter 5 will serve as a conclusion that lays a groundwork for how to return the philanthropic sector to its' roots. How rhetoric and philosophy of communication can restore the heart of philanthropy to the nonprofit sector and move it from a market-based approach back to ideas of civitas, caritas and friendship that preserve mission and messaging and build relationships based on the *ethos* of the mission for long-term support.

Chapter 2 – The Spirit of the Collective

Chapter one explored the implications of the neoliberal infiltration into the nonprofit sector resulting in, what Bishop and Green call, philanthrocapitalism. The chapter discussed how philanthrocapitalism turns nonprofits into market driven actors devoid of the original heart of philanthropy or *φιλανθρωπία* which literally means kindness, benevolence, humanity and love of mankind. Also previously explored was the movement from democratic principles outlined by Dewey as the “we that must do something” (Dewey) to an industry dominated by ploys and gimmicks designed to sell you their cause without developing relationships. This market focus is a new development in the history of philanthropy in the western world and has created an environment of competition that rejects the collective. The rise of philanthrocapitalism has rejected the historical foundations of philanthropy and traded relationships born in the spirit of the collective concerned for our common humanity for relationships built between market actors. The very heart of philanthropy throughout the ages has bolstered the idea that “we” is better than “I”, but Philanthrocapitalism focuses on the “I” that can “do” things. The significance in this shift in ideology has created a concept, coined by Lindsay Anderson in her 2009 article, “Conspicuous Charity”. This concept deals with the ideas pioneered by Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood in 1978 in *The World of Goods* and Thorstein Veblen’s conspicuous consumption highlighted in *The Leisure Class*.

Douglas and Isherwood explain that consumption is a about making gestures for marking esteem, the calendar and identity. When we shop we are creating patterns of consumption that illustrate the broader patterns of society (Douglas and Isherwood 1).

Douglas and Isherwood point out that consumption is part of life, but what ultimately matters is not *what* we purchase, but *how* we use the goods because goods are both ends and means by which others can scan for the symbolic meaning and capital they contain (Douglas and Isherwood xxii). In other words, the goods we consume reveal to others our lifestyle, personality and position in society through which we create communities of co-consumers with inclusion and exclusion standards (Douglas and Isherwood xxii). This is illustrated clearly in the nonprofit world when people seek to be part of community around which the organization or cause is at the center. We can think of people vested in the idea of being an “environmentalist”, “pro-life advocate” or “social welfare advocate”. At the heart of the issue of consumption is motivation. So, as consumers of charity what are we consuming positive societal change or are we consuming something conspicuous and narcissistic?

As contemporary culture becomes more other-directed there is more of a tendency to replace the personal sacrifice that used to be present in giving with tax write-offs, fun, profit, or publicized praise. It is no longer sufficient that charity make you feel good, it must now also make you look good to the public and your peers (Anderson 64). The act of charity has become more about the drama and conspicuous nature of consuming, than about the substance of the charity (Anderson 64) Lindsay Anderson calls this concept conspicuous charity where philanthropy has become the consumption of social capital used to build symbolic capital associated with prestige and honor (29). According to Robert Hall, ‘Social Motivation’ is “the motivation to do something that will not result in tangible economic or status gain—where the drive is more internal than external, and the purpose is larger than just self-gratification.” (Hall 12) This definition of

social motivation can easily be used to define the motivation behind participating in charity and philanthropy as well. The idea of selfless giving with no personal benefits is what giving should be according to some social ideals; however, many times this component of self-sacrifice is not present in giving. Many scholars separate the idea of giving into two separate and opposite ideals. “Altruistic helping has been defined as behavior motivated by the desire to increase another’s welfare, while egoistic giving has been defined as motivated by the desire to reduce one’s own personal distress or to receive rewards for giving.” (Piferi, Jobe, Jones 171) This idea of egoistic giving is benevolence given to shape society into a specific image. Using society as a mirror to reflect your own beliefs is not only selfish and self-serving, but it’s exploitative; or in the words of Veblen, predatory, because you are enacting change using those who are in need to gain prestige in the eyes of society. Veblen argues that giving, especially bequests can be considered ‘honorific waste.’ By using money and resources to further your own name, or that of a family member, it is a publicized way to demonstrate the ‘superiority of your soul.’ (Anderson 28-29). Chouliaraki calls this “wristband charity” (2012 134) which combines the act of doing good for others with the instant gratification of feeling good for oneself (2012 134) thus creating the perfect environment for philanthrocapitalism to thrive. The central problem is that philanthrocapitalism reduces the *logos* of giving to a market exchange focused on the self instead of *logos* grounded in mutual friendship and reciprocal responsibility that creates sustainable long-term relationships. To change the current face of philanthropy and return to the ideas inherent in *φιλανθρωπία* we must find the *logos* inherent in giving that blends our narrative with the narrative of the nonprofit.

How do we find the good reasons, the *logos*? When did things change? What prompted the philanthropic world to take on a market approach to charity that has created competition, individualism, over- use of *pathos* and misplaced *ethos*? The shift can be traced to the Western European economy, particularly in England and the U.S., which took a downturn in the 1970's after great prosperity during the 1950's and 1960's. This economic trouble set off the neoliberal turn and eventually the Band Aid Movement of the 1980's which set the third sector reeling to compete and expand wherein philanthrocapitalism was born in earnest and marketing and the market became the focus of nonprofit leaders everywhere. To move back to the traditional view of philanthropy and encourage strong leadership that doesn't chase dollars and seeks relationships with supporters that are unique and sustainable we can look to metaphors that dominated society's understanding of philanthropy throughout western history. Looking at the lessons of history may help the sector return to building relationships based on virtuous friendship, civitas, caritas, humanism and social responsibility that create lasting relationships of support for the organizations. Additionally, within these metaphors we can find the *logos* that is missing from philanthropy today. This chapter will explore the history of the Band Aid Movement, its impact on modern philanthropic efforts. Also, this chapter will review the *logos* inherent in historical metaphors of philanthropy and provide some guidance on using those historical metaphors to resist the philanthrocapitalism model. It is important to understand how philanthropy has been viewed in the past and how the role of charity has evolved throughout history so we can understand how these views changed in the late 19th and 20th centuries which eventually led to the misguided adoption of neoliberal corporatized messaging and marketing that over enhances the

commodification of charity and thus, hyper competitive operating arena instead of a more collaborative, collective and cohesive community sector. Furthermore, understanding the past understandings of philanthropy can give us a guide to returning to those views and functionality of the nonprofit sector. This chapter seeks to explore the historical metaphors of philanthropy from Aristotle to the robber baron era of Carnegie and Rockefeller and show the progression of neoliberal ideology that culminated during the Reagan and Thatcher years.

Where We Are Now – The Band Aid Movement

While every decade's varying social agendas shaped and changed how philanthropic organizations operate and serve their constituents the 1980's made lasting changes to the face of philanthropy and more importantly to how nonprofits do business. The Ethiopian famine of the 1980s was one of the worst humanitarian crisis of the 20th century resulting in more than 1 million deaths from 1983-1985, according to the United Nations. The Ethiopian crisis was brought on by a perfect storm of drought and conflict where the lack of rain resulted in the food shortage and the raging civil war made areas inaccessible to aid organizations (<https://www.worldvision.org/disaster-relief-news-stories/1980s-ethiopia-famine-facts>). In 1984, with 8 million people at risk of starvation, the Ethiopian government made an international appeal for help, but the scope and politics of the situation made it difficult for aid organizations to manage the demand. However, the situation began to turn in October of 1984 when BBC TV reporter Michael Buerk broadcast shocking images of emaciated starving women and children bringing a new level of public interest to the situation. The images were so powerful that people from all around the world were reaching out to aid organizations to help, however the real

turn of events took place in 1985 when celebrity humanitarian Bob Geldof famously spearheaded a series of “fundraising spectacles” (Jones 1).

Geldof pulled together a supergroup of popular artists to create a massive production of “Do They Know Its Christmas” which became both the fastest and biggest selling single of all time (Jones 1). Geldof’s phenomenon was followed in 1985 by the release of “We are the World” written by Michael Jackson and sung by the USA for Africa supergroup. The song headlined some of the most popular pop artists of the time including Lionel Ritchie and Madonna. Again, the song was produced as a fundraiser intended to alleviate hunger in Africa amidst a cataclysmic famine with all proceeds going to the United Support of Artists for Africa nonprofit organization. The scale of the effort was tremendous from the production with the various performers to the sales of both the song and the overwhelming amount of merchandise raising over \$63 million or the equivalent of \$147 million today (Gavin).

This Band Aid Movement of the mid 1980’s forever changed how we view philanthropy and charitable giving. While celebrity association with causes was not new the sheer volume of varying celebrities and their endorsement of aid to Africa was new and extensive commodification and infiltration of the market spirit of instrumental efficiency. This movement towards celebrity involvement fueled a corporatized quick fix philosophy about complex social issues. Furthermore, Band Aid heralded in a focus on celebrity advocacy from which both nonprofits and the celebrities themselves benefit wherein it can generate awareness of issues that may otherwise be overlooked or under recognized, but it can be dangerous territory because, as with the Band Aid Movement, it can severely commodify philanthropy and confuse the process of giving with investment

in the *ethos* of the celebrity instead of the nonprofit itself and the cause it fights. Chouliaraki explains well that while popular culture has the power to galvanize issues of social welfare and “reconfigure consumers into active citizens” (2013 109), in actuality they “often reduce causes into depoliticized commodities catalyzing consumer communities of fandom” (2013, 111). What is crucial to understand is how this moment in history changed previous centuries’ views of philanthropy and charity in the community. Throughout time communities, starting with ancient Greece and ending as late as the 1970’s, viewed philanthropy in more cooperative, collaborative and collective ways, but the introduction of a hyper commodification of philanthropy in the early 1980’s changed that to a competitive climate. This hyper competitiveness has created an environment where nonprofits rely less on the *ethos* of their own mission and purpose and more on the ethos of celebrities. The commodification and use of celebrities is not horrible or unexpected in modernity, but unchecked, can lead to sense aimlessness which in turn leads to mission and message slip from a sense of ‘chasing dollars’ and fitting the image of the celebrity or entity outside the organization.

Today, celebrity promotion of nonprofit organizations has become so prolific that there are now websites, such as *Look to the Stars.org: The World of Celebrity Giving*, designed to help fans see who their favorite stars are supporting. Scholars studying the phenomenon question whether this involvement builds solidarity or instead, distinction between differing forms of life. Chouliaraki, in particular, argues that celebrities stifle the plurality of voices from supporters to those in need (83). As Chouliaraki eloquently explains this ceremonial humanitarianism is a form of political legitimization that doesn’t rely on collective activism but operates at the level of elite personalities who decide what

is worthy outside the public conversation (112). These actions subordinate systemic socio economic and political questions to the quick fix logic of immediate results where the masses are not converted into global citizen activists but are consumer participants in a “theater of legitimation for the neoliberal agenda” (Chouliaraki 2013 112). Therefore, ceremonial humanitarianism reduces western publics into consuming fans of commodified participation operating on market principles. Simply stated it is the celebrity ability to draw crowds and make money.

Quickly dubbed, The Band Aid Movement, it was heralded in by media coverage of the Ethiopian famine in 1984. In late October of 1984 the BBC in Britain aired a news program “The Spark” which told the story of a devastating famine in northern Ethiopia. The story brought powerful graphic images of starving children into the living rooms of millions of British people. By November the story had become a serious political issue airing in the U.S. on CBS’ “60 Minutes” and further followed up by news shows on NBC and ABC. Almost overnight what once was considered a ‘third world’ disaster was transformed into a major political issue for the Western world (Jones 2). The disturbing reality of the situation mobilized people from all around the world including drawing the attention of humanitarian Bob Geldof who swiftly mobilized 40 popular mainstream music artists to perform the charity song *Do They Know It’s Christmas?* (Jones 2). While the effort was commendable and sent millions of dollars in aid to alleviate the crisis, the efforts extreme commodification initiated an enormous shift in the climate of the nonprofit world towards the commodification of charity. Additionally, the ability of celebrities to raise massive amounts of money created a quick fix philosophy about societal issues of all scopes and sizes. By the end of the 1980’s there was hardly a social

issue that had not become the theme for a concert, subject of a song or attached to the persona of a celebrity. While celebrity association with charity and philanthropic causes is not new, what became striking in the 1980's was the extensive commodification and infiltration of the market spirit of instrumental efficiency which further fueled the quick fix philosophy about complex social issues. This trend in commodification of charity found a foothold due to the broader socio-economic context of the 1980's.

After enjoying stable economic success for most of the 1950's and 1960's due to an abundance of cheap oil and the growth of the auto/highway/suburb complex, as well as the very nature of government intervention in the economy itself. However, with the dawning of 1970's the American economy rebounded leaving Americans to deal with high unemployment, economic stagnation and inflation rates that left families struggling with take home wages in 1981 equivalent to those of 1960 (Akerman 2). Upon election Ronald Reagan promised to change all that. Reagan's economic policies, Reaganomics, reflected a belief that growth and prosperity were being hampered by high taxes, excessive government, over industry regulation and massive social spending (Akerman 2). The resulting constriction of social spending created a surge in the need of social welfare programming as the reality of trickle-down economics never reached the neediest most vulnerable members of society. The result was an explosion of the nonprofit sector as it attempted to rally and fill the need left behind by shrinking government support. These conditions left the ground ripe for the popularity and success of the Band Aid movement. Andrew Jones explains in his article, "Band Aid revisited: humanitarianism, consumption and philanthropy in the 1980s", that "the significance of the movement was more than the donations it raised, but in how it utilized the mass appeal of rock music,

popular culture, celebrity and a globalizing media to build an extra-governmental social movement” (3). Thus, through Band Aid, pop music “reclaimed its role as a revolutionary youth movement for social and political change” (Jones 3).

As Lillie Chouliaraki points out in her book, *The Ironic Spectator*, this type of celebrity involvement in the philanthropic sector further commodifies charity leaving us with a sense of commercial moralism (2013 70). Band Aid type activities and celebrity benefits commercialization of social issues operate under market principles raising questions of authenticity around the legitimization of certain issues and subjugation of others to a less important status (2013 40). While popular culture has the power to galvanize issues of social welfare and “reconfigure consumers into active citizens” (Chouliaraki 2013 109), in actuality they “often reduce causes into depoliticized commodities catalyzing consumer communities of fandom” (Chouliaraki 2013 111).

The enhancement of commercialization rather than the production of true solidarity furthers a neoliberal agenda by reproducing rather than challenging colonial stereotypes of vulnerable others. In fact, by coopting a hegemonic agenda of legitimizing colonial continuities through iconographic images of the “distant sufferer” (Chouliaraki 2013 111) a deep inequality is perpetuated between “us” and the “inferior” other needing help (Chouliaraki 2013 111). In fact, *Black Voice* magazine described the *Do They Know It's Christmas?* “as ‘the racist event of the decade’ due to its exclusion of black artists and focus upon images of white millionaire philanthropists rushing to ‘save’ Africa” (Jones 8). Based on Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic capital, celebrities can produce their own meaning about socio-economic and political issues. The aesthetics of which shape moral conduct on what the public should care about and why (Chouliaraki 2013 114)

laying the groundwork for competition between nonprofits representing differing social issues. Andrew Jones explains that, “Band Aid both reflected and reinforced an ongoing shift in the legitimacy of charity and welfare, away from state-led welfare solutions towards more individualized and market-driven forms of action articulated through the realms of consumption and mass culture” (4). This change in how charity was viewed reflects a deeper societal turn towards neoliberal political-economic ideas heightened by Reaganomics and encouraged a more individualistic political consciousness (Jones 4). This form of marketized philanthropy successfully raised money, but at the expense of diverting engagement away from the underlying causes of complex social issues (Jones 4).

Using the Band Aid movement’s momentum there was an explosion within the nonprofit sector of new organizations addressing hunger as heightened awareness made it a “worthy” cause. Nonprofits, harkening back to missionaries and colonial era philanthropists, began using child-centric charitable appeals because modern NPOs recognized that this strategy offered the most efficient means to mobilize the public and extract funding. This blueprint heralded an era of extreme *pathos* driven messaging that dominates a great deal of most NPO communication. Philanthropic organizations built on the “success” of global hunger to bring the issue closer to home and the industry as a whole saw not only an expansion in the number of new organizations, but massive increases to existing NPO budgets and staffing as they rode the wave of popularity produced by the Band Aid movement (Jones 8). While Band Aid was accused of masking the underlying socio-economic and political issues involved with the Ethiopian famine, so too did NGO’s quickly focus on the humanitarian necessity of saving lives by using

impactful and emotional images of starving women and children while shying away from explaining that the ongoing political unrest and civil wars in Ethiopia were at the heart of the situation (Jones 8). A quote by the Archbishop of Olinda and Recife Brazil stated: “When I give food to the poor I am called a saint, but when I ask why are there so many poor I am called a communist” (qtd. In Jones 9) is relevant to the trend in charity proliferated by neoliberalism. The Band Aid movement of the mid 1980’s fueled a transformation in the philanthropic world by “giving rise to a new era of slick media friendly celebrity humanitarianism” (Jones 8). These ideas have had a significant and lasting impact on the way nonprofits structure their missions and messages. Since Band Aid NPO’s have spent the last 35 years manipulating their missions to accommodate the latest trends in “popular” charitable causes and using emotionally taxing imagery to manipulate the donor and the focus of the issue.

The market spirit of neoliberal capitalism had fully taken hold in the philanthropic world by the mid-1980’s leaving nonprofits to operate under a new business trend. The rise of microfinance institutions (MCIs) in the mid-1980s also contributed to the neoliberal philosophy of how charity should operate. MCIs operated under the age-old adage “that if you give a man a fish you feed him for a day but, teach a man to fish and he will eat for a lifetime” (unknown). This is the exact neoliberal “pull yourself up by your bootstraps” mentality that rewards those who work hard and finds those who fail to be inferior. The issue with this simple quick fix ideology is that it does not consider any underlying circumstance that would prevent a man from having the ability to fish or the ability to learn to fish. The MCI teaching philosophy pushed many NPO’s to amend their missions, messages and programming to include some kind of teaching aspect or the idea

of providing “clients” with tools to develop themselves further. This creates an environment of mission slip due chasing funds. If we continue to follow the fisherman analogy an NPO with a mission to feed the homeless or hungry might be tempted to institute some sort of “class” or “instruction” that will provide these hungry individuals with skills they need to acquire food. The neoliberal philosophy filtering down from the foundation and corporate donors is not one of alms giving tradition or of addressing systemic societal issues that are creating hungry/homeless individuals, but instead a philosophy of non-recurring “clients”. Applying this analogy helps one to see how NPO’s can slip into service lines that are beyond their mission and lead to organizational trouble and failure. MCIs also further validated concepts of venture capitalism of the mid-19th century wherein there was a push to apply the scientific method to improve social welfare (Letwin 369). However, even the robber barons Rockefeller and Carnegie recognized that, “to apply rational methods of business to the administration of charitable deeds was outdated and deficient” (Guillot 451). Throughout the 20th century the ideology of using rational business models for charitable organizations prevailed and NPO’s were pressured from external stakeholders/donors/foundations to adopt the hierarchical bureaucratic structures of business. Paul DiMaggio and Anheier Helmut note as early as 1990 that this created inefficiency and stifled service to those in need (139). Thus, by the mid 1990’s the nonprofit world seemed to morph into a single identity that embodied the same characteristics. Dolnicar et. al make an excellent point to this end:

“Institutional theory acknowledges the importance of powerful societal rules, norms and expectations for organizational success. Organizations within the same field (e.g., nonprofits) experience pressure to comply

with coercive, normative and mimetic demands1 to adopt institutionally desirable practices. Facing similar issues and challenges, they become similar in their culture, structures and routines, in a process known as institutional isomorphism. Institutionalization of corporate practices in recent years thus means that organizations across all sectors increasingly look the same” (108).

Philanthrocapitalism, while alive and well during the 1990’s and continuing today, was officially coined in 2006 in the *Economist* (McGoey 185).

Philanthrocapitalism was used to describe a new breed of donors that conflate business aims with charitable endeavors focusing on making philanthropy more cost effective, impact oriented and financially profitable (McGoey 185). The guiding philosophy that led to the rise of philanthrocapitalism is the idea that to do good socially, one must do well financially wherein public and private interest are strategically combined and promoted as mutually compatible (McGoey 185). The concept which is blatantly oxymoronic stands on the ground that morals and the market are not distinct phenomena, but instead corresponding goods (McGoey 186). In 2008, Matthew Bishop and Michael Green published *Philanthrocapitalism: How the Rich Can Save the World*” which touted the power of harnessing the market for an inevitable rise in the welfare of the broader community (McGoey 186). Truly, this concept is not new and harkens back Adam Smith’s premise in “*A Wealth of Nations*” that unencumbered markets naturally contribute to the common good (Smith xii). While some of the concepts of modeling philanthropy after corporate practice are not new, what is new is the scale of philanthropic giving which has quintupled since 1996 when foundation contributions

totaled \$13B and in 2018 *Charity Giving Statistics* recorded over \$75B (Nonprofit Trust.org). In 2006 Warren Buffet pledged \$37B to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation making it the largest single donation in history (McGoey 190).

Again, we must ask the question of what are these donations purchasing? The consumption of charity situated in a market philosophy is wrought with contradictions. One principle of philanthrocapitalism is the idea, articulated by Andy Beckett in a 2010 edition of *The Guardian*, that “the super-rich need to stay super rich in order for their charitable enterprises to function” (2017). Towards this end organizations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation have more than \$958M in investments in Royal Dutch Shell and Exxon Mobil. Royal Dutch Shell has been embroiled in scandalous destruction of the Nigerian Delta for several decades. Naomi Klein points out in a 2013 edition of *The Guardian* that “hypocrisy is staggering: a top priority of the Gates Foundation has been malaria research, a disease intimately linked to climate. Mosquitoes and malaria parasites both thrive in warmer weather. Does it really make sense to fight malaria while fueling one of the reasons it may be spreading more ferociously in some areas?” (Klein). In fact, concerns have been voiced that the Gates Foundation’s funding of 10% of the World Health Organization’s budget is problematic and compromises the independence of the organization (McGoey 2015 10). Nonprofits themselves are guilty of “robbing Peter to pay Paul” (unknown) so to speak as they follow the corporate model of investing. Both the Ocean Conservancy and the Natural Resource Defense Council state that they do not have environmental or social screening policies for their investments. This is significant because as Dan Apfel, Executive Director of the Responsible Endowments Coalition, points out, “, unless an institution specifically directs its investment managers

not to invest in fossil fuels, it will almost certainly hold some stock, simply because those stocks (including coal-burning utilities) make up about 13% of the US market. "All investors are basically invested in fossil fuels," says Apfel. "You can't be an investor that is not invested in fossil fuels, unless you've worked very hard to ensure you're not." (Apfel qtd in Klein). These hypocritical and certainly counterproductive practices are a direct result of the neoliberal philosophy putting the market at the center of all socio-economic and political issues. There is a fight to survive mentality in the overcrowded nonprofit world that requires leadership of these organizations to institute practices that ensure their financial viability beyond support from donors. However, the ethics of these practices is never at the center of the conversation. Communities sacrificing virtue for the market is echoed by Jerry Muller in "The Mind and the Market" where he decries the fact that "the quest for money has displaced the quest for public honor; the values of the market are crowding out that readiness to sacrifice" (102). So, in some respects some nonprofit organizations too have been taken over by a type of greed and avarice inherent in capitalism to justify and maintain their legitimacy as a necessary provider of services.

The Result of Philanthrocapitalism - Conspicuous Consumerism and the *Ethos* of Celebrity Advocacy

How the Rise of Consumerism has created an age of Conspicuous Charity

Consumerism is the hallmark of the neoliberal world where we are judged on our consumer behavior. Consumerism is today our new ideology, the paradigm of post-modernity. Consumerism has been identified as "corrosive of political life and a deformation of human consciousness, construed as a process by which the human being

is dehumanized and depoliticized – an active citizenry replaced with complacent consumers and passive spectators” (Norris 1). Max Weber tells us that society has transformed from a standard where economic success or failure has been transferred from the sphere of personal responsibility to that of the impersonal marketplace (vi). For Hannah Arendt the modern reversal of public and private spheres becomes the “the social realm” which is ultimately a community centered around the cyclical process of production and consumption, in which human self-understanding becomes based on privacy and speech becomes subservient to commercial discourse. It is the end of action and speech (Norris 1).

In 1978 Mary Douglas, a social anthropologist, teamed up with Baron Isherwood, a econometrician, to write *The World of Goods*, which was a pioneering work on economic anthropology. This work provides an account of consumerism that is helpful in articulating how we consume charity – the “we” are both the average donor and the billionaire philanthropist. Douglas and Isherwood state,

“the economist assumes the desire for objects is an individual psychological urge. The anthropologist assumes objects are desired for giving away, or sharing, or fulfilling social obligations. Saying that consumption is *for* other people turns the whole subject on its head. Consumption is not a way of behaving that is added on after social patterns have been fixed. It is part of a way of life.” (1)

Douglas and Isherwood go onto further explain consumption as making gestures for marking esteem, the calendar and identity. When we shop we are creating

patterns of consumption that illustrate the broader patterns of society (Douglas and Isherwood 1). society (1). As a society we have been programmed to consume charity and consume the societal changes that surface with its' so-called popular issues.

Consumption is part of life and provides both basic needs and pleasures, but the ultimate question is not *what* we purchase, but *how* the goods are used. Goods are both ends and means wherein others continually scan your possessions for the meanings they contain (Douglas and Isherwood xxii). The goods we consume reveal to others our lifestyle, personality and position in society and because of this marking function we create communities of similar co-consumers with significant inclusion and exclusion standards (Douglas and Isherwood xxii). Consumption is never static, but continually ebbing and flowing with societal trends and technology. This can be illustrated in the nonprofit world when donors choose an organization or cause to support based on the profiles of other donors or even celebrity advocates. Douglas and Isherwood explain that goods represent social life alignment (5) and this implication is exemplified in the nonprofit world by donor choice. Nonprofit organizations and causes carry with them significant images or, in the words of Douglas and Isherwood, markers. The social life alignment markers that nonprofits carry maybe of “the rebel”, “the protector”, “the savior” and carry titles associated with “environmentalist”, “social welfare advocate”, “women’s rights advocate” and “pro-life advocate”. The charitable cause or social welfare issue as a consumable product conveys an identity onto the consumer. The issue in our highly competitive market is that all nonprofits can’t provide all the persona described above, yet they often attempt to do that very thing.

At the heart of the issue of consumption is motivation. So, as consumers of charity what are we consuming? Are we consuming positive societal change or are we consuming something conspicuous and narcissistic?

Explosion of Celebrity Advocacy and its Impacts

Celebrity Advocacy is a logical offshoot of this self-aggrandizing view of charitable consumption. Chouliaraki warns that the danger of celebrity involvement with charitable work is that it creates an economy of consumption around the relationship with the star instead of the socio-economic issue at hand (2013 109).

Chouliaraki explains that celebrities create a shift in relationship from “spectator and sufferer” (2006 98) to a “confessional” (2006 98) relationship between the celebrity and his/her public (2006 98). This further contributes to the commodification of charity, reinforcing neoliberal market principles and drawing attention away from the nonprofit’s cause. Celebrities represent another type of Karl Marx’s ‘commodity fetishism’ under late capitalism (Daly 378). Much of the recent literature draws attention to the burgeoning scale of celebrity involvement in wider social life and the consequent blurring of the boundaries between politics and popular culture (Daly 37). Celebrities are said to have democratic currency because of their audience appeal, embodying the personification of Max Weber’s ‘charismatic individual’ – as an alternative source of authority within society. Daly discusses how politics is being celebritized while formal authority is being stigmatized; political authority is being ‘outsourced’ to celebrities, whilst politicians are captivated by the aura of celebrity. Daly links the rise of celebrities to “the hollowing out of the state under neoliberalism and envisages them as part of a discursive network of governance composed of elites incorporated by the state to shape

and promote its agenda among a public disinterested in conventional politics” (40). Some celebrities, while chastising Western governments for doing little to alleviate humanitarian disasters in the global South, adopt neoliberal solutions that involve shifting part of the responsibility to Western individuals as consumers. Celebrities link development with ‘ethical’ consumption, where the purchase of everyday goods becomes entangled with ethical and moral values that fill our need for gratifying consumption (Goodman 108). Examples of this abound from Nike’s pink breast cancer socks to Yoplait yogurt “lids” campaign and a litany of rubber band bracelet causes. In a consumer society happiness is temporary as consumption depends on the perpetual creation of new needs (Daly 382). “Justification of such needs, amidst images of global suffering and poverty, requires some compensatory activities” (Daly 383). Daly draws our attention to this sort of action as ‘causerism’ where consuming ethically has shifted from addressing the problems associated marketing and production of commodities to “solving their manifestations via a cause” (Daly 384) that is often hailed by a celebrity. Celebrity use of wealth and influence in the West to sell branded goods that raise money, fuels the reconstruction of humanitarianism as an economic enterprise and consumption as an ‘ethical’ act. For these celebrity philanthropists, according to Zizek the “market and social responsibility are not opposites; they can be reunited for mutual benefit” (15). Therefore, humanitarian crises resulting from ‘accumulation by dispossession’ are treated in isolation from their economic and geopolitical roots (Daly 379).

Thus, the competitive market driven nonprofit sector has resorted to a manipulative strategy using celebrities to draw attention to their cause and garner both a

financial foothold and secure their relevance to the broader community. It is not to say that all involvement by celebrities in the nonprofit world is negative. These stars do draw attention to important causes in our communities and provide inspiration for the average individual to become involved. There is also some positivity in celebrity's abilities to de-politicize issues thereby bringing government, business and humanitarian organizations together particularly on global scale (Daly 379). Moderation is the key to using celebrity advocacy with careful screening of the partnerships chosen. Furthermore, there must be careful consideration to the presentation of information to avoid commodification of charitable issues at the level of the Band Aid movement both at home and globally. If communication is constitutive, then nonprofit leadership must carefully consider what they want to constitute – fandom or solidarity around issue their organization addresses.

When Celebrity Advocacy is not Enough NPOs Turn to Pathos Laden Appeals

The Band Aid movement of the 1980's kicked off an additional trend in how nonprofits market themselves and their missions. In addition to the use of the celebrity to garner attention and credibility the use of heavily emotional imagery was delivered to the public of starving women and children. Since then it has not become uncommon to see at least one emotionally laced nonprofit "advertisement" if you will in any given day. Sarah McLachlan reaches into our homes on a continuous basis to beseech you to support the Humane Society with heart wrenching images of abused and neglected animals. St. Judes sends daily reminders of the awful toll cancer takes on small children and that it only beginning UNICEF, OXFAM and other large and small organizations have taken to guilt messaging to compensate for the crowded charitable market. In small quantities these appeals can be helpful in enlightening the public about the depth and impacts of certain

issues, but scholars, such as Lillie Chouliaraki have pointed out that this contributes to a “spectacle of suffering” (2006 25) which Musarò states leads to “compassion fatigue” (318). Compassion fatigue occurs when those you are trying to reach turn away feeling helpless in the face of a seemingly hopeless situation (Hibbert 726). Chouliaraki also points out that this does not create solidarity, but instead builds more existential distance between the observer and sufferer (2006 25). Building solidarity requires the empowerment of both the spectator/potential funder and the distant suffering other (Chouliaraki 2006 25). In instances where there is a reliance on extreme *pathos* the “spectator” (Chouliaraki 2006 1) becomes focused on the immediate visual crisis at the expense of the underlying socio-economic and political reasons that have resulted in the immediate crisis in view (Chouliaraki 2006 16). The theatricality involved in images of suffering turns solidarity from conviction to choice and it becomes not about vision and others, but about lifestyle and self (Chouliaraki 2012 3). Chouliaraki calls this the “ironic spectator of the suffering other” (2006 1). A significant problem with the theatrically crafted *pathos* driven imagery is that the viewer substitutes his own imagination of the situation, of the suffering being experienced for the true reality and what arises, Musarò tells us is a “banality of goodness” (317). This banality of goodness generates generalized suspicion and apathy equivalent to compassion fatigue (Musarò 321).

Philanthropy in Ancient Greece – Metaphor of Virtuous Friendship

The history of philanthropy should not be confused with the history of giving alone, in fact it is a lot less about giving and more about multi-layered relationships (Cunningham 44). The dominant metaphor for the Greek understanding of philanthropy lies in friendship. The word philanthropy or *φιλανθρωπία* – *filanthropia* first appeared in

Prometheus Bound, a 5th century BC Greek play where its meaning is best defined as “caring about, seeking and nourishing human potential” or “regard for humankind” (Cunningham 8). Philanthropy in Greek society was connected to one’s own family, friends, fellow citizens and was utilized to further one’s own character or reputation within the city-state (Ojvind 2). The Greek understanding of philanthropy revolved around the idea of cultivating oneself and others, but not all others as the Greeks stood in contrast to the ‘barbarians’ of the rest of the world (Ojvind 2). Three things characterized the Greek understanding of philanthropy. First, it typically was reserved for the powerful and wealthy, such as Gods, kings and highly ranked citizens. Second, it does not include everyone, but instead only certain social groups such as citizens in one’s town or members of one’s language and cultural community. Third, it doesn’t stem from unselfishness or altruism, but because human friendship has advantages (Ojvind 3). Even Aristotle’s references to philanthropy make it clear that it is not universal and was in the context of specific friends (Ojvind 3). This is in stark contrast to the ‘love of’ concept that we typically associate with philanthropy. Initially, conceived of as a way in which Gods of Greek mythology interacted with humans, philanthropy implicated power relations (Cunningham 8). However, because it flowed through the social and civic networks of obligation and help cultivated by the ancient Greeks, philanthropy maintained an element of reciprocity (Cunningham 8). Therefore, from the very beginning, philanthropy was structured to solve collective problems practically and strategically through value laden judgements (Cunningham 8).

Philanthropy for the Greeks lived in the realm of strategic friendship and a moral citizenship of care where the telos is oriented directly to the well-being of the other as a

friend (even at a distance). A friend, says Aristotle, is “someone who wishes for and does good things . . . for the sake of the other person, or who wants the friend to be and to live for the friend’s own sake” (Aristotle XI). The moral vision that directs philanthropy is the recognition that “life is difficult for one who is alone,” and that “a human being is meant for a city and is such a nature as to live with others” that “it is necessary for a happy person to have friends” because happiness is an activity that requires contact with others. The content of that contact is the mutual benefit of friendship, which when extended to broader horizons of kinship, time, and space, makes strangers into friends. “A friend, who is another self,” says Aristotle, “supplies what someone is incapable of supplying by himself,” and, conversely, “the excellent person will need people for him to benefit” (Aristotle IX). This component of self-love is seen in Greek philosophy as *philautia* and is described in Plato’s laws as “every man is naturally his own friend” (O’Donovan 15). In *Eudemian Ethics* Aristotle elaborates on his theory of friendship stating that it is based in self-esteem by recognition that what we value in the friend is what we value in ourselves (O’Donovan 15). The *logos* found in Greek philanthropy is the reciprocity of friendship and moral citizenship of care. Both nonprofit organizations and supporters, as well as potential supporters should ask how the relationship between the two is reciprocal and to what end is the reciprocity.

Philanthropy in Early Rome – Metaphor of Civitas

The Romans built on the Greek conception of philanthropy, but for them philanthropy was a universal concept that should be extended beyond one’s own culture, even to the ‘barbarian’, according to Cicero (Ojvind 9). *Civitas* is the metaphor that drives a Roman understanding of philanthropy and is grounded in humanism. *Civitas* is

the concept of binding the citizenry together through the law wherein you have rights tied to responsibilities. Cicero ties humanism to the concept of philanthropy where he comments that the Roman's owe something, essentially to all humanity, for the success of the Roman culture and way of life (Ojvind 9). Cicero's *humanitas*, which would lay the ground for Christianity's teachings on philanthropy and tithing, was based in ideas of politeness, modesty and sensitivity to others. The Roman Empire was the first to enact state sponsored assistance for poor women and children and created a program of frumentation which gave away grain or sold it for less than the cost of production (Aftyka 151). Roman philanthropy strongly illustrates the reciprocal nature of philanthropy through rights and responsibilities. Under the protection of rich families and wealthier citizens were poor citizens or plebeians. Basic duties of the plebeian citizens included daily greeting of the sponsor, accompanying him in the processions and giving support during the elections. In return, the patricians invited them to feasts, defended them in court or supported them with clothing, food, and money (Aftyka 151).

The protection of the Roman state over the poor was strongly associated with politics, and specifically with the concern of the rulers to keep the people in a relative peace. The concern for lower levels of society took various forms aimed at countering the waste of money at the expense of the poverty of their fellow citizens such as decrees restricting food, limiting the issuance of feasts and their pompousness. Hadrian abolished the basic problem in Lazio, namely the general indebtedness of citizens (Aftyka 151). The *logos* found in civitas is with rights come responsibilities. The *logos* or good reason for each stakeholder involved with a nonprofit is defined by what right they see generating what type of responsibility. As with the Romans does an abundance of food,

shelter and basic needs evoke a responsibility to feed another? This will vary depending on the narrative of each stakeholder, but it is beholden upon the nonprofit to identify what 'right' driven 'responsibilities' these varied stakeholders hold dear.

Medieval and Judeo-Christian Tradition- Metaphor of Caritas

Judaism, one of the oldest religions, has always taught that alms giving is a gesture that imitates God's love for us as we show love for our brothers and the poor. Christianity follows suit and we can see throughout even the earliest parts of the Bible that generosity for the poor is more than mere philanthropy it is of the highest religious import. For the Medieval person two entities ruled their lives: the state and the church. In fact, the church was a state. The role of religion in the middle ages was central to individual and community life. Thus, the directives of the Bible became, in some instances, more important than any other activity or engagement. While it has already been illustrated that philanthropy was not a new concept, the way charity was delivered and the status it held in society was new in the Middle Ages and laid the groundwork for our modern sense of charity and philanthropy. As early as there is evidence of Western Christianity, the church taught that a dying man "was in duty bound to make such atonement as was possible for the wrongs that he had done and to devote to the relief of the poor and other pious works a portion of the wealth he was leaving behind him." For this teaching of the church the authority of Scripture: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul . . .and thy neighbor as thyself" (Mark 12:30- 31). "Give and it shall be given unto you . . ." (Luke 6:38) And as it is said in Matthew 25:34-40: Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an

hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me Verily, I say unto you, In as much as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me” (Moe 141).

Few texts have had more consequences than these. For what these texts do is to urge men to give generously to what we call charity and to assure that, if they do, their actions will be pleasing to God and will merit the reward of heaven. Gifts to charity were given as the price of salvation, to make peace with heaven. Thus, salvation at a price is the theme of practically all medieval wills and conveyances to what were then called pious uses and later came to be charity in a more modern sense (Moe 142). Thus, there is no doubt that the concept of the self-serving nature which is evident still in society today. Saint Augustine, one of the first fathers of the Church (354 -430) was a significant figure within the early Church because he reconciled Greek philosophical and rhetorical thought with the emerging Christian faith. Augustine, born in Roman territory in North Africa to a Christian mother and pagan father began his early life he was schooled in grammar and rhetoric were hoped to fuel a career high within the Roman Empire, but in 387 after a long struggle reconciling differing beliefs he was baptized by Bishop Ambrose and eventually became the Bishop of Hippo. St. Augustine’s concept of ‘love thy neighbor’ dominates the Christian understanding of philanthropy through duty of generosity towards our fellow man. This is the concept of caritas. Caritas is love of generosity and creative grace exemplified by the Christian God. St. Augustine defines caritas as the theological virtue that connects man to God. It is the idea that love of God and love thy neighbor come together in Caritas. Caritas means that the “outward sign of

mercy is the sign of the indwelling “amor dei” (Freyaan 69-70). For St. Augustine, love of God and love of neighbor are inseparable. *Augustine speaks of this in terms of the Church: if we love God, we love Jesus, God incarnate; and if we love Jesus, we love all the members of his body, the Church. It is important to note that Augustine’s love of the Church also includes all those who might one day be members of the Church, all those for whom Christ died, which is everyone. Augustine speaks directly to the Bible verse in 1 John 4:20: “He that loves not his brother whom he sees, how can he love God whom he sees not?”* Augustine blends Greek philosophy with Christian doctrine and this blend is illustrated in his definition of love he calls *charitas* relates to the Greek concept of *agape* or selfless friendship or care for another (O’Connor 45). Christian *agape* is not born of emotion and feelings as might be the Greek’s concept of *eros*, but instead of a collective commitment to humankind (O’Connor 45). *Eros* for Augustine finds value in an object versus *agape* which creates value (O’Donovan 13). Augustine goes further and discusses the concept of loving others as you love yourself even though there is controversy over the proclaimed self-love that Augustine discusses. If we love each other as we love ourselves and we love ourselves as creations of God then this is the idea that fuels charity through love of thy neighbor.

In Augustine’s first book of *De Doctrina Christiana* he set out to reconcile the paradox of love of God, which we are told in the Bible, is the only thing we should love, the only ‘good’ and ‘proper’ love and the edict of love thy neighbor, also in the Bible. It is worthy of note that both the ancient Greeks and Augustine maintained different kinds of love and chose different words to account for the differing kinds. In *De Doctrina* Augustine uses the words *uti* and *fruitio* or use and enjoyment to explain the twofold

command of loving God and thy neighbor (O'Donovan 25). Use became a kind of love for Augustine where human beings might be used for kindness or, in the case of our enemies for patience and *fruitio* became love in the possession of "supreme good" (O'Donovan 25). Through this use-enjoyment pair Augustine reconciled love of God with love of thy neighbor. Furthermore, this logic provides an order to love, in other words, which things should be loved first, second etc. Thus, in Augustine we see that loving others is intimately tied to loving ourselves which harkens back to Aristotle's ideas on friendship where we identify values in others that we value in ourselves. In the philanthropic world then there is more than almsgiving as moral duty or obligation, but as self-illustration of morality we find valuable. This egoist view suggests that "only in the revealed moral law" can we "learn what behaviors are in our best interest" (O'Donovan 8).

Nearly one-thousand years later, nearing the end of the middle ages Thomas Aquinas lays out his definition of charity as "friendship of a person for God" (Adam 208). Aquinas also grappled with the concept of reconciling 'love thy neighbor' with love of God. Aquinas' claim that "in love of a neighbor is included love of God as an end is included in the means." In other words, Aquinas gives us a primary/secondary distinction understood as the ends/means distinction. Thus, with charity I am to love my neighbor for God's sake just as I love wine for the sake of or means to pleasure (Adam 208). Aquinas uses this example, following Aristotle, to point out a deficient kind of love. We don't love wine for its own sake, and so there is no true friendship for wine. What we can have for wine is *concupiscence*, which is an understanding of love as desire, passion or lust (Adam 208). Therefore, what Aquinas seems to be saying about charity is that there

is no true friendship for fellow sinners (Adam 208). God is the ‘primary object’ of charity in the sense that God is the only genuine object of charity. Fellow sinners are ‘secondary objects’ of charity in the sense that they are not genuine objects of charity, they are somehow merely a means to the love of God, as the wine is merely a means to pleasure. On this view, charity does not involve a genuine friendship for God and one's neighbor; the genuine friendship is for God alone (Adams 208). Within the Thomist tradition, love is addressed with a wide “metaphysical sense to mean a movement toward, or force maintaining cohesion and unity, whether of universe at one extreme or of the individual personality at the other” (O’Donovan 4). This concept of self-regard or egoism illustrates the concept that moral obligations flow from an ultimate obligation of personal fulfillment (O’Donovan 7). Certainly, today in the philanthropic world there is a sense of charity as a means to an end in the Aquinas tradition wherein that end is fulfillment of some sort through giving and volunteer work. Thus, the *logos* dominant in the idea of *caritas* is personal fulfillment, duty to love thy neighbor and responsibility – I am my brother’s keeper. By capturing these metaphors in their mission and messaging nonprofits return to communal spirit of accomplishing something for the whole of humanity and attract stakeholders on the *logos* of personal fulfillment through care and responsibility.

Philanthropy in the Renaissance/Age of Discovery and Enlightenment – Metaphor of Humanism

As the Renaissance era took hold across Europe there was an increased focused on humanism which as the Protestant Reformation exploded the world saw a unique combination of theology, philosophy and humanism. This phenomenon provided new

ways of understanding philanthropy, again as a type of love or friendship, wherein all human beings are equal, combined with a sense of duty to do good. Human love is determined as a fundamental principle as a natural right in Enlightenment Protestantism where love contributes to the creation of welfare for all humans in society and is in fact the highest duty in natural law (Ojvind 7). Johan Gottfried von Herder summarizes the human and the protestant theological perspective on the notion of human love and human friendship (*philanthropy*) by stating that humanity has its origin in human beings' own sentiment, disposition and nature, while at the same time it is a fulfillment of the Christian commandment to love thy neighbor (Ojvind 7).

Around 1520 there was an international movement for welfare reform that shifted charitable action away from church control and into the hands of layman and sometimes government (Cunningham 45). This movement did not mean that the church no longer concerned itself with charity, but rather there was a shift from giving to religious causes to “attending to the secular needs of humanity” (Cunningham 45). These laymen were conspicuous in their funding and soon almost merchants from almost every Western European town began to establish new charities over which they maintained control and not the church (Cunningham 45). By the beginning of the 17th century the lines between public and private began to blur as the English government began taxing people to pay for the poor relief, but this was still considered charity (Cunningham 45). Poor relief could be granted for a variety of reasons a ‘logic of charity’ was instituted by elites and the bourgeoisie which felt that “poor relief could be ‘used’ to regulate the labor market, stabilize social order, avert turmoil, reduce the risk of infection, affirm their own status, forward a career and web of patronage, promote one’s own salvation, and ‘civilize’ the

poor (Cunningham 45). This is the *logos* of humanism. Need was not the directive for charity and the poor were forced to resort to strategies including pawning, revolting, begging and prostitution and turned charity into a site of power relations that could be negotiated. The poor understood that they had to adopt certain behaviors if they wanted help. These behaviors included certain types of body movements and language, as well as letter writing for entry into almshouses (Cunningham 46). It is interesting to think that these letters could be viewed as the first grant applications. In this, we can begin to see societal trends towards charity and philanthropy that manifest in today as corporate social responsibility programs, celebrity advocacy and the commodification of philanthropy into philanthrocapitalism (discussed in depth later in the chapter).

Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel take two influential positions that also relate to the metaphor of humanism. Kant argues that that human love (*philanthropy*) should be understood in ethical terms as a moral duty that should be realized in practice in relation to other humans (Kant 25-26). Kant's universal thinking creates a concept of humanity that encompasses all human beings and in so doing, develops a notion of a universal human right. Freedom, for Kant is the meaning of human right (Ojvind 7). Kant writes: "*Freedom* (independence from being constrained by another's choice), insofar as it can coexist with the freedom of every other in accordance with a universal law, is the only original right belonging to every man by virtue of his humanity" (Kant 43).

In opposition to Kant, Hegel claims that Kant's understanding of philanthropy is too limited because it is entirely abstract and lacking in the concrete (Hegel qtd in Ojvind 7). Therefore, Hegel claims that philanthropy or the moral should be incorporated as a

form of ethical life (*Sittlichkeit*) in the institutions of society and the state can't stand alone (Hegel qtd in Ojvind 7). Hegel operates with a developed concept of civil society based on some of the concepts he finds in Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, which become evident in his *Philosophy of Right*. One of Smith's biggest merits is his creation of a social theory in which civil society formed the center of society in contrast to the state. Although Hegel had integrated Smith's perspective in his *Philosophy of Right* Hegel elevates the family and civil society into the state as the real basis for philanthropy. A consequence is that although Hegel regards private philanthropic donations, almsgiving, etc., as a good and necessary "subjective help", private philanthropy is, according to Hegel, accidental (Hegel 242). Hegel regards it as necessary that the state sustains public organizations like public poorhouses and hospitals. (Hegel qtd in Ojvind 7). Therefore, Hegel emphasizes the right and duty of the corporation, under the supervision of the public authority, (Ojvind 7) to take care of its own members and protect them against "particular contingencies:" in that sense to be a "second family" for its members (Hegel 252). The family is the first ethical root of state, and the corporation is the second, and it is based in civil society (Hegel 255).

Smith's first major work is *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* is concerned with 'the moral sentiment' as the authority, through which we relate to other persons. In other words, we can have sympathy for other people and this sympathy can motivate us to do good deeds for other people. As an expression of 'philanthropy', Smith speaks about 'benevolence' and 'beneficence'. Benevolence means the sentiment that a person has who would like to do good towards another person (Smith 245). Beneficence means to do good motivated by the sentiment of benevolence (Smith 239). In this way, philanthropy

can be defined as a beneficent action that is motivated by a benevolent sentiment (Ojvind 8). We use this in the context of the word ‘sympathy’, which comes of the Greek word *sympatein*, meaning to feel or suffer with another person. However, it is Smith’s general moral philosophical opinion that the sentiment of sympathy is insufficient to sustain a society. In the end, human beings are fundamentally selfish. Therefore, according to Smith, we need to have laws that can mediate human selfishness (Ojvind 8).

Smith places self-interest at the center of his societal theory. In civil society, the essential thing is to optimize one’s own possibilities and happiness. Smith has the famous dictum that it is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker, that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. Therefore, we should never talk to them out of our own ‘necessities’ but only of their ‘advantages’ in their business (Smith 25). According to Smith, no one except the beggar chooses to depend on others’ benevolence (Smith 73). But even the beggar must act rationally and strategically in the same way as all others to fulfill his immediate needs. The beggar must, according to Smith, like everybody else, make arrangements with other people, exchange basic requirements of life and do his best to attain the objects of his desires (Ojvind 8). Smith’s ideas lead to an understanding of enlightened self-interest which leads corporate philanthropy or corporate social responsibility today as companies seek to ‘partner’ with nonprofits in ways that somehow increase their bottom lines. These humanist ideas of equality, rights and morality fueled the French and American Revolutions and ultimately ended the institution of slavery. The *logos* from this era that can provide direction for the nonprofit today and lay the groundwork for solid relationships with stakeholders can be found in equality of all

human beings and being a vehicle of change that improves the whole of humanity, including ourselves.

Philanthropy in the Age of the Robber Barons/Turn of the 20th Century – Metaphor of Responsibility for and Investment in Public Interests

As the 19th century came to a close, the industrial robber barons were poised to extend philanthropy at a magnitude never seen before. The fortunes amassed by the industrial robber barons was both unimaginable and names like John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Henry Ford and Cornelius Vanderbilt became household names that still maintain, over a century later, their elite reputations for wealth, prestige and business acumen (Zunz 1). Andrew Carnegie conducted philanthropy with the same tenacity he used to streamline his steel operations and late in his life he “resolved to stop accumulating” and began “the infinitely more serious and difficult task” of what he termed “wise distribution.” (Carnegie qtd in Zunz 1). Carnegie’s philanthropic motivations were two-fold. He wanted everyone to know that he had reached his decision to become a philanthropist as a matter of duty or “gospel of wealth” (Carnegie qtd in Zunz 1) that obligated him to return to society what he had taken, but it was also important to him to approach this duty following the same intelligent managerial principles that had made him a rich man (Zunz 1). Carnegie’s approach to philanthropy was popular and over the course of the next century, philanthropists and their advisers followed in his footsteps, perfecting the art of spending money for the common good (Zunz 1). While Carnegie and his peers were clearly committed to and saw the importance of giving back their inspiration to create good in the community was coupled

with an exhilaration for the recognition of both his generosity and his business savvy (Zunz 2). The robber baron's innovation was in conceiving of philanthropic funding as another financial investment where they used their business skills to minimize the risk of their speculations thereby, greatly enlarging the scope of their charitable giving. Charitable givers of more modest means also had more modest goals and did not expect much in return for their generosity. What may have been true of the charitable giver 100 years ago, is no longer true of the modern philanthropic funder. American philanthropy has become a capitalist venture in social betterment, not an act of kindness as understood in Christianity" (Zunz 2).

Regardless of the motivation or approach, these early philanthropists provided inspiration across the U.S. and the world for giving back. Throughout the early part of the 20th century there was a rise in giving by people of modest means and new community efforts were created to expand the impact of those modest dollars through the development of community chests, which became the United Way, and community foundations (Zunz 2). The now established nonprofit sector began taking on many social injustices throughout the early half of the 20th century including workers' rights, child labor laws, women's suffrage, ethical treatment for the handicapped, mentally challenged.

In 1948, following the end of WWII and its significant human atrocities, it became evident that a global entity needed to be created that would incorporate a variety of the historical philosophical and theological concepts of human equality and ultimately philanthropy. This movement created the United Nations and the following declaration enforced a standard for modern philanthropy: "All human beings are born free and equal

in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.” (UN qtd in Ojvind 12). This declaration is significant, not only in identifying the equality of all human beings, but also in identifying our moral duty to help our fellow human beings. During the 1960’s nonprofits, headed by Martin Luther, Ella Baker and others, led the way to equality for African Americans based on historical concepts of human equality and equal dignity. Again, we can see a *logos* emerging that focuses on the equality of all accompanied by responsibility to fellow man.

Conclusion

The commodification and use of celebrities is not horrible or unexpected in modernity, but unchecked, can lead to sense aimlessness which in turn leads to mission and message slip from a sense of ‘chasing dollars’ and fitting the image of the celebrity or entity outside the organization. This line of thinking explains the existence of nonprofit organizations in response to “failures of the market, including information asymmetry, lack of perfect competition, and excessive transaction costs; or failures of the government, such as the free-rider problem and the need to ensure political neutrality” (Koschmann 140). Historical metaphors defining concepts of philanthropy over time began with the ancient Greek’s concept of virtuous friendship and moved through historical moments: Roman - *civitas*, Christian/Medieval - *caritas*, Renaissance/Age of Discovery/Enlightenment eras - humanism, turn of the century industrial revolution and robber barons – investment in and responsibility for public interests. Throughout these time periods communities, starting with ancient Greece and ending as late as the 1970’s, viewed philanthropy in more cooperative, collaborative and collective ways. These

historical views of philanthropy were clear that it must be grounded in *logos*, but not a *logos* that we might construe today as statistics or numerical, but in the idea of logical reasoning. By giving fellow humans good reasons to help their fellow man there was no need to rely solely on misguided *ethos* or *pathos*. Market mechanisms do not convert into the type of *logos* that modern man needs to support a philanthropical cause. Today, as in the past, people need to logically understand their own reasons for becoming involved with a nonprofit organization. People should be focusing on the questions within their own narratives that drive them to support their fellow man, animals or the environment without that understanding the support is hollow and unsustainable. Nonprofits today must move away from the temptation to commodify themselves and move towards a deeper understanding of how they can connect to the narratives of their stakeholders or potential stakeholders. While no two narratives are the same there are common threads that nonprofits can identify particularly based on the historical metaphors of philanthropy. For instance, one group or type of stakeholder may value virtuous friendship, another civic duty and yet another Christian love of thy neighbor. All these provide a strong *logos* of support for the organization and its' mission. Using the historical references nonprofits can craft communication that exemplifies, not only their own view of their mission and message, but also how that mission and message is experienced by their stakeholders. The philanthropic world could benefit from retrieving its' historical roots in concepts of friendship, humanism and moral duty to guide purpose and messaging that is not commodified with misplaced *ethos* or *pathos* but instead uses *logos* focused on the equality of humanity, brotherly love and a spirit of cooperation.

Building on the idea that *logos* based messaging is missing from nonprofit communication, chapter 3 will turn to rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication, to provide a guide to changing the lived world and conscious experience of nonprofits and their stakeholders. Chapter 3 will look at the following four key scholars to unpack how theory can guide nonprofit messaging: Lilie Chouliaraki, Kenneth Burke, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin. The multidisciplinary work of Lilie Chouliaraki, professor of media and communication at the London School of Economics, on humanitarian communication and the media's portrayal of the suffering of distant others helps to define many of the problems with nonprofit communication today. We can extrapolate from her communication theories of media portrayals to see that nonprofit themselves are using the same tactics. Kenneth Burke, an American literary critic, is best known for his rhetorically based analyses of the nature of knowledge and for his views of literature as "symbolic action," where language and human agency combine. Through this Burke develops a rhetorical theory of identification moves us towards a strategy for nonprofit communication that incorporates *logos*. However, it is the rhetorical theory of invitational rhetoric developed by Foss and Griffin, that creates an answer for nonprofit communication that is meaningful, *logos* driven and creates sustainable relationships with stakeholders. Overall, exploring the theories of Burke, Foss & Griffin and Chouliaraki will help nonprofit messaging that is not over reliant on sources outside the organization, but instead on inside the organization. Turning inward to the nonprofit's mission to direct messaging and build stakeholder relationships that endure and encourage a collective, collaborative philanthropic sector instead of a competitive individualistic environment.

Chapter 3 – Constituting Relationships

Introduction

Previously, I explored the commodification of philanthropy and how the nonprofit sector has been pushed into highly competitive market-based approach to doing their work. The Band Aid movement of the early 1980's was impetus for this commodification and forever changed the way the world views and interacts with philanthropy. This movement in the 1980's pushed the nonprofit sector into a neoliberal market-based approach that enhanced a quick fix philosophy to social problems. As stated in the previous chapters this competitive environment has led nonprofits to rely on the *ethos* of celebrity advocates and the overuse of *pathos* driven messaging instead of relying on the *ethos* inherent in their missions and internal works. Chapter 2 explored an historical view of philanthropy and the dominant metaphors for each historical moment from the Greek's virtuous friendship to the idea of social responsibility exhibited first by the robber barons of the industrial revolution and through the mid-20th century. Each of the metaphors – virtuous friendship, civitas, caritas, humanism and social responsibility give the nonprofit an opportunity to find and use *logos* driven communication that builds strong sustainable relationships with and between stakeholders. The significance of this is that it puts nonprofits in a position use a phenomenological approach to messaging that reflects the experience and consciousness of the relationship between the nonprofit and its' stakeholders in the lived world. This phenomenological approach that searches for and reflects *logos* represents the importance of reciprocal generosity between the nonprofit and stakeholders.

While history helps provide *logos* driven metaphors that can guide our understanding of some of the good reasons people should support philanthropy, the inherent ideas in rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication can give concrete guidance to the objectives of nonprofit communication. Furthermore, a study of rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication provides direction for nonprofit communication that constitutes strong reciprocal relationships that increase stakeholder trust and keep nonprofits on mission focused activities and mission true messaging. Rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication can inform nonprofit communication that balances *logos*, internal mission centered *ethos* and *pathos* which does not cause “compassion fatigue” (Chouliaraki 2012). Additionally, rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication assist in unpacking the phenomenology of the relationship between stakeholder and nonprofit in the lived world.

This chapter will define exactly what we mean by rhetoric and then discuss the theories of Lilie Chouliaraki, Kenneth Burke and Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin. Chouliaraki helps define the problems currently plaguing the nonprofit sector and which have sent them on a continuous feedback loop of competition and commodification. Chouliaraki also aids in understanding the damage of misplaced *ethos* and overuse of *pathos* that constitute shallow relationships that can’t stand the test of time. Burke’s rhetorical theory of identification begins to open up a *logos* based approach to relationship development. However, it is the rhetorical theory of invitational rhetoric developed by Foss and Griffin that give insights into how to use the *logos* of identification to craft meaningful messaging that solidifies long-term reciprocal relationships.

Defining Rhetoric and Philosophy of Communication

While the term rhetoric is commonplace it is often misunderstood and used incorrectly and the idea of philosophy of communication can be illusive. According to Aristotle, rhetoric is "the faculty of discovering in any particular case all of the available means of persuasion" (vii). For Cicero rhetoric is "one great art comprised of five lesser arts: *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, and *pronunciatio*" (Bizzel and Herzberg 35). Rhetoric is speech designed to persuade and is as inherent in the human being as breathing. Rhetoric comes about in almost every communication we as humans make, including our nonverbal communication and life choices. We are animals with *logos* or as Charles Taylor put it in his book, *The Language Animal*. The ultimate question is what are we persuading others to do or think and why and what tools might we use for the effective delivery of the message? Aristotle's theory of rhetoric gave three us three rhetorical devices: *ethos*, *pathos* and *logos*. Bizzel and Herzberg tell us that "rhetoric has a number of overlapping meanings from the practice of oratory to the study of the relation between knowledge and language" (1) that include the study of persuasive effects of language and the use of tropes and figures (Bizzel and Herzberg 2). Isocrates gives us the idea that rhetoric is both a branch of philosophy, defined as the ability to arrive at the best course of action, and a tool of persuasion (Benoit 254). Aristotle, on the other hand links rhetoric to dialectics and ethics wherein he states that, "rhetoric is a combination of the science of logic and of the ethical branch of politics" (Benoit 254). An understanding of the roots of rhetorical theory will help as move into more contemporary rhetorical theories.

Isocrates gives us the idea that rhetoric is both a branch of philosophy, defined as the ability to arrive at the best course of action, and a tool of persuasion (Benoit 254).

Aristotle, on the other hand links rhetoric to dialectics and ethics wherein he states that, "rhetoric is a combination of the science of logic and of the ethical branch of politics" (Benoit 254).

While Aristotle developed the three commonly known modes of rhetorical proofs of *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos* defining *ethos* requires us to look closely at both Aristotle and Isocrates. *Ethos* is one of the three rhetorical proofs, but it becomes evident through Isocrates writings that he valued it as the most important proof over *pathos* and *logos*. Isocrates firmly attributes a man's prior reputation to be of the utmost import for persuasion (Benoit 257). Isocrates stresses that it is the speaker's prior reputation that concerns him the most with statements like: "men of good repute," "men who live under a cloud" (Isocrates qtd. in Benoit 257). Benoit points out that Isocrates juxtaposes the "argument which is made by a man's life" with "that which is furnished by words" (Isocrates qtd in Benoit 257). In the *Antidosis*, his meaning becomes very clear he declares that "probabilities and proofs and all forms of persuasion support only the points in a case to which they are applied, whereas an honorable reputation not only lends greater persuasiveness to the words of the man who possesses it but adds greater luster to his deeds" (Benoit 257).

Aristotle varies from Isocrates on his understanding of *ethos* and relies less on prior reputation and more on how his knowledge of a topic and delivery of speech further his reputation. Benoit quotes Aristotle's saying, "this kind of persuasion like the others, should be achieved by what the speaker says, not by what people think of him before he

begins to speak" (257). For Aristotle *ethos* is developed from audience perception during the speech.

Today, the concept of linking the “efficacy of the speech to the credibility of the orator” (Amossy 2) has stretched into a variety of disciplines beyond rhetoric including sociology. Ruth Amossy is a Professor Emeritus in Department of French of Tel-Aviv University and is the author of several works on stereotype and cliché, as of a synthetic work intended to integrate argumentation studies into the linguistics of discourse.

Amossy brings forward the question of whether Is the power of speech, bound up with the authority and credibility of the orator, an integral dimension of verbal exchange? Should *ethos* be considered as a purely language-related construction or as an institutional position? These questions are germane to this work as we look the use of *ethos* by nonprofits and attempt to understand the use of celebrity advocacy.

In the mid-20th century Chaim Perelman’s new rhetoric situates “argumentation as the verbal means by which an orator aims at obtaining or reinforcing the adherence of the audience to some thesis” (Perelman 11). For Perelman the study of argumentation is conducive to sociological applications because, he says the discourse of the orator is oriented toward the public. According to Perelman, it is “an essential fact for the sociologist” (qtd in Amossy 6) that “all argumentation develops in function with the audience to whom it is addressed and to whom the orator is obliged to adapt himself” (qtd in Amossy 6). Therefore, the orator, speaking a language understood by his audience, only develops his argumentation by hanging it onto theses accepted by his hearers. The thesis and argumentation are fully dependent upon what is recognized as true, as normal, as believable and valid (Amossy 6). Thus, the importance of the audience entails an

emphasis on the values and norms outside of which any dialogue is impossible. By drawing on common knowledge and beliefs the orator attempts to make an interlocutor share his or her views. For Perelman, argumentation must lead the audience by using the commonplaces shared by participants to garner agreement on the given to the premises (Amossy 6). Perelman's conception of the new rhetoric relates to Calvin Schrag's point that all communication is by, about and for. Wherein, all communication changes depending on the orator, audience and topic. This way of understanding rhetoric, particularly *ethos*, will clarify the socially based theories of Bourdieu, Burke and Invitational Rhetoric of Foss and Griffin.

Pathos, or appeal to emotion, was another of Aristotle's rhetorical devices. *The Encyclopedia of Rhetoric and Composition*, defines *pathos* as "an argumentative/persuasive appeal to the emotions of the audience" (492). Of the three basic appeals (*ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*), *pathos* "is based upon the rhetor's ability to arouse certain types of emotions in the audience" (493). *The Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* defines *pathos* in Greek rhetoric as a state which is "allied with the Greek verb *paskhein*, to undergo, experience, suffer, or more generally, to be in a state or condition, and the Greek noun *pathos* preserves this range of meaning" (555). If we look closely at these definitions we see a range of understanding that goes from some rhetors who consider *pathos* nothing more than a sense of the state of orator's mind influencing his rational capacity for decision making to a "thorough analysis of the human soul and its broader relations to language and perception" (Myer 6). So, *pathos* is a complex rhetorical tool and to fully understand it we should look at its' history.

The idea of *pathos* grows into the complex appeal it is today beginning with the classical Greek philosophers. Plato seems to have little use for an emotional appeal of any kind which he illustrates in the dialogue *Gorgias* as he condemns the use of rhetoric in almost any form. Later, though, in several places, including *Phaedrus*, Plato discusses the use of emotion in speech, stating “the task before rhetoricians is to gain better knowledge of the kinds of souls and the kinds of emotions which appeal to those souls through speech” (Plato qtd. in Myer 6) As Michael J. Hyde says: “By setting up an opposition between emotion and reason whereby emotion is conceived as an irrational impulse destructive of a person’s thoughtful judgment, Plato could discredit both the mythopoetic and rhetorical uses of discourse because of their intentional and solitary appeal to this impulse” (Hyde 122). Aristotle, Plato’s student, discusses the pathetic appeal at some length in his *Rhetoric*. Aristotle begins by defining emotions as “all those feelings that so change men as to affect their judgements, and that are also attended by pain or pleasure. Such are anger, pity, fear and the like, with their opposites” (Aristotle qtd in Myer 7). Aristotle delineates what Hyde calls “a more positive conception of emotion and its relationship to rhetorical and poetic discourse than allowed by Plato” (Hyde 123). As Hyde notes, “For Aristotle, then, the emotional character of human beings plays an important role in their development; it constitutes a person’s spirited potential for coming to know what is true, just, and virtuous” (Hyde 123). In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle sets about to define and to discuss the various 16 emotions used by rhetors and to advise rhetors on how to generate each in speech. Aristotle defines pity as “a feeling of pain caused by the sight of some evil, destructive or painful, which befalls one who does

not deserve it, and which we might expect to befall ourselves or some friend of ours, and moreover to befall us soon” (Aristotle qtd. in Myer 7).

The Romans too, specifically Cicero, greatly added to our understanding of *pathos* by reinforcing the importance Aristotle placed on analyzing the audience to create *pathos*, and by calling for the placement of the most pathetic appeals in the conclusion. In Cicero’s *On Oratory and Orators*, he stresses how important audience analysis is to oratory, stating the rhetor “must penetrate the inmost recesses of the mind of every class, age, and rank, and must ascertain the sentiments and notions of those before whom he is pleading” (Cicero qtd. in Myer 10). Cicero again stresses audience analysis, saying the orator must know “what their sentiments and opinions are, what they expect, to which side they incline, and to what conclusion they are likely to be led, with least difficulty, by the force of oratory” (Cicero qtd. in Myer 10).

Christianity contributed to our understanding of *pathos* with St. Augustine’s writings. stressing that the orator must “speak sweetly”, (Augustine qtd. in Myer 11) emphasizing that *what* you say and *how* you say something are both part of the pathetic appeal. Of the low, middle, and grand styles, St. Augustine saw the grand style as particularly suited for moving the will, what *The Encyclopedia of Rhetoric* calls using “all linguistic sources” (577). Thus, employing the powerful stylistic device of repeating similar syntactic structures himself, St. Augustine suggests that the listener is convinced if the rhetor realizes that the audience is:

“persuaded if he loves what you promise, fears what you threaten, hates what you condemn, embraces what you commend, sorrows at what you maintain to be sorrowful; rejoices when you announce something delightful; takes pity on those whom you place before him in

speaking as being pitiful, flees those whom you, moving fear, warn are to be avoided; and is moved by whatever else may be done through grand eloquence toward moving the minds of listeners, not that they may do what they already know what is to be done, but that they may do what they already know should be done” (Augustine qtd. in Myer 13).

St. Augustine squarely places rhetoric into a Christian context, which very important. The pathetic appeal for St. Augustine has two significant components: rhetorical knowledge of his secular training in rhetoric, combined with the motivation to use such appeals because they are legitimated by the teachings of Christ who himself used such emotional appeals as pity (Myer 12). From Augustine on linking Christianity with pathetic appeal appears again and again. In the Renaissance when rhetoric is seen to be, according to *The Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*, “a tool given by a Christian God, the better to know God’s universe and bring the soul into closer communion with God” (578). Alexander Campbell, in *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* published in 1776, spent much of that treatise on the role of passion in rhetoric. Campbell saw the passions intricately related to style, concluding that “the kind of address of which I am treating, attains the summit of perfection in the *sublime* (italics in the original), or those great and noble images, which, when in suitable coloring presented to the mind, do, as it were, distend the imagination with some vast conception, and quite ravage the soul” (Campbell qtd in Myer 12). Grounded in these ideas Kenneth Burke connects the pathetic appeal to style. Burke’s theory of rhetoric as symbolic processes of association and disassociation wherein rhetoric as identification is salient to this work in both analyzing and guiding nonprofit messaging and missioning.

Philosophy of communication is an undetachable companion of rhetoric. Ronald C. Arnett and Annette Holba define philosophy of communication as, “interplay of ideas, people and historical situations that shape the dwelling of human meaning” (Arnett and Holba 3). The story of rhetoric and philosophy of communication is a socially and historically rooted search for meaning and where, “philosophy of communication and rhetoric are the praxis of philosophy where we with the other we find meaning, knowledge and understanding through engagement” (Schrag ix). Thus, philosophy of communication plays a role in helping understand the significance of the nonprofit sector and how it shapes meaning for itself, stakeholders and the community. Furthermore, Schrag tells us that communication is always “by”, “about” and “for” (ix). In other words, who is speaking to whom about what is an ever changing and dynamic scenario. The lesson for nonprofits is that one blanket message will likely not be effective to all audiences – “for”. Nonprofits must consider to whom they are sending a message and what the unique situation and relationship is to be maintained or altered. Lilie Chouliaraki’s work on the media’s portrayal of suffering and humanitarian communication can help in identifying how nonprofits are reducing the effectiveness of their messaging. The work of Kenneth Burke can begin to give the nonprofit sector a guide on how to construct Schrag’s by, about and for through his use of rhetoric as identification. Finally, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin’s work on invitational rhetoric sheds the light and direction necessary to nonprofits deploy messaging that relies more on *logos* and less on misguided *ethos* and overdone *pathos*.

Lilie Chouliaraki – Solidarity and Spectatorship

Lilie Chouliaraki is a well renowned professor of media and communication at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Her works include: *The Ironic Spectator: Solidarity in an Age of Post-humanitarianism*, *Spectatorship of Suffering*, *Discourse in Late Modernity*, *Self-Mediation. New Media, Citizenship and Civil Selves*, *Media Organizations, Identity* and *The Soft Power of War* along with more than 60 peer reviewed articles. Her work is dominated by metaphors of distant others, suffering, solidarity and spectatorship. While a great deal of her work focuses on media presentation of global crisis, suffering, and how distant others are portrayed in the media, her work is salient to how nonprofits portray themselves and interact with their stakeholders. Chouliaraki's work focuses on large global humanitarian organizations, however, the criticisms and analysis she brings to bear are universally applicable to most nonprofit organizations today regardless of size or scope of work. Chouliaraki's work helps us see the pitfalls of nonprofit communication today that hinder these organization's ability to develop lasting reciprocal relationships with their stakeholders. She states, "that if we wish to move towards a 'global village' with cosmopolitan values, then we need to critically examine the discourses and practices by which global information flows invite the individual spectator to be a public actor in the contexts of her/his everyday life" (Chouliaraki 2008 2). Chouliaraki illustrates here a *logos* based on the idea of the global village and speaks directly to the type of relationship nonprofits should be constituting through their communication. Although insightful in terms of communication missteps, her work hints at how to fix these messaging problems, wherein she states that communication should invite those on the outside to be part of the work of the nonprofit and not just a spectator who just watches and possibly send donations.

However, her work does not round out a solid path for achieving communication that invites a long-term reciprocal relationship with stakeholders. Kenneth Burke's work on identification, discussed in the following section, helps to provide a path towards communication that solidifies relationships between the organization and the stakeholders. These concepts also tie Fairhurst and Putnam's work on the constitutive nature of communication in organizations to Foss and Griffin's work on invitational rhetoric.

Cosmopolitan citizenship was initially conceived of in ancient Greece where Diogenes, a cynic, used it to criticize the polis during the polis' decline. This was a way for Diogenes to state that the polis no longer had first claim to individual allegiances (Linklater 23). During the enlightenment, Kant used the idea of global citizenship to promote a stronger sense of moral obligation between the people of separate sovereign states (Linklater 23). Since WW II the idea cosmopolitan citizenship has been used to advance a stronger sense of the collective and individual responsibility for the world as a whole. Furthermore, cosmopolitan citizenship challenges the view that individuals first responsibility is to their nation state and is part of the ongoing search for universal rights and obligations that tie us all humanity together (Linklater 23). This language of 'us together' is important because, in Chouliaraki's work, we see that it moves us beyond mere spectatorship and towards more meaningful committed service to each other. Truly, the point of advancing cosmopolitan citizenship is to emphasize a person's membership in two communities – city/state and humanity (Linklater 25). Thus, it is important that nonprofit messaging bring all stakeholders into the fold of the human community which means moving them beyond spectatorship as Chouliaraki tells us. If a person sees a

homeless person on the street and gives that person money or goes home and donates to a shelter this would still be spectatorship, but if a person searches for understanding on the plight and causes of homelessness and inserts themselves into this circumstance through understanding and then supporting holistically, then the person has moved closer to the ideas of global citizenship.

Chouliaraki's focus is on media portrayals of suffering, but the ideas she explores are applicable to nonprofit organization communication as they directly relate to both constitution of relationships and how to invite 'outsiders' into the organization, as well as current stakeholders. Through their systematic choices of word and image, the media don't only expose audiences to the spectacles of distant suffering but, in so doing, they simultaneously expose them to specific dispositions to feel, think and act towards each instance of suffering. In the context of the debate on media and cosmopolitan connectivity, it becomes particularly important to specify which media reports on suffering may dispose audiences towards a passive voyeurism of human pain—as the compassion fatigue argument has it— and which reports may urge them towards active charity and humanitarian action (Chouliaraki 2-3). In other words, she believes messaging through both language and image should move the viewer to action that is possible and effective and states that this is done by discourse that combines emotion for the sufferer with a demand for justice (Chouliaraki 2008 4). Again, what Chouliaraki is getting at are the right practical reasons or *logos* that drive people's actions.

Humanitarian discourse is that too often it reduces “vulnerable and suffering populations to voiceless victims by reifying their condition of victimhood while ignoring their history and muting their words” (Musarò 2013 2). It is not only media

representations that foster a message of global inequality based on ideas of the safe comfortable western world and the non-western world of need and vulnerability, but the vendible communication produced by humanitarian NGOs and governmental organizations. Musarò explicates this paradox “between those who are subjects (the witnesses who testify to the misfortunes of the world) and those who can exist only as objects (the unfortunates whose suffering is testified to in front of the world)” (2015 321). This dichotomous world view seems to imply that politics of compassion is politics of inequality, however if we recognize that moral sentiment rests on other as fellow then politics of compassion becomes politics of solidarity (Didier Fassin qtd in Musarò 2015 321).

Chouliaraki’s questions of what types of emotions do images of suffering evoke and what is the relationship between the emotions and the nature of our call to responsibility to action, is it a self-reflexive or an un-reciprocal responsibility to the distant other. Specifically, how do the aesthetic properties of communication either deploy a shock effect, positive image appeal or what Chouliaraki calls post-humanitarian communication that reduces the emotional intensity and creates a point for self-inspection. Orgad and Nikunen on “making over” humanitarian communication is helpful in explicating ways of diffusing the unequal power relationship between the western world and the global south (237).

In her two seminal works, “The Spectatorship of Suffering” in 2006 and “The Ironic Spectator: Solidarity in the Age of Post-Humanitarianism”, Chouliaraki argues that there has been shift away from doing good that is about common humanity and towards doing good because it makes the individual feel good (Chouliaraki qtd. in Scott 344).

Chouliaraki further explicates these concepts in her article, *Post-humanitarianism: Humanitarian communication beyond a politics of pity* published in 2010. This article is key to understanding humanitarian communication as “as the rhetorical practices of transnational actors that engage with universal ethical claims, such as common humanity or global civil society, to mobilize action on human suffering” (Chouliaraki 2010 108). Chouliaraki analyzes three distinct types of humanitarian communication, shock-effect, positive image and post-humanitarian appeals. These three styles of humanitarian communication work to establish a relationship between Westerner and distant sufferer that fosters certain inclinations toward action (Chouliaraki 2010 108). While her work focuses on mostly large humanitarian organizations operating on a global scale, her points and observations can be seen in nonprofits of all types and sizes.

Shock-effect appeals are victim oriented focusing on the distant other as a spectacle of suffering devoid of those individualizing features such as sex, age, cultural, social or religious affiliation (Chouliaraki 2010 110). Instead, the viewer is exposed to horror invoking images of emaciated body parts, where Chouliaraki states, “bodies become fetishized: they do not reflect real human bodies but curiosities of the flesh that mobilize a pornographic spectatorial imagination between disgust and desire” (2010 110). This causes an objectification of the distant other that reifies the distance between viewer and sufferer and confirms a colonial segregation which creates a moral climate of guilt and shame in danger of Western banal complicity (Chouliaraki 2010 111). Other examples of emotional appeals can be seen in Humane Society ads and with St. Judes, but on a smaller scale many social justice-oriented organizations follow the same pattern of pity driven messaging and imagery. Emotional pleas that generate empathy, sympathy

and pity can generate social justice action however, inundating the market with these types of messages can result in compassion fatigue where the spectator feels ‘I’ve seen this before’ and “what can I really do the problem is too big’. Liz Jackson, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Policy Studies at the University of Hong Kong, explains that because emotions are difficult to predict and maintain appeals to correct social injustice should have an “a priori rational orientation framework” (1071). This rationality does not override appeals to emotion, but instead adds further depth.

Positive image appeals replace victimization images with images that focus on the sufferer’s agency and dignity (Chouliaraki 2010 112). These types of images evoke emotions of tenderheartedness, empathy and gratitude by focusing on the benefactor instead of the persecutor and, by so doing “personalize sufferers by focalizing the appeal on distinct individuals as actors” and “singularizes donors by addressing each one as a person who can make a concrete contribution to improve a sufferer’s life” (Chouliaraki 2010 112). Chouliaraki highlights that these types of appeals preserve a sense of shared humanity that the shock effect imagery does not (2010 112). The critique of positive image appeals is that they fall into an un-reflexive trap of appealing to qualities of sameness and ignore the vast complexities of politics of development that impede social change, as well as, implying a level of gratitude on behalf of the benefactor that further enhances global polarization between the “haves and the have nots” (Chouliaraki 2010 113).

Thus, Chouliaraki argues that, since shock effect appeals become tied to negative feelings of our complicity in global injustice and positive image appeals are tied to positive emotions that further global social and power inequalities, there must be an

appeal that “departs from previous ones in terms of aesthetic quality, problematizing photorealism, and in terms of moral agency, breaking with the traditional registers of pity as motivations for action (guilt and indignation, empathy and gratitude) by not seeking to resolve the contradictions of humanitarian communication but to putting them forward in an explicit way” (Chouliaraki 2010 114). This emergent style of humanitarian communication uses aesthetic representation in what Chouliaraki says is multi-modal juxtaposition that pits our lives and what is familiar against the situations of others in reflexive and thought-provoking ways (2010 115). These types of appeals shift the concept of photorealism away from authentic realism and towards an aesthetic choice to depict or represent suffering. Furthermore, these appeals reinforce a simplified call to action, such as, “pick up a pen” or “with the click of a mouse”. These types of appeals are empowering to the spectator and preserve the dignity of the distant other that neither spectaclizes nor diminishes their suffering (Chouliaraki 2010 118). Amnesty International’s calls to action are an excellent example of Chouliaraki’s aesthetic choice and simplified action. In Amnesty’s *Ink* campaign advertisements the use of cartoon figures instead of images of real people allows the viewer to see the issue without evoking compassion fatigue and is followed by a simple call to action that inspires the viewer that they can make a difference. The video can be found here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iiN7CNJO1gI>.

Chouliaraki’s stance on celebrity advocacy furthers the ideas discussed above. Celebrity advocacy creates a commodified message of suffering wherein a pity becomes a spectacle that is ‘sold’ instead of a push towards solidarity and global citizenship. The celebrity introduces a theatrical component into the dynamics of pity. Celebrities act as

crucial communicative figures who command “the necessary symbolic capital to articulate personal dispositions of acting and feeling as exemplary public dispositions at given historical moment” (Chouliaraki 2012 2). Claims such as Hepburn’s “The world is full, I’ve discovered, of kind people” (Chouliaraki 2012 2) and “I think every human being is filled with compassion,” (Chouliaraki 2012 2) or Angelina Jolie’s “I don’t believe I feel differently from other people. I think we all want justice and equality,” (Chouliaraki 2012 2) illustrate how celebrity articulates aspirational discourse by proposing an altruistic disposition for all to share. However, it is significant to note, as does Chouliaraki, that this discourse impersonates this disposition and through this performance and reference an all-inclusive ‘everybody’ presupposes the altruistic disposition as an already existing virtue of not only the celebrity, but of their public (2012 2).

The logic of the theater, is not just a logic of moral education but also of the market. Through association, putting a famous ‘name to a message’ and having ‘people like you in our corner,’ is how the nonprofits amplify the power of their organizations. This logic of associational representation adds a commercial component to the communicative structure of celebrity, in that there is a transfer of meaning from celebrity to message, for instance “save the children,” simultaneously enacts the corporate strategy of branding which operates by “setting up symbolic relationships of equivalence between unequal “‘goods” with the goal of capitalizing on the existing “‘aura” of one commodity in order to promote another” (Chouliaraki 2012 14). These market strategies are commonplace now because they can reach a greater volume of publics. This transfer is troubling because it places the requirement for authenticity at the

heart of its aspirational discourse and begs the question of with what are these publics identifying? Are they identifying with the celebrity or the person in need or, as Chouliaraki calls it the distant sufferer?

Ultimately, the consequence of celebrity advocates is a reduction of the complex social problems into soundbite politics that carry the logic of a quick fix. Chouliaraki explains that the implications go far beyond the decline of public collectivities, the commodifying nature of inserting celebrities into social justice causes is evidence of the “ecstatic communication of show business, wherein suffering turns into fleeting spectacle without moral content”. (Chouliaraki 2012 15). Kenneth Burke’s work on identification helps to provide a road map for finding that moral content wherein that moral content is the lost *logos* of nonprofit communication.

Kenneth Burke

Kenneth Duva Burke was born in Pittsburgh in 1897 to a working-class family. After spending a couple of years at Ohio State University and Columbia, Burke abandoned formal education to teach himself as he believed it was doing him more harm than good holding him back from becoming, in his own words, “a genius” (Encyclopedia.com/biographies). Burke was a literary theorist and critic and his work not only crossed disciplines itself, but also widely influenced several fields of knowledge, particularly social and political that dealt with symbols (Encyclopedia.com/biographies). As were most theorists and critics of the 1920’s and 1930’s, Burke was heavily influenced by Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud and Friedrich Nietzsche, but unlike many, he avoided dogmatism and his vast library of work exhibits “powerful and original theory marked by paradox, erudition and comic spirit” (Encyclopedia.com/biographies). Burke’s

work on rhetoric as identification is particularly applicable to this work. Since we live in a world naturally defined by segregation we are always seeking to increase congregation or a coming together which happens through identification. Every time we seek to influence or persuade another there is an element expressed of commonality between the rhetor and his audience. Burke goes as far as to say that identification is a “function of sociality” (Burke qtd in Cheney 143). Burke’s work in this area provides a vehicle by which we can analyze nonprofit communication, but it also helps to move us towards a communication model that invites essential long-term stakeholder relationships. Burke’s work begins to plant the seed of how organizations can effectively communicate, but the work of Cindy Griffin and Sonja Foss on invitational rhetoric (discussed in the next section) provides a more solid account of how nonprofit organizations should craft messaging that is mission based and designed to build strong lasting relationships.

Burke’s interest in poetry, literature and music led him to theorize how human relations could be explained through poetry and criticism. Through his writings Burke explored the idea that literature is both a social influence and a reflection of social attitudes and can provide us with a model for human action. “Human action, said Burke, is essentially symbolic action, shaped and motivated as if it were drama” (Quigley 1). In fact, Burke used the term dramatism to describe a way of studying human motivation. The key to dramatism is that human action differs from simple motion or physical movement in that it is free and purposeful (Rosenfeld 175). The structure of human action is dramatic, based on interaction of the five sources of motive that Burke identified in *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) as the pentad: act, agent, agency, purpose, scene (what was done, who did it, by what means, to what end, and where and when?) (Burke qtd in

Quigley 2). This also relates to Calvin Schrag's concept of communication "by, about and for" (15) wherein every utterance changes depending on who speaks, what they speak about and to whom they speak. In order for nonprofits to maintain consistency in their mission/purpose and use appropriate messaging of the mission they must define each piece of Burke's pentad and keep in mind Schrag's by, about and for to avoid mission drift or off mission messaging. Mission drift and off mission messaging will decrease stakeholder trust in the organization.

In *A Rhetoric of Motives* (1950), Burke wrote that rhetoric, or persuasion, is central to any study of the human condition, defining rhetoric as "the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols" (Burke qtd in Encyclopedia.com/biographies). The idea of identification is the key to Burke's conception of rhetoric. For Burke, identification is a recognition of common interests or common "substance," with other humans and works in concert with its' opposite: division (Burke 1969 iiv). Through our perceptions and symbolic relations rhetoric maintains and/or changes the social order (Rosenfeld 175). Although rhetoric is rooted in language, Burke extended its "operation to any human activity in which meaning could be found, and that means all human action" (Rosenfeld 176). "Wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric. And wherever there is 'meaning,' there is 'persuasion.'" (Burke qtd in Quigley 2).

Burke's concept of identification is particularly germane to the work of nonprofit organizations and how they communicate about that work with a variety of stakeholders. Further exploration of Burke's concept of identification is particularly helpful in understanding the draw of nonprofits to use celebrity advocates and how mission and

message can use identification strategies to maintain and expand support. If we look at how Burke uses identification to help define the human condition and our search for meaning we can find many implications for the nonprofit world. Burke explains identification as a process that is fundamental to communicating and therefore in being human. Furthermore, he explains that the need to identify arises out of division; “humans are born and exist as biologically separate beings and therefore seek to identify, through communication, in order to overcome separateness” (Quigley 2). The awareness of our biological separation leads us to recognize vast societal separations. This awareness creates a sense of ambiguity in being separate yet identifying with others: we are “both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another.” (Burke 1969 21). Burke also points out that our awareness of separateness or division generates feelings of guilt about differences between ourselves and others. Brooke Quigley explains that Burke says, “to overcome our division and our guilt, we look for ways in which our interests, attitudes, values, experiences, perceptions, and material properties are shared with others or appear to be shared” (2). Thus, we continually seek certain associations while rejecting others to attain a position in the “hierarchy of social relations and relieve ourselves of the guilt we bear” (Quigley 2).

George Cheney in his article, “The Rhetoric of Identification and the Study of Organizational Communication”, explains there are three types or categories of identification within Burke’s theory and each contain a different strategy or way of communicating. These three strategies are: common ground, identification through antithesis and identification through the transcendental assumed ‘we’ (Cheney 148). Common ground involves language that illustrates ‘I am like you’ in some way. In this

instance the rhetor emphasizes shared values or ideals such as ‘being American’ or having a ‘concern for economic stability’ (Cheney 148). The common ground strategy also credits employees with the success of the organization and recognizes individuals for their contributions. Recognition efforts can include membership in company sponsored clubs, such as a president’s club or top sales club. Organizational communication artifacts that use the common ground strategy are often from management and illustrate commonality through labeling everyone as company people. Cheney gives the examples of Arthur Anderson’s periodical titled “The People of Arthur Anderson”, the Donnelley and Sons Co. publication titled “The Donnelley People” and the Ball Corporation which cites the “people factor” as the root of their success (150). The distinction here is that the communication is employee focused and stresses a sense of belonging and not just a company as a group of people (Cheney 150). Further ways that organization’s create identification is the use of language that unites all employees through a shared sense of values and ideals, as well as, through shared ideas on advocacy and the benefits of being part of the group i.e., training, improved skill and even reputation from association (Cheney 150). A nonprofit could easily use common ground in building stakeholder relationships by presenting a case that could not be refuted. In other words, who would want animals abused or children to die from hunger where the answer is no one thus, showing solidarity around an issue we can all get behind.

The second identification strategy Cheney highlights is identification through antithesis which unites a group against a common enemy. Cheney’s example here is that of oil company’s uniting everyone against government regulation (151). In this strategy the outside entity threatens the company and thereby each employee as well. The most

notable example provided by Cheney is Dupont's "Context" publication which devotes 22 of 25 pages writing each time about a different regulation threat to their business presented in a manner that makes it a threat to each employee (153). The nonprofit organization can, and often does, use this strategy to create a 'war' against common enemies. Unlike with the corporate scenarios the common enemies for the nonprofit organization are not tangible, such as hunger, abuse or violence.

The third strategy of identification is achieved through the assumed or transcendental 'we' that corresponds to a 'they'. This is Dewey's "we that must do something" (35). This strategy assumes a common bond among members of the organization (Cheney 154). Again, the language is unifying, but in this instance the power comes from its subtle nature. Examples include language such as "we all realize the importance of" (Cheney 154). As a result of the subtleness and blatant assumptive nature of the language this strategy of identification often goes unnoticed because audience does not realize they have just been persuaded to believe in an idea of valuation and unquestioningly follow along (Cheney 154). Nonprofit organizations often use this strategy it is like uniting against a common enemy and relies on the idea that no one would reject helping this cause or person. However, what will be discussed in the section under invitational rhetoric in the next section, this strategy is universal in nature and fails to invite each stakeholder or different type of stakeholder to partake in the mission of the organization.

The search for a societal position through identification when combined with Thorstein Veblen's idea of conspicuous consumption or, in this case conspicuous charity, helps explain how communities of social understanding are built around certain

nonprofits and areas of philanthropy. People identify, belong to and associate with specific missions, such as saving trees, preserving natural areas, aiding the homeless or supporting cultural institutions like museums. A person's own persona encompasses the charity they support. This association or identification with an organization may stand upon merit of the organization alone or a belief in the importance of the organization based on a celebrity advocate. An example maybe that I identify with, for example, Angelina Jolie as a maternal figure and advocate for refugees and children in underdeveloped countries. This identification coupled with the idea that I want to "conspicuously" (Veblen) be seen as the same type of figure or possess the same social hierarchical position may draw me to donate time and money to UNICEF or some other similar organization.

Further building Burke's theory of identification are Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin, who developed the idea of invitational rhetoric in the mid 1990's. The theory behind invitational rhetoric can provide insight into effective messaging that builds stakeholder trust and loyalty.

Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin's Invitational Rhetoric

Sonja Foss is a professor of communication at the University of Denver, Colorado whose teaching and research interests focus on contemporary rhetorical theory and criticism. Foss has a particular interest in feminist perspectives on communication and the incorporation of marginalized voices in rhetorical theory and visual rhetoric. She is the author or coauthor of the books *Gender Stories*, *Destination Dissertation*, *Rhetorical Criticism*, *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, *Inviting Transformation*, *Feminist Rhetorical Theories*, and *Women Speak*. Her essays in communication journals have dealt

with topics such as paradigms of change, invitational rhetoric, agency in the film *Run Lola Run*, visual argumentation, and body art. Her work has been recognized by various awards, including the Distinguished Scholar Award from the Western States Communication Association, the Francine Merritt Award and the Douglas W. Ehninger Distinguished Rhetorical Scholar Award from the National Communication Association, and the Distinguished Lifetime Achievement Award from the University of Colorado Denver (U.C. Denver.edu).

Cindy Griffin was a professor of communication at Colorado State University for 23 years until her retirement in 2016. During her time at CSU she allied herself with the departments women's and ethnic studies and from this partnership she created new curriculum offerings in gender and communication, feminist theories of discourse and rhetoric of civility. Griffin's work essays and books helped reconfigure the rhetorical studies. Griffin's adamant critic of rhetoric's focus on persuasion and a wide range of masculinist perspectives led her develop new perspectives on rhetoric grounded in feminist theory which were instrumental in helping scholars rethink and reimagine rhetoric. Griffin's most influential essay, written with Sonja K. Foss, was "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitation Rhetoric." The essay has been cited nearly 500 times and translated into numerous languages and has generated vigorous conversation around issues of power, agency, and political effectiveness

(<https://magazine.libarts.colostate.edu/article/cindy-griffin-retires-23-years-csu/>).

Griffin's career is marked by translating the scholarly into the pedagogical. Taking invitation as a central theme, she published the bestselling public speaking text *Invitation to Public Speaking*, whose innovative argument engages students and teachers in public

speaking as a central mode for engaging others in civil, world-making discourse
(<https://magazine.libarts.colostate.edu/article/cindy-griffin-retires-23-years-csu/>).

Looking at rhetorical styles through a feminist lens, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin coined Invitational Rhetoric (IR) to account for an emerging dialogically based rhetoric. Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric builds off Burke's identification to offer nonprofits a clearer guide to crafting mission centric messages that build and foster lasting and reciprocal relationships with a variety of stakeholders. Foss and Griffin defined IR as a style rooted in equality, immanent value and self-determination that uses techniques of offering and the creation of a safe and freedom rich environment (330). This style of rhetoric has been hotly debated and criticized for its inability to reconcile subjectivity and objectivity since Foss and Griffin's first article on the topic in 1995. Regardless of the controversy over IR and its true integrity as an effective rhetorical tool for public speaking I believe that it makes an excellent medium for grassroots organizing and bringing people together for community causes. In attempt to provide an alternative to the historically patriarchal view of traditional rhetoric, Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin coined a new style of contemporary rhetoric based on feminist ideology with their 1995 groundbreaking article, "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for Invitational Rhetoric". While this style had been employed, particularly in civil rights/social movement speeches prior to 1995, this was the first time that a name had been appropriated.

Foss and Griffin explain that, whereas traditional rhetoric is infused with the patriarchal ideals of power and domination, invitational rhetoric (IR) is built upon the feminist ideals of equality, immanent value, and self-determination (2). The rhetorical tradition handed down to us from Aristotle, the Sophists, Cicero, St. Augustine, and

others is subject to creating environments of competition and manipulation. Our patriarchal rhetorical heritage handed down to us from the ancients, church men and scholars of argumentation from Bacon, Blair and Whatley, to Toulmin and Perelman has unwaveringly relied on the premise that man is here to alter the environment and influence social affairs of other men. (Gearhart 195) Sally M. Gearhart, in her renowned work on the *Womanization of Rhetoric*, clearly states the obvious fact that as humans we are continually exerting energy in one manner or another including communication and that in and of itself creates change to the environment, other humans and non-humans (196) She makes a point that it is not the change that is bad, but instead indicts the intent to change as it brings with it the ideology of conquest and violence (196). Gearhart's radical view on persuasion goes as far as to say that it is ecological violence (195). In order to expand our understanding of rhetoric and how it shapes our world we must challenge the historical boundaries of traditional rhetorical theory (Foss and Griffin 330). Looking through the feminist lens gives us the tools and insights to challenge the boundaries of traditional rhetorical theory.

IR finds a rich and textured history in the prolific research on women as communicators conducted in the mid to late 1970's through the 1990's. Gearhart's work opens a floodgate of conversation on the true nature of communication and rhetoric by putting forth the concept of women's communication as co-creative versus persuasive in nature. (198) Gearhart's co-creation model is significant in that it distinguishes between the intent-to-change model based on a conquest/conversion mentality and the co-creation of environment which enables the natural process of changing and being changed by others to unfold based on recognition of individual integrity spring from the recognition

of each individual's "immanent value" (Spitzak and Carter 401). This concept Gearhart likens to Mao Tse Tung's theoretical question of whether an egg can become a chicken in which the answer is "yes" under the right circumstances because the potential in the egg, but stone will never be a chicken because it has no potential inside and no conditions will change that. Thus, by using communication in a manner that creates the optimal situation for change without forcing someone/thing to become or believe something for which they never had the internal potential. Carole Spitzak and Kathryn Carter built on Gearhart's ideas in which they theorized a new view of women in communication theory that challenged men and women researchers alike to design inclusive strategies (401). Inclusivity to Spitzak and Carter means not creating a place for women in an already existing male dominated framework but creating a new place for contribution based on "asking what women say, how women use the public platform, and how women speak" (407). The answer, Spitzak and Carter found, is that women communicate with a focus on relationship building which comes from an "ethic of care" and thus may "promote cohesiveness, openness, trust and commitment" (418). However, even these early studies in the late 1970's through the 1980's by Gearhart, Spitzak, Carter and others still used language revolving around the ability to change power structures and influence people. In other words, women's commitment to an ethic of care and relationship building could be used to influence their audience.

Flowing from the unrest over women's roles in communication theory Mary Daly put forth a rhetorical theory that would be deemed by Alison Jagger and others as a "radical" feminist perspective (104). Griffin goes further and explains that Daly's viewpoint rested on three assumptions: all oppression and subordination are rooted in the

oppression of women, insights can be gained from women's own experience with oppression and organizing should not be devoted to direct confrontations with the patriarchy, but instead develop "alternative social arrangements" (Griffin 159). Griffin states that Daly's theories are generative because they offer new alternatives for understanding rhetoric that "unhinge normative assumptions in culture and open new vistas for action" (160). Such normative assumptions include the idea that there are different "rhetorical realms" which suite different rhetors at different times and refutes, Griffin says, Lakoff's idea that women's rhetorical forms and strategies grow out of a lack of self-confidence or denial of responsibility instead positioning women as the "maintenance workers" of conversations (160).

The importance of studying women as communicators and the call for rhetorical theory to reflect the differences in gendered communication led to a rebellion of the traditional forms of the patriarchal rhetoric inherited from Aristotle, Cicero, and Augustine. This led feminist scholars to call for a new look at rhetoric through a new non-patriarchal lens that challenges the traditional definition of rhetoric as a means of persuasion, "a means to consciously change the intent of others" (Foss and Griffin 2). Through this new lens Foss and Griffin challenged the old guard views of rhetoric grounded in values of competition, devaluation, superiority, and power and proposed the idea of Invitation Rhetoric as an alternative based on feminist principles espoused by women in communication (3).

Firmly grounded on the feminist precepts of equality, immanent value and self-determination, (Foss and Griffin 4) IR is a significant addition to contemporary rhetorical theory. In fact, Foss and Griffin define IR as "an invitation to understanding as a means

to create a relationship rooted in equality, immanent value and self-determination” (4). The goal of IR is not an attempt to convince others of the rightness of their own views, but rather is an invitation to the audience to enter the rhetor’s world and see the world as the rhetor sees it (Foss and Griffin 4). Instead of changing others as the ultimate purpose, the goal of IR is a “communication exchange” that fosters growth, understanding and change through mutual respect for the value of each person (Bone, Griffin and Scholz 436). IR can promote an environment in which participants arrive at an understanding of themselves and precipitates an understanding “embedded in appreciation, equality” (Foss and Griffin 4) and value because of its “non-hierarchical, non-judgmental and non-adversarial framework” (Foss and Griffin 4). IR does not presuppose resistance in the audience but instead creates an environment of discovery through questioning between audience and rhetor (Foss and Griffin 5). Thus, the goal of IR is not change, but transformation.

Bone, Griffin and Scholz illustrate that IR is a move towards civility because it raises questions about the language we use, our goals as communicators, the options available to us, and the way we position and view those with whom we communicate (457). The ideologies of equality and reciprocity promote civility which Bone, Griffin and Scholz posits as “what we do for the sake our common journey with others, and out of love and respect for the very idea that there are others” (457). When we are civil we do not pretend to hold any attitude towards another, but instead accept and value them as our equal (Bone, Griffin and Scholz 457).

The distinctively dialogic nature of IR’s approach and assumption is unique to rhetorical theory which is illustrated through Foss and Griffins concepts of “offering and

willingness to yield” (6) as rhetorical tools for rhetors and listeners. Offering gives a perspective through narrative in which one articulates a viewpoint that is not a means to an end, but simply an end (Foss and Griffin 6). Buber’s I-Thou relationship exemplifies rhetorical “offering”. The I-Thou relationship forces the realization that the self can’t be a self-constituting, autonomous ego, but part of the ‘in-between’ which Buber calls the “ontology of the inter-human” (70). This inter-human space, Buber says is where “a person is confronted by the” and “its unfolding is dialogical” (70). Richard Johannesen explains that the I-Thou relationship is characterized by openness, directness, mutuality and presence that is completely reciprocal in nature; not seeking anything from the other, but rather meeting the other in their uniqueness allowing the impact of the encounter to “wash over them” (376). Johannesen goes on to say that Buber’s dialogue builds from the fact that this experiencing of the other side is a process of inclusion that allows one to meet and know the other in his concrete uniqueness (376). While this dialogic model has been typically associated with communication between two or a small group, scholars of IR, such as Bone, Griffin and Scholz say that it is also inherent in IR by creating a heuristic space of discovery in which all voices are equalized in their own situation and an environment of freedom or “egalitarian reciprocity” (437). Ultimately, IR calls attention to the nature of change, the role of humans in creating change and asks us to consider the ethics of change: “At what point do I know what is right for another?” (Bone, Griffin and Scholz). IR drives us to have understanding rather than change as a fundamental rhetorical goal and demonstrates that intention means engagement in an issue rather than persuasion to a belief; and meaning lies not solely with the rhetor, but in the dialogue between speaker and audience (Ryan and Natalie 70).

Importantly, Ryan and Natalie's work refine IR's epistemological assumptions help to illustrate how it includes both internal and external sources of knowledge and then recasting it as standpoint hermeneutics fused with rhetoric (70). Ryan and Natalie posit that there is an inherent epistemological contradiction in basing the theory of IR on immanent value and self-determination which places the self as the ideal knower "supporting a view of the self as isolated and separated from the negative influence of others" (74). The emphasis of the solitary self contrasts the notions of offering and willingness to yield because an understanding can't be reached if the self is the ultimate knower and all external influence is an attack on self-determination and human value (74). Given this epistemological discrepancy, Ryan and Natalie suggest "a realignment towards Lorraine Code's dialogic model of knowing, or subjective-objective position, that is based on the feminist concept of knowing others" (75). Code's concept, according to Ryan and Natalie, rejects the essentialist view of the unified core self and replaces with a notion of positionality based on the theoretical concept of standpoint (75). Code's definition of positionality means to "analyze, assess and assume responsibility or the positions one occupies, while engaging in critical dialogue with, or resistance against, occupants of other positions, in cognizance of their political implications" (180). Code's theory of positionality then connects Annette Baier's concept of the second person which argues for the dual importance of autonomy (subjective) and interdependence (objective) (Code 82, Ryan and Natalie 76). Code states: "It is possible to endorse Baier's "second person" claim without renouncing individuality, if "individuality" is not equated with "individualism": she shows that uniqueness, creativity, and moral accountability grow out of interdependence and continually turn back to it for affirmation and continuation (82)".

This account explains that autonomy grows out of knowing other people which provides a fluidity of one's subjective position which is always open to interpretation and constant reconfiguration (Ryan and Natalie 76). Thus, we arrive at Ryan and Natalie's epistemological rectification that knowing other people parallels the kind of dialogue based in offering and willingness to yield and that the value of knowing other people as an epistemic foundation for invitational rhetoric is that knowing is a dynamic, communicative process located in the relationship of the self to others where the knower wants to participate in generating knowledge with others (76). This epistemic realignment of IR reliant on second person discourse is "emancipatory" (Code 86) allowing IR to bridge the gap between public and private spheres of discourse especially in public arenas where dialogue is seen as having potential for problem solving (Ryan and Natalie 84).

Upon providing an improved epistemological foundation for IR, Ryan and Natalie draw a significant connection between Gadamer's hermeneutical work and IR that ends in the conclusion that IR is a combination of rhetoric and philosophical hermeneutics bounded by feminist theory which they term "standpoint hermeneutics" (78). Ryan and Natalie argue that when IR is identified as a hermeneutical practice the "interpretive and dialogic possibilities of offering and willingness to yield gain greater significance and resonance for everyday use" (77). Conversation, according to Gadamer, is a process of coming to understanding. When dialogue is entered into as hermeneutic practice, participants are not engaged in changing each other's mind, but are interested in gaining a better understanding of the self and the other, which might lead to transformation (Gadamer 385). Ryan and Natalie posit that Gadamer's definition of true conversation unmistakably resonates with IR's concepts of offering and willingness to yield which

refutes criticisms that these concepts do not lead to action (79). Furthermore, using Gadamer's theory of "fusing of horizons" to understand the transformation that takes place in dialogic communication it becomes clear that understanding is the "fusion of horizons" between Buber's I-Thou relationship (Ryan and Natalie 80). Thus, in dialogue with persons who participate with openness, offering, willingness to yield and equality "horizons grow and fuse resulting in understanding" (Ryan and Natalie 80). To draw the connection that IR is an effective way to engage oppression Ryan and Natalie use feminist standpoint theory to explain a range of women's oppression that explores the links between situated knowledge that results from a communicator's gendered life experience and position in social relations and structural power differentials that exist between people as a result of patriarchy and positionality (81). The result is that people from different standpoints will have no choice but to engage in, what Gadamer calls the task of overcoming and assimilating the strange (Ryan and Natalie 82). Finally, Ryan and Natalie arrive at the conclusion that IR, founded on the principles of offering and willingness to yield is uniquely positioned as the rhetorical tool with which to encounter the strange and uncover the situated knowledge of the oppressed and the oppressor (82).

The dialogic nature of IR makes it a good rhetorical choice in mobilizing social movements, calls to action and as a tool for communication that advances non-adversarial cooperative ethical communication. The strong element of self-determination, reciprocal engagement and immanent value that condemns elitism supports the idea that nonprofit stakeholders, including those being served by the philanthropy, but also the organization itself should use their voice as agents of change. Ella Baker, an African-American civil and human rights activist of the 1960's, provides an example of IR and its effectiveness in

mobilizing social movements and provides insight into nonprofit messaging that promotes stakeholder trust and diminishes mission slip. Baker's goals were to forge identification, cultivate local leadership, reconstitute and encourage her audience to reevaluate their identities to see themselves as agents of change and she accomplished these goals by, not only the words she said, but by fully embodying the principles and practices of invitational rhetoric: listening, inviting and reciprocal engagement (DeLaure 3). Furthermore, Baker's organizing promoted the IR principles of equality, recognition of the immanent value of all human beings, cultivation of self-worth and encouraged self-determination (DeLaure 6). Eschewing the image of the great public orator, Baker chose to remove herself from the limelight believing that leadership did not come from outside or above, but instead that people who are the most oppressed must take action to change their circumstances (Ransby 170). "The Negro must quit looking for a savior, and work to save himself" (qtd in Ransby 171).

Baker stood in stark contrast to the charismatic leader model of the time that mobilized people for big events and instead organized communities to "feel empowered to assess their own needs and fight their own battles" (Ransby 172). Baker's activism was firmly rooted in her belief in self-determinism which she continuously illustrated in her works and words on ground up leadership. Baker believed that even the idea of leading someone to freedom was a contradiction because, from her perspective, freedom demands self-analysis of your own social situation and the belief in the collective ability to change it without a "leader" (Payne 893). Baker provides the nonprofit world today with the advice that the mission should speak for itself and often from those who are the sectors neediest recipients. Furthermore, mission centric nonprofit messaging should

focus on reciprocal engagement with supporters that empowers them as agents of change regardless of the amount of support.

Conclusion

As stated earlier in this project, the nonprofit sector is highly representative of what John Dewey described as moving beyond mere association and to consciously cultivated bonds of community where there is a collective mindset of “we” that must “do” something (Dewey 25). Dewey’s conception of global citizenship has become skewed into philanthrocapitalism that gained popularity with the Band Aid movement of the 1980’s. Philanthropy has fallen victim to neoliberal market mentality which has commodified charity and created competitive environment jeopardizing the very heart and soul of what the Greek’s *φιλανθρωπία* (philanthropy) as nonprofits vie for life in the marketplace of social, environmental and other issues. In their quest to solve the problems that plague the world many nonprofits are relying misplaced tactics of overly emotional appeals and celebrity endorsements that shift the focus of identification from the mission and cause towards a more narcissistic focus on self.

By analyzing the nonprofit marketplace and looking closely at how the organizations are operating we can provide a clearer picture of how the rhetorical theories of identification and invitation coupled with Chouliaraki’s conceptions of solidarity, spectatorship and theatricality can provide both more solid mission statements and mission focused messaging that avoids the overuse of emotion and celebrities. These theories can provide messaging strategies that strengthen stakeholder loyalty and improve organizational viability by returning to historical concepts of philanthropy provided by ancient Greece through the mid-20th century. Virtuous friendship, *civitas*, *caritas*,

humanism and responsibility for public interests all maintain components of global cosmopolitanism and reject ideas of philanthropic capitalism. Furthermore, rhetorical theory based on identification and invitation provides *logos* driven messaging in place of *pathos* and *ethos* which is better at creating sustainable relationships.

Chapter 4 is a case study of three different settlement houses, Hull House of Chicago, Hill House of Pittsburgh and the Irene Kaufman House of Pittsburgh. The first two settlement house examples illustrate use of some of the problems previously laid out in chapters 1 and 3. The third example illustrates a success story and provides an example of *logos* driven messaging that connects to the narratives of the community in which it is seeking to serve. The Irene Kaufman house later became the Squirrel Hill Community Center and shows how an organization with a long history can change and grow while maintaining its mission. The Kaufman Settlement House of Pittsburgh also illustrates a return to a historical conception of philanthropy driven by solidarity and not division. Both Hull and Hill Houses were forced to close due to lack of funding and support combined with mission slip and off mission messaging. However, the Kaufman house was able to adapt to times without changing its' original purpose and is still a viable organization today. All these examples illustrate that when an organization is around for a very long time there is need to adapt to changing needs and changing times but staying true to original intent of your organization is critical to gaining and maintaining the level of stakeholder loyalty necessary to stay viable. While none of these organizations used celebrity advocacy in the way of Band Aid or Sarah McLachlan, Hill and Hull relied heavily on local officials and government to convey their importance for the community.

Chapter 4 – Finding *Logos*

Introduction

Previously, this work uncovered how historically the act of philanthropy focused on the collective based in ideas of virtuous friendship, brotherly love, benevolence, citizenship, duty and responsibility and how that changed in the early 1980's with the Band Aid Movement. The Band Aid movement heralded in an era of philanthropy governed by neoliberal market driven ideas. The extreme commodification of philanthropy for the last 50 years has created an overcrowded and highly competitive nonprofit sector wherein organizations have developed manipulative tactics that misuse or overuse *ethos* and *pathos* driven messaging at the expense of *logos*. These tactics often lead to off mission messaging and mission slip. Revisiting the historical views of philanthropy can help nonprofits gain perspective on their purpose and resituate their messaging that focuses on mission and not the market. Furthermore, nonprofit leadership can look to rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication to guide messaging that leaves generic manipulation of stakeholders behind and provides a roadmap for messaging that is mission true and *logos* centered instead using misguided *ethos* in celebrity advocacy and *pathos* laden appeals that evoke compassion fatigue. Additionally, the *logos* driven theories of Lillie Chouliaraki along with Kenneth Burke's theory on persuasion as identification and Cindy Griffin and Sonja Foss's work on invitational rhetoric provide theoretical ground for the development of solid missioning and messaging for nonprofit organizations.

The importance of theoretical and historical applications to the missioning of a nonprofit organization is that it clarifies for both the nonprofit and its stakeholders how it

experiences the lived world. Theory and history provide a framework for understanding the nonprofit organization's *raison d'être* and prevents or minimizes the urge to chase money, use neoliberal market tactics and creates an environment where a multiplicity of stakeholder relationships can be started and maintained. According to a 2020 survey conducted by Charities Aid Foundation of America one-third of all nonprofits are expected to permanently close within a year (Philanthropy News Digest). The same survey indicated that money most needed by nonprofits is unrestricted funding (Philanthropy News Digest). Unrestricted funding or funding that is not specifically tied to a specific program or activity only accounts for 20% of nonprofit funding while nonprofits report non-restricted budget items account for up to 89% of activity (Salesforce Blog). Further threatening the state of the nonprofit sector are corporate and private foundations who are requiring increased analytics from nonprofits which they simply can't furnish due to a lack of human resources to gather data and the inability to easily gather reportable statistics, impact and outcome measurement reigns as a primary obstacle for nonprofits — (Salesforce Blog). The discrepancy between what funders ask from nonprofits and what nonprofits can provide is only growing. Over half (55%) of organizations indicated that their funders are requiring more information than they had required previously, making securing funding more difficult each year. In fact, more than half of funders require outcome data from their grantees, but less than 70% ever cover the costs associated with measurement, leaving nonprofits with a heavy burden of data collection and analysis, and limited funds to do the work required (Salesforce Blog). While foundation and corporate support are a necessary component to a well-rounded fundraising plan, relationships begin with individual people and individual people rarely

require analytics. Individuals give because of a connection to the purpose of the organization. The state of nonprofit sector today illustrates the need to develop more and stronger individual relationships for long-term sustainability. To generate these types of relationships the organization must have a strong mission grounded in *logos*, identification and invitation.

This chapter will explore how organizations can fall victim to, but also resist philanthrocapitalism and thus, successfully or unsuccessfully develop strong sustainable relationships based on *logos*, identification and invitation. The case narratives of this chapter will focus on settlement house organizations. The chapter will begin with a review of the theoretical tools used to analyze the work of the three organizations and then move to a history of the settlement house movement at the turn of the 20th century. Case narratives about Hull House of Chicago, Hill House of Pittsburgh and the Kingsley House of Pittsburgh will follow. These organizations provide excellent examples of how different organizations adapt over long periods of time illustrating the importance of nonprofit leadership understanding the *logos* upon which they were founded. Identification and Invitation build on the existing *logos* of the organization creating a triadic relationship between the three theories.

Logos, Identification and Invitation

Rhetorical theory has a rich and diverse history starting with the ancient Greeks and moving into the 21st century where it uses feminist theory to cater to the varying needs of our historical moment. Aristotle's *logos*, Burke's identification and Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric are useful tools to understand how nonprofits operate in fulfilling their missions and gaining long-term sustainable relationships with

stakeholders. *Logos* helps define the good reasons for both the nonprofits existence, but also the good reasons for stakeholder involvement and support. Through an understanding of the good reasons for existence and support nonprofit leadership can craft messaging that seeks identification with stakeholders. Once stakeholders identify with the organization nonprofits must take an additional step and invite participation into the organization making the stakeholder feel a part of the organization and its purpose.

The previous chapter analyzed the three rhetorical theories of *logos*, identification and invitation. What follows in this chapter is an analysis and application of the three theories to the nonprofit sector in general and then provides three specific case narratives that illustrate the benefit of using these rhetorical tools for guidance. Too often theory is seen as purely an academic exercise, but this chapter and its case narratives reveal the real-world beneficial application of theory even theory dating to ancient Greece.

Logos

Chouliaraki, through her metaphors of distant others, suffering, solidarity and spectatorship, illustrates *logos* at work in the philanthropic sector. Too often *logos* is reduced to the simple concept of logic, but for Aristotle *logos* was much encompassing of the entire human condition. Through conceptions of reason, definition, standard and proportion Aristotle implies that *logos* is not only our understanding of the things around us, but also our understanding of our own reason for being – our essence (Aygun 2).

Logos is central to Aristotle's understanding of virtue (Gomez-Lobo 181). Virtue is a matter of acting and feeling as the *logos* commands, or more as the right *logos* commands, because *logos* determines our passions and actions (Gomez-Lobo 182). In Book 6 of Nichomachean Ethics Aristotle tells us that *logos* is phronesis or practical

wisdom (Gomez-Lobo 182). Aristotelian *logos* is tied to Aquinas' concept of prudence. Ethics of prudence, according to Aquinas, is right reason about human acts dependent on experience and habituation in the virtues. *Logos* as the idea of right practical reason is Aquinas' prudence (Westberg 15). Aquinas' prudential ethic is a love centered ethic wherein morality begins in love, works through desire and is completed in joy (Westberg 17). Action, the doing of good instead of evil, is the identifying characteristic of practical reason (Westberg 20). For Chouliaraki right practical reason is found in global citizenship based in cosmopolitan values where the "individual spectator is invited to be a public actor in the contexts of her/his everyday life" (Chouliaraki 2008 2). Cosmopolitan citizenship challenges the view that individuals first responsibility is to their nation state and is part of the ongoing search for universal rights and obligations that tie us all humanity together (Linklater 23). This language of 'us together' is important because, in Chouliaraki's work, we see that it moves us beyond mere spectatorship and towards more meaningful committed service to each other. Truly, the point of advancing cosmopolitan citizenship is to emphasize a person's membership in two communities – city/state and humanity (Linklater 25).

Logos as prudential ethics and right practical reason requires the individual or organization to assess what the right practical reason is for their purpose and what is the right practical reason the stakeholder should donate. The right practical reason of the market, to promote the idea that "human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade" (Harvey 2) is not compatible with the search for universal rights that tie humanity together. Right

reason in dealing with actions is a virtue or developed ability that allows a person to make and carry out good decisions (Westberg³). When considering *logos* as a driving factor for nonprofit communication and philanthropic giving we must look to the right practical reason behind ideas of virtuous friendship, civitas, caritas and social responsibility of which none are exemplified by the neoliberal free market system. *Logos* of virtuous friendship is based on reciprocal generosity, *logos* of civitas exemplifies rights tied to responsibilities, *logos* of caritas is defined by mercy that illustrates a Godly love of thy neighbor and *logos* of social responsibility based on Adam Smith's idea of to do good motivated by the sentiment of benevolence.

It is important to understand the *logos* or right practical reason of an organization's existence, as well as the *logos* behind why individuals are supporting the organization. The *logos* of the organization's purpose gets lost when market tactics are improperly used. The examples of UNICEF and WWF below explain this phenomenon. UNICEF does work with the *logos* based in care for impoverished, starving, unhealthy and victimized children, but instead uses market tactics with the *logos* of obtaining products for personal benefit. The WWF example illustrates that the 'sale' of items is tied to the *logos* of protecting the environment and animals. How does the sale of animal themed jewelry shown in the UNICEF catalog at this url:

<https://www.market.unicefusa.org/jewelry/animal-themed/>

Relate to the following statement by UNICEF:

“Every day, UNICEF workers brave war zones, treacherous terrain, disasters and disease to make the world safe for kids. UNICEF has helped save the lives of more than 122 million children.”

The fact of the matter is that it does not. Stakeholder relationships and fundraising campaigns are not one size fits all. Not every organization has a mission that fits with a purchase conceptualization like the WWF. Their mission is simple yet vast:

“Our mission is to conserve nature and reduce the most pressing threats to the diversity of life on Earth.”

The images from their website at url: https://www.worldwildlife.org/how-to-help?_ga=2.227370525.1286452687.1624459008-1479550539.1611949093&_gac=1.193135327.1624459015.CjwKCAjw8uGBhBAEiwAayu_9bGS0o3AJj7vkbkV0QiKwROiz6ypv3ies8U-Y7SueWtkJEbPHIxt0xoCFA0QAvD_BwE and the language for support identify with a variety of stakeholders and the varying right practical reasons and ways they may choose to become involved. The language here invites the stakeholder into the organization’s purpose. There is also a political plea which taps into the *logos* that we are all in this together to save the planet. In other words, we save our own existence by saving the existence of animal diversity and planetary health. It is important for organizations to realize the constraints placed on them by their missions and adhere to while effectively working within those constraints. Operation Renewed Hope Foundation and Virginia Supportive Housing are two smaller scale organizations providing programming to end homelessness. Operation Renewed Hope Foundation maintains the following mission:

“ORHF’s mission is to provide quality housing and supportive services to our Nation’s homeless Veterans.”

This organization is trapped in a neoliberal mindset ruled by market ideals that do not translate to their mission and purpose. The organization has a “buy a virtual brick” campaign. While at first glance this appears to connect to housing there is no connection to the actual importance to of helping the homeless. There is no attempt to identify with the *logos* stakeholders may possess for helping the homeless and there is no continuous reminder provided by the brick. This type of campaign will likely generate one-time gifts that lack an invitation for a long-term relationship. The campaign illustrated at Operation Renewed Hope Foundation’s website found at url:

<https://operationrenewedhopefoundation.org/buy-a-virtual-brick/> lacks an understanding that there is not one-size fits all fundraising strategy for all types of nonprofits.

Virginia Supportive Housing on the other hand embraces their mission. Their home page, url: <https://www.virginiassupportivehousing.org/>, invites stakeholders to understand that ending homelessness is a process that requires long-term support.

The image discussed above is simple but taps into a *logos* of positive change anyone can make. The mission page has a simple donate button and very subtly in the list to the left invites visitors to join an email list. Nothing is sold. The organization is identifying with the *logos* of positive change in our community benefits us all and invites you to become part of this positive change by becoming involved in some way, even if only to receive emails. This type of structure has more potential to develop long-term support through strong relationships based on identification and invitation.

Persuasion as Identification

Identification originated out of the psychoanalytical thinking of Freud in 1897. Burke did read Freud and often Burke tested his own theories against that of various groups of psychoanalysts. In fact, Burke found the basis for his theory of identification through the adaptation of two of Freud's processes (Wright 302). These two processes are Freud's mechanisms of condensation and displacement. In 1931 in his book *Counterstatement* Burke begins to unfold his theory of identification by stating that, "Symbols are most persuasive when the reader's and writer's experiences closely coincide" (Burke qtd in Wright 302). He goes on to say that symbols attract us because we "meet with our own lives" (Burke qtd in Wright 302). Combining Freud's mechanism of displacement and DeGourmont's work on dissociation, Burke begins to ask questions about how people integrate and form orientations. Burke demonstrates "the value of a dramatic viewpoint in integrating action and motion for the study of public communication" (Wright 304) through his approach to combining dynamic psychology and behaviorism in his treatment of the construction of associational clusters provides an early (Wright 304). Burke converts the construction of clusters from a "dream process of displacement powered by unconscious, forbidden wishes into a public ritual which shares in the forensic texture of society" (Wright 304). Similarly, Burke reimagines the perception of similarity from a defense against unacceptable desires into vicarious living that helps individuals make their way in society (Wright 303). This work on identification then becomes the basis for Burke's theory of rhetoric where rhetoric is identification. Burke says that when we engage another in an effort to persuade them there is always an element of commonality. Identification is a recognition of common interests or common "substance," with other humans and works in concert with its'

opposite: division (Burke 1969 iiv). Burke's theory extends rhetoric beyond language to all human activity (Rosenfeld 176).

The key to identification is commonality. We are always comparing our values, choices and decisions to that of others. Likewise, we unconsciously compare what our concept of moral goodness is to the moral goods provided to society by a variety of organizations. Should I be a member of this church or that faith? Should I work for this organization or that? Should I be friends with these people or not? Identification is both how we see ourselves and how we see others. We also, as Burke points out, go through processes of the opposite of identification which is division, separation or disassociation. One may decide to become Catholic because the prolife work they do and represent is very important, however, one may decide not to become Catholic because they are prochoice. Today, identification in politics has become an extreme example of identification. The MAGA movement maintains very significant characteristics around the *ethos* of Donald Trump which people feel strongly that they want to be seen as a member of this group or not a member of this group. Human beings are constantly making decisions about identifying with the world around them. We make decisions in the store on which products to buy based on identifying with the brands or identifying with the manufacturing process (is it organic or not). We make identifications as environmentalists, Black Lives Matter advocates and other social justice issue advocates.

For nonprofit organizations the creation of lasting relationships begins with identification. The nonprofit must clearly understand their own identity. Nonprofits must know what moral good they are protecting and what stakeholders are identifying themselves with that same moral good. This approach keeps the organization focused on

their mission and will help prevent off mission programming and messaging. Speaking to stakeholders about the common ground they share in protecting a moral good brings the stakeholder into the organization in a meaningful way. Motivating stakeholders to support a cause or moral good comes from attraction to that good not from duty and attraction springs from identification. In the above examples of UNICEF and WWF the importance of identification is visible. In UNICEF's catalog they are selling a variety of goods that are not directly linked to the moral good of saving the world's impoverished children. There is no way to create a bond over the common moral good and interest in protecting and helping children when supporters are reduced to purchasers only. The WWF, however, reaches the supporter on the common ground of the importance of protecting animals. WWF identifies itself as the savior of the world's animals and promotes the moral good of conservation through merchandise that speaks to the supporters love of animals. The example of Virginia Supportive Housing's visual rhetoric on their homepage identifies itself as an organization that brings about positive change. Supporters can immediately identify with ideas of transformation and positive change for individuals and the community as a whole. The Operation Renewed Hope Foundation virtual brick campaign fails to identify with supporters on their desire to help homeless veterans. There is no connection with the possible military veterans that identify with the importance of helping others who have served or those who identify with respect and gratitude for those who have served. Nonprofits must capitalize on identification connections that illustrate a sense of 'we' that are alike and how together the 'enemy' or 'they' out there will be defeated, managed or reduced.

Foss and Griffin's Invitational Rhetoric

Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric builds on Burke's theory of identification. IR is a rhetorical style rooted in feminist theory and stresses equality, immanent value and self-determination that uses techniques of offering and the creation of a safe and freedom rich environment (330). IR is an alternative to the western rhetorical tradition that is patriarchal and steeped in hierarchy. Sally Gearhart states that the problem with our traditional rhetorical tradition is that it stands on a premise that man is here to alter the environment and influence social affairs of other men (195). As humans we are continually exerting energy in one manner or another including communication that creates change to the environment, other humans and non-humans (196). Gearhart makes the point that it is not the change that is bad, but instead indicts the intent to change as it brings with it the ideology of conquest and violence (196). Gearhart subsequently generates the concept of co-creative communication which enables the natural process of changing and being changed by others to unfold based on recognition of individual integrity spring from the recognition of each individual's "immanent value" (Spitzak and Carter 401). IR is centered on theories of women's communication that puts forth that women communicate with the intent to build relationships which comes from an "ethic of care" and thus may "promote cohesiveness, openness, trust and commitment" (Spitzak and Carter 418).

Invitational rhetoric invites the listener into the conversation where together something new is created. In the world of philanthropy that new creation is a relationship of some sort designed around an issue or problem. Organizational rhetoric is steeped in hierarchal power structures that produce rhetoric based on the ancient "art of persuasion" handed down from Aristotle, Socrates, Quintilian and Augustine (Cheney and McMillan

94). The reason that organizational rhetoric maintains these communicative orientations is to preserve and maintain goals of productivity and efficiency. Taking its cues from the corporate world nonprofits have created traditional epideictic rhetoric, inherent in PR, marketing and advertising to deliberative and forensic rhetoric seen in employee performance reviews and the board room. This type of rhetoric does not invite stakeholders into the mission of the organization and essentially forces them to remain outside as audience only even going as far as to alienate stakeholders. In contrast, IR provides a hermeneutical path to understanding, commitment, care and cohesiveness with stakeholders.

Not only has the nonprofit sector adopted many of the market strategies of the for-profit corporate world they have also adopted their communication style. This style often pushes corporate selected information out to stakeholders whose role become passive, evaluative and rarely discursive. Nonprofit organizations in following the corporate path have turned to manipulative communication tools of using *ethos* of celebrities and extremely emotional *pathos* appeals. Stakeholders then become, in the words of Chouliaraki, spectators of suffering. The nonprofit world faces serious threat today and their only chance for not just survival but increased strength is to invest in communication strategies that invite reciprocal relationships and where stakeholders feel invited into the purpose and action of the mission. As previously illustrated above with the examples of UNICEF, WWF, Operation Renewed Hope Foundation and Virginia Supportive Housing we can see examples of a lack of invitation, as well as, inviting messaging. UNICEF behaves very much like corporation as the stakeholder is left outside the mission and offered a chance at an everyday purchase of products unrelated to the

mission. The WWF creates messaging around ‘adopting’ animals that invites the stakeholder to be part of the difference. Operation Renewed Hope too falls into the corporate purchase trap that UNICEF uses while Virginia Supportive Housing invites you to be witness to the change in a person’s life.

An analysis of the settlement house movement reveals a good example of what *logos* looks like in the nonprofit sector. The settlement house movement was founded on the principles of the social gospel movement which took root because of the social instability following the American Civil War. Thus, understanding the origins of the movement helps provide a background for understanding the organizations that came out of the movement. The narratives of Hull House, Hill House and the Kingsley Association illustrate that they were begun as part of the settlement house movement. These three case narratives further help us understand the importance of *logos*, but also help us understand the important role that identification and invitation play in organizational sustainability. These three cases are helpful because of the length of time they have been operating. The narratives of Hull House and Hill House illustrate problematic operations resulting from a lack of *logos* that leads to an inability to seek identification with the community resulting also in an inability to invite stakeholders into the organization. Kingsley on the other hand shows us how an organization with over 100 years of operation can grow and adapt to the times without losing the original *logos* of purpose.

History of the Settlement House Movement

The settlement house movement was founded on principles of the social gospel. The social gospel in the United States was begun amidst the social instability of post-

Civil War society and lasted in the 1920's (Deichmann 203). Advocates of the movement interpreted the kingdom of God as requiring social as well as individual salvation and sought the betterment of industrialized society through application of the biblical principles of charity and justice. For Shailer Mathews, the social gospel was, simply, "the application of the teaching of Jesus and the total message of the Christian salvation to society, the economic life, and social institutions such as the state, the family, as well as to individuals" (Mathews qtd in Deichmann 203). The goal of the social gospel was to bring about Christian salvation that redeemed and transformed both personal lives and the social order. Thus, the focus of social gospel work was aimed not only at individuals, but also at American society and the whole world. Both clergy and laity leveraged democratic political processes and the emerging social sciences to accomplish the bold, broad mission of the social gospel to build the kingdom of God on earth (Deichmann 203). The social gospel movement associated itself with concerns about unchecked capitalism and limited democracy by supporting fair, living wages for workers and by issuing scathing critiques about discriminatory labor and voting laws and practices (Deichmann 205). It provided programs for social betterment and reconstruction that addressed poverty and the myriad other problems facing society. Social gospel commitments were institutionalized in legislation such as child labor and health and safety laws, and in denominational home mission societies and organizations such as the Methodist Federation for Social Service (1907), the Federal Council of Churches and Methodist Social Creed (1908) and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (1909) and, as previously stated, in the settlement house movement (Deichmann 205).

The industrial revolution brought with it much prosperity and opportunity but it also brought a massive population explosion and deep poverty. In London the population exploded from approximately one million in 1800 to six million in just 100 years resulting in widespread poverty and extremely squalled conditions (<https://www.britainexpress.com/London/victorian-london.html>). The city was simply incapable of keeping pace with rapidly increasing population and the slums spread across the city. People living in these horrible conditions sought refuge in alcohol and drugs which in turn led to more poverty, crime and other social issues. In response, the settlement house movement took root and originated out of religious and secular interpretations of urban-industrial society. The guiding philosophy grew out of the work of English religious and reform leaders such as Charles Kingsley, Frederick Denison Maurice, John Ruskin, and Samuel A. Barnett, whose ideas and efforts produced the Toynbee Hall Association in the East London slums of 1884 (Butera 25). Charles Kingsley was a proponent of tory radicalism which was Christian Socialist support of the working class against liberal capitalists on matters of social reform (Butera 25). These ideas produced both significant social criticism and senses of social responsibility and paternalism. Kingsley, a clergyman, believed that his class must wage a "holy war against the social abuses which are England's shame, and, first and foremost, against the fiend of competition" (Butera 25). Those who followed Kingsley believed that the abuse of competition created detrimental situations for children and women that were contrary to the middle-class notion of the family and home. Furthermore, Kingsley adherents viewed the working class as being relegated to a life of subsistence wages and economic immobility (Butera 25). Living in clearly defined slums and removed in "location and

amenities from middle-class accommodations, the wage earner appeared to lack the capacity for art, play, or amusement” (Butera 25). Settlement advocates wanted to restore the capacity for cultured leisure to the working class by means of social interaction with middle-class reformers and reduced class distinction by stressing commonly shared tenets of Christianity (Butera 25).

In 1884, Kingsley cohort Samuel Augustus Barnett, founded Toynbee Hall, a social settlement in the Whitechapel area of London in an effort to understand the causes, symptoms and to discover remedies to the saturating poverty. Toynbee Hall was named after Arnold Toynbee, an English social reformer (Encyclopedia Britannica). The original intent of Toynbee Hall was to be a residence for graduate students of Cambridge and Oxford to live and participate in daily life in the area development of adult education, collection of social data, and improvement of local social and industrial conditions by sharing knowledge and culture. Toynbee Hall continues to operate today providing citizens of London’s East End such services as a citizens’ advice bureau, a free legal advice center, aid for invalid children, help for alcoholics, welfare services for the elderly, and theatres for adults and for children. It has undertaken the teaching of adult immigrants and has housed various social and cultural associations (Encyclopedia Britannica).

In 1886 Stanton Coit, upon visiting Toynbee Hall, opened the first settlement house, the Neighborhood Guild, on the lower east side of New York (Encyclopedia of Chicago). Three years later, Jane Addams, a graduate of Rockford Female Seminary of Illinois and visitor of the Toynbee Hall, opened Hull House in Chicago. These settlement homes were erected in areas dominated by non-English speaking immigrants with the

idea of bridging the gulf between the very poor and the wealthy. As word of these experiments spread, other settlements appeared in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago. Hull House inspired Charles Zueblin to organize Northwestern University Settlement in 1891. The following year, Graham Taylor started Chicago Commons and Mary McDowell took charge of the University of Chicago Settlement near the stockyards. By 1900, there were more than 100 settlements in America; 15 were in Chicago. Eventually there were more than 400 settlements nationwide. The most active and influential ones were in the large cities of the Northeast and Midwest of which several were located in Pittsburgh including the Irene Kaufman Settlement House, which later became the Jewish Community Center in Squirrel Hill. Modeled on these early versions, settlement house continued to spring up in needy neighborhoods across the U.S. throughout the first half of the 20th Century. Hill House in Pittsburgh's Hill District was one of the settlement houses that appeared later, opening in 1964.

Generally, settlement houses performed similarly to modern day community centers with the purpose of providing supportive social services, educational offerings and cultural outlets, as well as childcare. Settlements were organized initially to be “friendly and open households,” a place where members of the privileged class could live and work as pioneers or “settlers” in poor areas of a city where social and environmental problems were great. Settlements had no set program or method of work. The idea was that university students and others would make a commitment to “reside” in the settlement house in order to “know intimately” their neighbors. The primary goal for many of the early settlement residents was to conduct sociological observation and research. For others it was the opportunity to share their education and/or Christian

values as a means of helping the poor and disinherited to overcome their personal handicaps.

What actually happened was that residents of settlements learned as much or more from their neighbors than they taught them. The “settlers” found themselves designing and organizing activities to meet the needs of the residents of the neighborhoods in which they were living. While trying to help and uplift their neighbors — organizing classes, clubs, games and other educational and social activities — settlement house residents and volunteers experienced firsthand the powerlessness of the poor, the pervasive abuse of immigrants, the terrible conditions in which men, women and children were required to work in factories and sweatshops, the failure of public officials to enforce laws, the dangers of unsanitary conditions and the debilitating effects of tuberculosis and other diseases. Settlement house residents soon learned that the low standards of living and unsafe working conditions that were the usual lot of poor people in the neighborhoods were most often not the result of choice but of necessity.

When neighborhood conditions and individual or social problems seemed too pressing to be ignored, settlement workers tried to meet them. Their efforts often led to confrontations with local and state officials. At other times, bringing about a change required becoming advocates for a specific cause or acting as spokespersons appealing to a wider public for understanding or support for a proposed civic matter or political measure. From their advocacy, research and sometimes eloquent descriptions of social needs afflicting their neighbors, lasting contributions were made by residents of settlement houses in the areas of education, public health, recreation, labor organizing, housing, local and state politics, woman’s rights, crime and delinquency, music and the

arts. Settlements soon became renown as the fountainhead for producing highly motivated social reformers, social scientists and public administrators. In fact, settlement houses laid the foundation for modern day social work.

Narrative #1: Hull House

Hull House was founded in 1889 by Jane Addams. Addams was significant figure in social reform and activism and became the first woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931 for her peace activism (Michaels). Addams was born on September 6, 1860 in the small farming town of Cedarville, Illinois and was the eighth of John Huy and Sarah Weber Addams' nine children. Addams grew up in a life of privilege as the daughter of one of the town's wealthiest citizens. Her father owned a successful mill, fought in the Civil War, was a local politician, and counted Abraham Lincoln among his friends (Michaels). Addams also grew up with liberal Christian values and a deep sense of social mission.

Addams, part of a new generation of college-educated, independent women that historians have called "New Women", graduated at the top of her class from Rockford Female Seminary in 1881 and immediately sought to put her education to greater use. Although her religiosity waned under the heavy Christianity of Rockford, her commitment to the greater good increased. In her efforts to improve society, Addams was instrumental in successfully lobbying for the establishment of a juvenile court system, better urban sanitation and factory laws, protective labor legislation for women, and more playgrounds and kindergartens throughout Chicago. In 1907, Addams became a founding

member of the National Child Labor Committee and played a significant role in passage of a Federal Child Labor Law in 1916. She also played a key role in the development of School of Social Work at the University of Chicago, which created institutional support for a new profession for women and, along with her social justice work, earned her the title as the mother of social work in America. Addams served as president of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections from 1909-1915, was active in the women's suffrage movement as an officer in the [National American Women's Suffrage Association](#) and pro-suffrage columnist (Michaels). She was also among the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) (Michaels).

As a staunch pacifist, Addams promoted international peace during WW1 and protested U.S. early entry into the war which brought criticism to bear upon her. However, Addams retained a strong belief that people are capable of solving disputes without violence and joined a group of women peace activists who toured the warring nations in hopes of bringing about peace. g to bring about peace (Michaels). In 1919, she helped found the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in 1919, serving as its president until 1929 and honorary president until her death in 1935.

It is easy to see how the settlement movement fit well with Addams sense of social justice and decency towards her fellow man. Addams was inspired to open Hull House after she and fellow progressive Ellen Gates Starr visited Toynbee Hall just one year prior. Hull House was an immediate success and became, not only the most famous of the settlement houses, but also the model for the more than 400 that popped up across the U.S. over the coming years. Situated at 800 S. Halstead Street in the run-down Nineteenth Ward of Chicago, most of the people living in the area at the time were

recently arrived immigrants from Europe, including people from Germany, Italy, Sweden, England, Ireland, France, Russia, Norway, Greece, Bulgaria, Holland, Portugal, Scotland, Wales, Spain and Finland. Jane Addams and Ellen Starr moved into Hull House on September 18, 1889. They started their program by inviting people living in the area to hear readings from books and to look at slides of paintings. After talking to the visitors from the neighborhood it soon became clear that the women of the area had a desperate need for a place where they could bring their young children. Addams and Starr decided to start a kindergarten and provide a room where the mothers could sit and talk. Within three weeks the kindergarten had enrolled twenty-four children with 70 more on the waiting list. Soon after a day-nursery was added and other activities for the neighbors soon followed. These services included:

- medical aid
- childcare
- legal aid
- food assistance
- clothing assistance
- financial assistance
- clubs and activities for both children and adults
- English-language classes
- citizenship classes
- cultural classes in the humanities
- lecture and concert series
- University of Chicago Extension classes for credit

- vocational instruction in sewing, basket weaving, millinery, embroidery, crafts, cooking, and dressmaking (Salmon)

Jane Addams ran a club for teenage boys and Ellen Starr provided lessons in cooking and sewing for local girls. University teachers, students and social reformers in Chicago were also recruited to provide free lectures on a wide variety of different topics. Over the years this included people such as John Dewey, Clarence Darrow, [Susan B. Anthony](#), William Walling, Robert Hunter, Robert Lovett, Ernest Moore, Charles Beard, [Paul Kellogg](#), Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Ray Stannard Baker, Francis Hackett, Henry Demarest Lloyd and Frank Lloyd Wright (Cohen).

Thus, settlement houses were originally not designed to be about charity and social services, but instead to deliver educational, art, music, and cultural programs to address the spiritual poverty of poor people. Often the goal was to integrate U.S. culture with the immigrant's home culture to facilitate better social integration. Addams understanding of poverty was more than a financial condition and she, along with other affluent but socially concerned people, saw themselves as bridging a socio-economic gulf in which they helped and learned from their poor neighbors (Cohen).

In learning from the poverty-stricken, often immigrant neighbors, the settlement houses “became political institutions, beacons of advocacy for issues such as an increased minimum wage, labor rights, child labor laws, and decent (and nondiscriminatory) provision of public services” (Cohen). Addams was an advocate for even the most menial things such as garbage collection and pressured the alderman presiding over the 19th ward (where Hull House was located) to improve services, and even served for a time as the ward's garbage inspector in order to identify for the city exact locations of garbage issues

(Cohen). Other Hull House accomplishments included: the creation of the first public playground in Chicago, the first public gymnasium in Chicago, the first public swimming pool in Chicago, and the first citizen preparation classes in the United States. Addams led Hull House into investigations of sanitation, truancy, tuberculosis, infant mortality, and cocaine use in Chicago, prompting changes in laws and public programs. In its first few decades, the Hull House of Jane Addams was a beacon for social change (Cohen).

Even though Hull House spent the early decades of the 20th century as a beacon of hope, help and change for the community something terribly wrong took root along the way that ended with Hull House shutting its doors forever in 2012. There are multiple reasons that Hull House was forced to close and some of these were decades in the making. Rich Cohen, in his article “Death of Hull House: A Nonprofit Coroner’s Inquest”, discusses a phenomenon known as founder’s syndrome. Essentially, this concept refers to a situation in which the organization itself is tied to the persona of an executive director or founder. Cohen states that after the death of Jane Addams Hull House lost a significant strength and focus on its purpose and that her shoes were just too big to fill, no one after could quite own and live the ideas of “Saint Jane” (Cohen). Often Addams’s successors didn’t even grasp some of what she might have meant by the socialization of democracy or Hull House as a “cathedral of humanity” (Cohen). This lack of focus and determination in the leadership eventually led the organization into off mission activity and chasing funding in the wrong places. To Addams, the settlement was all about social change. As she wrote, “The educational activities of a Settlement, as well as its philanthropic, civic, and social undertakings, are but differing manifestations of the attempt to socialize democracy, as is the very existence of the Settlement itself” (Cohen).

When Hull House first opened it was almost entirely self-funded by the modest inheritance Addams received upon the death of her father and resident staff mostly lived and worked without compensation. This volunteer organization was able to attract programs and garner support from unbelievable list of famous people including W.E.B. DuBois, Peter Kropotkin and John Dewey. Support from these social change enthusiasts reveals a strong relationship between mission and the principles of the stakeholders. In fact, even though money was hard to come by even in Addams' time the relationship between strong mission values and the principles of stakeholders was how they continued. Addam's stated, "I always believed that money would be given when we had once clearly reduced the Settlement idea to the actual deed" (Cohen).

Over time Addams acquired other properties in short order until Hull House became a thirteen-property complex. In the 1950s and 1960s Hull House began to look like any other nonprofit and in the spirit of solvency and not social change became part of the Near West Side Urban Renewal project. Mayor Richard Daley decided to target the removal of Hull House in a plan to develop the campus of the University of Illinois at Chicago. Only the original Hull House was maintained as a museum on the university campus, but the rest of Hull House was demolished. The Hull House program became a federation of community centers around Chicago, growing to 29 program sites by 1985. The urban renewal of the Hull House properties meant that the organization finally morphed from a settlement house—a physical site in a poor neighborhood where the settlement residents connected with low-income immigrants—to a provider of community center programming. This illustrates significant mission slip in the name of chasing dollars.

By 1967 Hull House had expanded beyond its means both geographically and programmatically creating a situation where different centers were competing for support eventually leading to \$2 million dollar deficit. This created an atmosphere where funding was not used to build on programmatic and mission strengths, but instead to remediate problems (Cohen). This led Hull House leadership to seek and expand government funding. By the 1990's and early 2000's Hull House had narrowed its services to become essentially a social service contractor for the local government. When it collapsed, however, Hull House was a ward of government with about 85 to 90 percent of its funding coming from government in a state known for delaying contract reimbursements and shorting nonprofits on what they are owed. It was in the game of chasing government funding (Cohen). One contract alone, with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) in the mid-1990s, amounted to \$6 million (and was obtained when the then-director of Hull House was a former director of DCFS). At its height, Hull House's budget was \$40 million in the early 1990s, but it plummeted to \$23 million in 2011(Cohen). In an article in the *Chicago Tribune* an agent familiar with Hull House stated, "It relied too much on a state that doesn't pay its bill and its leaders didn't move quickly enough to change how it operates" (Cohen). Hull House had completely left their original mission behind and become an arm of the government. Cohen asks, "If a social change organization decides to follow a path of collecting and administering government contracts, how much social change can it really pursue?" (Cohen) Just over a decade later the federal government was faced with bailing out the Hull House pension plan because of a shortfall of \$4.8 million to cover the organization's 500 employees and retirees

which led to a pension fund bailout by the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation and helped Hull House stave off insolvency for a couple of years (Cohen).

Hull House provides an excellent example of mission slip, commodification of charity through the chasing of government contract money, lost *logos* and too much reliance on the *ethos* of one ‘celebrity’ which in this case was founder, Jane Addams. Hull House was originated as a beacon of democracy and social change that fostered a sense of community through varied educational, cultural and support programs. There was no need to expand beyond the community centered model where the *logos* for support was found in relationships of reciprocity, responsibility, civility, equality and *caritas*. As is so often the case today with celebrity advocacy, what is not uncovered is the *logos* that is attached to the mission. Jane Addams had a clear vision based on the social gospel of what Hull House’s role was to be and what relationships would foster that vision, but those who came after her were not sufficiently indoctrinated and were easily led astray.

Hull House did not have a written mission statement and as a result over the years the organization strayed further and further from its original intent. This situation also led the organization to lose its community roots and with that a sense of identification with the residents around it. The leadership of Hull House was not seeking common ground with members of the community and as a result there was never an opportunity for invitation into the mission and purpose of the organization. Hull House leadership failed to establish Burke’s identification orientations of a sense of ‘we that are alike’ and together are fighting against an injustice or a ‘they’. Finally, without any relationships on which to build and prosper Hull House had to chase the funding of the government that

was available to them. An organization can't invite the government into a sustainable relationship because sustainable relationships are created human beings. Without the human element Hull House failed honor its original social gospel purpose and became a failing government sub-contractor.

Narrative #2 – Hill House of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania's Hill District was once considered to be the "crossroads of the world" (Goldman 279) because of the cultural diversity it maintained. The legacy of the Hill District began after the Civil War when lower Hill was inhabited by the Irish moving up from the Point, some Scotch-Irish, a few Germans and a scattering number of German-Jewish families. With mass emigration of the 1880's from Eastern and Southern Europe, the Hill was rapidly populated with Italians, Jews from Russia, Poland and Romania, Russians and Slovaks, Armenians, Syrians and Lebanese. The Hill took on an international color. A sprinkling of Chinese laundries added color to an international spectrum. Thus, the Hill District was a true American melting pot. This great immigrant diversity was rich in culture, but also exhibited the characteristics that gave rise to a need for settlement houses in the late 19th century and early 20th century.

The Columbian Council School and Settlement opened in 1895 and was the first Settlement House in the Hill District. The Columbian School changed its name to the Irene Kaufman Settlement House in 1911 in honor of the daughter of major donor Henry Kaufman (Kaufman House Records). The Kaufman House is still open today in new neighborhoods as the Anna B. Heldman Association and in answer to the large Jewish community in Squirrel Hill the Jewish Community Center. The SOHO Settlement House

soon followed in 1909 (SOHO House Records). In the years leading up to WWI the population shifted away from Jewish and European immigrants to an African American population making it the city's first black district. The Hill District soon became a national center for African American sports, journalism, theater and commerce. It was also a crossroads for jazz artists from around the country who performed with Pittsburgh's many acclaimed musicians in the Hill's jazz venues. A jazz Renaissance began on the Hill in the early 1920s and continued through the 1960s. Jazz evolved and thrived in Hill District's many lively night clubs, dance ballrooms, theaters and the Musicians Club (<https://www.pittsburghbeautiful.com/2017/08/07/the-rich-history-of-pittsburghs-hill-district/>).

Once an epicenter for culture and the arts the Hill District took a hit beginning after WW2. After World War II, the housing in the Hill was slated for redevelopment due to aging housing conditions. However, this process was not planned out well, and the lives of the local people were disrupted as the renewal got under way. Over 8000 residents (as well as 400 local businesses) were displaced, and the area's access to the downtown economy was cut off. A new arena and parking lot were built in an area that predominantly black families had once called home. The civil unrest and violence of the late 1960s added fuel to the fire, and soon The Hill had deteriorated into a shell of its former self. By 1990, 71 percent of the community's residents and a majority of its businesses were gone. Vacant lots and decrepit buildings replaced the colorful and vibrant Hill that had once been such an integral part of the city of Pittsburgh (<https://www.pittsburghbeautiful.com/2017/08/07/the-rich-history-of-pittsburghs-hill-district/>).

Amid the chaos of the 1960's and disruption in the Hill District rose Hill House, formed when the Kaufman House merged with other settlement houses and Hill-based civic organizations. After a period when the Hill District rivaled Harlem and the South Side of Chicago as one of the preeminent centers of African American culture and economic vitality, Hill House served as a crucial center of activity in the neighborhood. At the time, the community was still dealing with the aftermath of the demolition and redevelopment of the Lower Hill, which displaced some 8,000 residents from their homes in the late 1950s. The path to recovery began in 1964, when a county study led to a new social agency to confront these problems. The organization was formed from the settlement houses and the Hill City Youth Municipality, an organization offering lessons of leadership to youth. Patterned on the settlement house concept, the Hill House Association was the first agency to combine health, welfare, recreation, and community programs in the city's African American community. Its philosophy—unchanged since its beginnings—empowered individuals to change, become models for their family, and gradually reweave the community's social fabric (<https://www.hillhouse.org/about-hill-house/history/>).

In 1970, the Hill House Housing Development Corporation became one of the first agencies to tackle housing redevelopment on the Hill. The growing housing stock and influx of new Hill residents seen today is testament to its early vision. In 1972, Hill House completed a new headquarters on Centre Avenue which once again established a true center for the community and a place to start for anyone needing help. By bringing other agency partners on site, Hill House forged the collaborative, “whatever it takes” approach. Under director James Henry in 1997 Hill House began its first-ever capital

campaign which raised \$5 million in funds to renovate campus facilities. The second phase of renewal was launched in 2003 under new President and CEO Evan Frazier. The *Generations Ahead* campaign, launched in 2008, was intended to sustain the work of the Hill House for generations to come. However, just over one decade later Hill House closed its doors permanently.

Similar to the situation with Hull House of Chicago, Hill House too felt the economic pressure of finding sustainable funding in the 1990's and into the 2000's. This was exacerbated by poor leadership that lost site of the original mission and intent of the organization. Failing to see its primary purpose as essentially a community center supporting a variety of educational, cultural and support services for residence in the neighborhood, Hill House leadership increased its role as an economic development leader and financial manager of public dollars tied to development negotiations of the Lower Hill neighborhood, the former site of the Civic Arena. This led to the justification for the Centre Heldman Plaza, which brought a full-service grocery store back to the community for the first time in decades and would ultimately be the final straw in a troubled financial history (Lisi). It left the already struggling organization exposed to more than \$1 million of new debt. The more challenges Hill House faces the less community presence they maintained in fact residents stated that the familiar faces that had built the trust of community members for years were fewer and farther between (Lisi). Lakeisha Wolf, executive director of the Ujaama Collective (resident of Hill House), summed the situation up with her comment "The sort of cultural institutional knowledge was lost, and that's like the heartbeat — the blood was no longer pulsing" (Lisi). Sala Udin, a community leader who has served on Pittsburgh City Council and is

on the board of Pittsburgh Public Schools, stated that “It always seemed like a natural institution similar to the way you feel about your church, your church always seemed like it’s always been there, and it’s yours, it’s part of the fabric of the community” (Lisi).

To some extent Hill House became victim of neoliberal takeover of the nonprofit sector in the 1990’s. Diversity of funding was a problem for Hill House which relied significantly on The United Way for funding. When the United Way, responding to the push for a market approach to charity, changed the process by which it distributed funds organizations like Hill House had to restructure/repackage themselves to fit the request for proposals process (Lisi). Eventually, the United Way funding dried up and Hill House began chasing funding, creating programs based on funding opportunities. Programs they developed to fit grant opportunities included new fathers and new mothers programs. In 2003, under the guidance to the new President Evan Frazier, the board devised a new real estate development strategy as a way to replace the outside dollars that had kept the organization afloat for 40 years. In 2005, Hill House leaders renamed sister nonprofit organization Hill House Housing Development Corp., which had been involved in housing development projects in the area, to the Hill House Economic Development Corporation [EDC] (Lisi). The same year, the EDC attracted Family Dollar to the site once occupied by the Hill Pharmacy. The store was an early success for the organization, said Richard Witherspoon, CEO and treasurer of the Hill District Federal Credit Union and former Hill House board member. Based on the success of the venture, according to Witherspoon, Hill House leaders said, “Let’s keep going here. The community's got a Family Dollar and it’s doing well, let’s try something else” (Lisi).

Unfortunately, this move into real estate development was ill advised. This represents a complete separation from the *logos* of the settlement house movement and the roots of the creation of Hill House in 1964. The *logos* driving the organization was purely financial. The *logos* that was lost were the ideals of social justice, responsibility, civitas and caritas. This move particularly damaged the *ethos* of the organization as a pillar of the community and instead made it a ‘business in nonprofit clothing’, if you will. This confusion of identity brought the financial house of cards down in the summer of 2019.

Over the weekend of Martin Luther King Jr. Day, a frozen water main burst at the Hill House Association’s flagship building on Centre Avenue. The basement flooded in the James F. Henry Hill House Center, often called Hill House Main. Three feet of water pooled for days before anyone noticed. Leaders of the organization soon learned the building’s antiquated switchboard needed special parts to be ordered before they could restore electricity to the building. Tenants, including a dental clinic and medical clinic, were faced with a choice to wait months to reopen or find a new location. By April, the Hill House board would vote to dissolve the organization. For at least one Hill resident, the flooding incident captured part of what led to the end of the organization whose *logos* was “the heart of the Hill.” Amid great financial challenges, leaders’ efforts to bring the Hill House back from the brink only made matters worse at times. As part of major budget cuts and restructuring over the last decade, the 55-year-old Hill House Association outsourced its maintenance duties to a private firm in late 2014. Hill House nonprofit tenant LaKeisha Wolf recalls the company keeping on one of their former in-house workers at Hill House Main at first. Not long after, the company moved him to a

non-Hill House property, and they lost an important source of knowledge about the building. “When the water main froze and busted, there was nobody here who could’ve prevented the further damage,” said Wolf, executive director of Ujamaa Collective. “All of those things could’ve been prevented at least by this one person” (Lisi). The flooding could not have come at a worse time for the Hill House. The land development dealings were significantly problematic as they called into question the charitable nature and nonprofit designation of the organization. However, on June 27, the Hill House elected officials allowed the completion of the \$4.9 million sale of four of its seven buildings to Lawrenceville-based E Properties and the Hill Community Development Corporation. The sale helped the Hill House board avoid bankruptcy proceedings and allowed it to eventually dissolve the organization. Hill House was a nonprofit operating under a land development business model and thus not prepared with the necessary assets to survive any failure or unforeseen catastrophe.

It was easy for Hill House to veer away from the *logos* of its original purpose because a mission statement had never been created that encompassed the organization’s reason for being. Hill House was opened in the mid-1960’s and as a result was far removed from *logos* of the turn of the 20th century settlement house movement. Hill House was developed in the more modern conceptualization as a community center. The community center model is ripe for generating strong stakeholder support from those local to the community in which it serves through identification and invitation. The community center’s identity is one of being part of the social and cultural fabric of its community wherein community members can identify with the organization because a strong sense of ‘we that are alike’ is generated. Identification created between the

community center organization and other members, including businesses, other organizations and individuals, is one of understanding of the unique needs and issues of that community. In other words, a strong community center breathes life into the community and acknowledges the strengths and weaknesses of that community. Messaging that reinforces this identification of a ‘we’ that are members of a unique community invites stakeholders to be part of the organization in every way from board membership, staffing, volunteering, program participation to financial support. This inviting messaging tells community members that they are important and needed by the organization. Upon its opening Hill House did work to identify with community members addressing needs and providing a center for people to come together to address those needs. However, without a mission statement and leadership committed to maintaining that mission Hill House soon lost the identification with the community and focused more on financial concerns of staying in operation than in inviting participation with the organization. In fact, by the end Hill House had done more to alienate community members than invite. This pattern forced them into activities outside their purpose, such as real estate development, that led to their demise.

Narrative #3 Kingsley House

On Christmas day 1893 the Kingsley Settlement House opened in then Pittsburgh’s 12 ward at 1707 Penn Avenue just 12 blocks from where Andrew Carnegie had begun work on city’s first skyscraper (Butera 25). This was an interesting juxtaposition, not only in geography, but in the structure of late 19th century America as a whole that culminated in stereotypes of “opulent captains of industry and impoverished day laborers” (Butera 25). Kingsley House exhibited the overriding philosophy of the

settlement house movement that, rooted in Christian social outlook or social gospel, was concerned with the impacts of the unfolding industrial revolution on cultural life (Butera 25). The social gospel did not decry industrialism, but instead took an environmental approach to understanding urban society. The environmental approach did not blame poverty, disease and crime on the immorality of individuals or groups and believed that these problems would not go away unless the causes of the conditions was uncovered and corrected (Butera 32). A bastion of manufacturing, life in Pittsburgh was dominated by disease and death that so often accompanies steelmaking, coal mining and bridgebuilding (Butera 29). Reverend Dr. George Hodges saw the quiet desperation that many lived with on a daily basis in Pittsburgh and, following the teachings of Charles Kingsley, felt it was his Christian duty to understand and ameliorate the urban condition of the poor. Thus, in partnership with W.E.B. English, the son of an abolitionist Baptist minister and head of the Berkshire Insurance Company, Hodges started the Kingsley Association. Their concerns covered all aspects of urban life of the poor, including sanitation, administration of the city, wages, politics, rent and “generally all conditions under which men live from Sunday to Sunday” (Butera 32).

The area in which Kingsley was located was in police station number 3’s jurisdiction and encompassed wards 9, 10 and 12. Twenty-four percent of all the crime in the city of Pittsburgh was committed in these three wards with 75% of them including drunkenness, disorderly conduct, prostitution and gambling (Butera 32). Even more telling was that Wards 9,10, and 12 had an arrest rate of 187 per 1,000 population in 1893, and it climbed to 304 per 1,000 in 1899. Furthermore, within a one-mile radius of Kingsley, seventeen murders were committed between 1892 and 1899, representing 41%

of all the detected homicides in the entire city (Butera 33). This unhealthy and crime prone environment served as Kingsley House's home for 8 years with much of the settlement houses work focusing on offsetting these environmental deficiencies (Butera 33). Between 1893 and 1920, Kingsley House passed through three phases of settlement activity. Two were basically passive and dealt with symptomatic neighborhood problems, while the middle period was most noted for advancing an environmentalist view. The foundation of the first symptomatic stage was built upon the Kingsley House's first social worker and director, Kate A. Everest's belief in education, cultural contact, and the necessity of daily physical contact in order to build and maintain a notion of social progress with small children. Kindergarten was not the only program Kingsley House offered to improve the 'degraded' aspects of the community. The settlement credo maintained that social clubs, dramatics, debates, and public speaking would enhance self-development, awaken individuals to a sense of community, and give expression and stability to the requirements of social exchange (Butera 33). In 1896 and 1897, the settlement sponsored a "Thirty Day Food Examination" at the request of Dr. Atwater of the state agriculture department. The program gave poor families in Kingsley's vicinity a fixed amount of money and were encouraged to prepare nutritious meals within the budget. The purpose of the project was to teach families how to budget and provide nutrition simultaneously.

Over the years Kingsley House responded to the varying populations of their areas and the varying needs of the community. In 1902 Kingsley House started the Lillian Taylor Summer Camp in Butler county. This project was truly innovative in its environmental approach. The camp allowed for inner city urban youth to experience the

rural countryside. Many of the children living in urban areas at the time had never been out of the city. There were even exchange programs that provided an opportunity for youth living in rural areas to visit Kingsley's urban environment (Kingsley Association Records). The summer camp was closed in 2006 due to the changing nature of suburban land development in Butler County. In 1919 Kingsley opened facilities in Larimer and East Liberty where it still operates today. Today, Kingsley is officially known as the Kingsley Association and per their website explain that they "provide a variety of programs to neighborhood residents in East Liberty, Larimer, and other East End communities" (Kingsley website). Programs have included boys/ girls clubs, a literary society, infant care programs, music lessons, cooking and home economics classes, swimming, basketball, boxing, senior citizen classes, personal charm courses for young women, arts and crafts classes, camping, Office of Economic Opportunity programs, educational and career guidance, placement service and training for students at area colleges, community organization service for citizens groups, and involvement in the construction of homes for low and moderate income families" (Kingsley website).

Kingsley operates under a strong, simple and clear mission: "To inspire and promote our community growth as a physical anchor; social, wellness, and service program provider, as well as a thought leader" (Kingsley website). Clearly, even though the times have changed and people are faced with different social, educational and health needs, the Kingsley Association has been able to stick to its original purpose for existence while adapting and growing. This steadfast adherence to a strong *logos* grounded in the principles of the social gospel has made the Kingsley Association a success for over 120 years. The Kingsley Association remains a nonprofit that accepts

charitable donations, however, their business model operates on a membership basis that provides funding stability. The membership rates are very low making it affordable for most individuals, families and seniors. Kingsley touts a large membership and members are affectionate about the center many feeling like it is a part of their family. A great deal of those involved with Kingsley have been going to the center their entire lives and spanning generations. This image strongly illustrates how Kingsely's messaging and programming has created a sense of identification with the unique characteristics of the community in which it operates. Kingsley's membership model invites members to be part of the organization as much as it requests an invitation into members lives. Kingsley's website is full of words like "join the team" and "together" with explanation points and bright colors it rhetorically inviting and encouraging. Kingsley's website page found at url: <https://www.kingsleyassociation.org/membership> illustrates how people feel about the organization and with such strong individual support Kingsley does not need to chase funding that is outside of their mission.

Kingsley is currently running a fundraising campaign based on the brick buying idea. However, unlike the Operation Renewed Hope Foundation virtual brick purchasing campaign, Kingsley's campaign involves the purchase of real bricks that will be placed in the physical building. This permanently connects the donor with the organization and since it is tied to concepts of building up an organization that builds up the community is correctly tied their mission and vision. It should be noted that many donors are people who are members of the Kingsley Association illustrating strong sustainable stakeholder relationships directly built on the *logos* of the mission and vision of the organization. The commitment of members shows a strong sense of identification with the organization and

the financial support in addition to membership illustrates how community members invited into be a part of the organization. Kingsley Association's website of their brick purchasing campaign found at url: <https://www.kingsleyassociation.org/support-us>

Conclusion

The above three settlement house examples provide insight into the importance of logos driven mission statements, messaging that identifies with stakeholders and messaging/programming/administration that invites stakeholders to be part of the organization. The trick, if you will, for organizations with long histories is having the ability to adapt and grow with the different times and needs around them while staying true the original *logos* behind their founding. In the case of the settlement house movement the founding *logos* was the social gospel movement with its deep progressive protestant roots. The social gospel ideals also provide an avenue for identification and invitation based on common Christian values.

In the case of Hull House, Jane Addams was an adamant follower of the social gospel principles believing deeply in its' social justice edicts, however, after her death in 1935 and with the passage of time and new leadership those principles were lost. In this case we see an organization that was based in the *ethos* of the dynamic Jane Addams and not directly linked to *logos* of the social gospel. Early on Hull House needed to convert the tenets of the social gospel movement into a strong *logos* driven mission statement that could withstand the test of time and provided a rhetorical basis for identification and invitation throughout the years with members of the community. It is possible that if Hull House had done this instead of only relying on the *ethos* of Jane Addams' leadership the focus of the work would not have become diluted allowing the organization to evolve

into a community center model. Instead, leadership of Hull House lost understanding with the *logos* of its original mission which led them into chasing government funding to stay afloat and became an overstretched social service agency mitigating foster care and other child welfare issues. Again, in the case of Hill House we see a loss of connection with the original *logos* of the settlement house movement. In part Hill House was lost from the beginning as it did not open its doors till decades after the social gospel movement had ended. While Hill House opened in the community center model providing many community services similar to those offered by settlement houses the lack of a strong mission statement derailed leadership into real estate development. Furthermore, Hill House lost identification with the community members and the community members failed to continue to identify with the organization as it went further and further away from the community center model that addressed the community's needs. In stark contrast The Kingsley Association provides a clear mission statement on their homepage. This mission statement is clearly still steeped in the *logos* of the social gospel and resulting settlement house movements. The strength of the *logos* carried the Kingsley Association through over 120 years of service to individuals and health of the community at large. Kingsley's *logos* driven mission statement directs activities that foster a sense of identification that invites the community to be part of the organization. Other settlement houses across the United States have also been able to stay open with the community center model.

This chapter has analyzed existing examples that reflect the importance of *logos* driven mission and messaging in the sustainability of an organization. Also explored is the role of identification and invitationally situated rhetoric. Chapter 5 will use the ideas

found in historical metaphors of philanthropy along with rhetorical theory and philosophy of communication to provide a road map of how to build mission statements. Strong mission statements include *logos* that defines their *raison d'être* and rhetoric that both identifies with stakeholders and invites participation with the organization. The intent of chapter 5 is to provide guidance to nonprofit organizations on avoiding fundraising strategies that chase dollars instead of support for current work and how to create visual and written messaging that builds sustainable and meaningful relationships with, not just donors, but all stakeholders of the organization. Nonprofit organizations must identify what historical metaphor of philanthropy within which they fit. The settlement house movement was directed by metaphors of *caritas* and social responsibility. The *logos* carried within that metaphor will serve as a guide for the organization's reason for existing and keep activities and messaging that is mission centered. Additionally, the ideas of Burke's identification and Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric can provide specific guidance on messaging that builds strong sustainable relationships based on *logos*. Through these methods nonprofit organizations can find ways to grow and expand without jeopardizing their longevity and sustainability.

Chapter 5 – Inviting Friendship

Introduction

This work thus far has explored the problem of neoliberal infiltration of the nonprofit sector wherein philanthropy has become extremely commodified. This commodification was coined by Bishop and Green in 2008 as Philanthrocapitalism. The second chapter explored how this trend began and how it is different from the historical views of philanthropy throughout western civilization. To find an entry point for improving the plight of the nonprofit sector and returning philanthropy to its historical roots chapter 3 examined ideas of Lillie Chouliaraki as they relate to *logos*, Kenneth Burke's identification and Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric. Chapter 4 provided a real-world context for the application of the theories introduced in chapter 3 and provided a clear route for resisting philanthrocapitalism.

Understanding the neoliberal infiltration of philanthropy through the practice of philanthrocapitalism is important because it is driving nonprofits to chase funding at the risk of mission slip and off mission messaging. As guardians of social welfare and change it is vital that nonprofit organizations stay true to their purpose. The introduction of market driven principles into the philanthropic sector constitutes an existential threat to nonprofit's role as a representative of marginalized groups and its ability to harness the power of difference through networks and associations. Repressing the urge to adopt neoliberal tactics pervasive throughout our social and economic environments will preserve the heart of philanthropy. It is the philanthropic sector that helps to build trust among citizens, set the public agenda that defines problems and

proposes solutions to those problems through collaboration and negotiation (Payton and Moody 157). In fact, a case can be made that philanthropy is the very safeguard of democracy.

We live in a unique historical moment in which we have been called to be our brothers' keeper like never in recent history. The idea of 'we together' has been abundantly important with the onslaught of the Covid-19 virus. The pandemic has forced us to change the way we see each other and ourselves and forced the corporate and nonprofit world alike to alter their business/operating models. This is an opportunity for nonprofits to reexamine their *logos* and find new and innovative ways of engaging stakeholders on the commonalities that invite them into participation with the organization in different ways. This chapter will provide essential guidance on the importance of switching off the tendency to operate under market principles and focus on building reciprocal friendships with stakeholders that can ultimately weather the test of time. First this chapter will provide a detailed summary of the key points this work has previously illustrated followed by sections on the importance of constructing mission statements and brands that invite the friendship of those outside the organization. Since the foundation of nonprofit sustainability can only be found in individual relationships, the role of both organization communication theory of communication as constitutive and interpersonal communication theory will be used to help construct missions, messages and brands that invite friendship.

Summary of the Situation

Our current historical moment is plagued by uncertainty that has revealed cracks in some of our most treasured institutions and even Democracy itself. This is especially

true for the nonprofit sector where the cracks have revealed a sector that is broken and misguided. In fact, Philanthropy News Digest recently reported that an estimated one-third of all nonprofits in the U.S. are expected to close within the next year. The same survey Philanthropy News Digest reported on indicated that 52% of nonprofits need unrestricted funding the most and 63% of those indicated that they did not raise enough to cover those funding needs. Unrestricted funds are not tied to a specific program or service and are often used for general operating expenses not covered by specific grant programs, such as, rent, electric, phone/internet service, some salaries and other administrative fees. While not tied directly to program delivery these costs are an essential component of operation. Foundation and government funding sources do not typically offer unrestricted funding or offer it in very small amounts due to a lack of trust, need to control risk, a need to show impact directly tied to dollars and government regulations (Stamperdahl). Improvements are needed in how relationships are built with foundation funding sources that increase transparency and support good leadership instead of just good projects.

A reliable source for unrestricted funding is individual donors both large and medium or small donors. However, to ensure the sustainability of these donations nonprofits must cultivate sustainable meaningful relationships with their individual donors. Depending on the size of the organization it may not be possible to foster one on one relationships with each donor, but there are ways to build relationships with broad categories of donors with similar characteristics through meaningful engagement with the mission and purpose of the nonprofit. To accomplish meaningful engagement, we must reexamine how philanthropy has been historically viewed and how and why it has

changed in recent history. Coupling the historical metaphors with rhetorical and communication theory can provide nonprofits with strategies for messaging that builds lasting donor relationships.

Previously this work explored the history of the metaphors used to describe philanthropy which help provide us with a variety of *logos* for engaging and helping our fellow man. Regardless of the specific *logos*, philanthropy has been a key aspect of community relationships since the ancient Greeks. Philanthropy has guided personal relationships such as friendship, civic relationships as duty to others and relationships to our broad human society through responsibility. In ancient Greece philanthropy was viewed through a lens of reciprocal virtuous friendship. Aristotle described a friend as someone who sees and does good things for another. The moral vision of Greek philanthropy is that there is mutual benefit since life alone is difficult and friendship allows for a good life within the city-state (Aristotle XI). Ancient Romans maintained a more universal view of philanthropy that extended it beyond its own culture or society even to the ‘barbarian’ world. Rome’s philanthropy was rooted in the metaphor of *civitas* which brings the whole of society together through rights and responsibilities. Christianity brought the idea of *caritas* to philanthropy where love thy neighbor as God loves you was given application in everyday life. Augustine defined *caritas* as the theological virtue that connects man to God. It is the idea that love of God and love thy neighbor come together in *Caritas*. *Caritas* means that the “outward sign of mercy is the sign of the indwelling “*amor dei*” (Freya 69-70). Thomas Aquinas lays out his definition of charity as “friendship of a person for God” (Adam 208). Aquinas also grappled with the concept of reconciling ‘love thy neighbor’ with love of God. Aquinas’ claim that “in

love of a neighbor is included love of God as an end is included in the means”
(Adam208).

As the modern age began to dawn the Enlightenment saw great thinkers of the time contemplate philanthropy and how we protect the good of all society. Immanuel Kant understands philanthropy as the moral duty of human love through which he gives us the conception of universal human rights (Kant 25). Hegel, believing Kant’s view is too limited, claims that philanthropy is morality and should be incorporated as a form of ethical life (Sittlichkeit) in the institutions of society and the state and can’t stand alone (Hegel qtd in Ojvind 7). In *Philosophy of Right* Hegel elevates the family and civil society into the state as the real basis for philanthropy (Ojvind 7). Adam Smith brings the concept of sympathy to bear on philanthropy. Smith states that if we have sympathy for other people it can motivate us to do good deeds for others. As an expression of ‘philanthropy’, Smith speaks about ‘benevolence’ and ‘beneficence’ (Smith 245). The dawning of the 20th century brought incredible wealth from the industrial revolution. The robber baron era was ushered in with such names as John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie. Carnegie’s philosophy on philanthropy was one of social responsibility and moral responsibility to give back some of the great fortune he had amassed. Unique to this era was the idea of philanthropic funding as another financial investment where they used their business skills to minimize the risk of their speculations thereby, greatly enlarging the scope of their charitable giving. This idea of philanthropic giving as an investment is still with us today. Also new to the idea of philanthropy that remains with us is the idea of recognition for generosity. While Carnegie and his peers were clearly committed to giving back, their inspiration to create good in the community was coupled

with an exhilaration for the recognition of both his generosity and his business savvy (Zunz 2).

Each historical metaphor provides us with *logos* from reciprocal friendship to social responsibility, but in the mid-1980's that changed with onslaught of Reaganomics and neoliberal thought. Neoliberalism, the idea that market exchange is an ethic itself and can provide a guide to all human action (Harvey 2), rapidly gave rise to the concept of philanthrocapitalism, coined by Matthew Bishop and Michael Green in 2008. While not originally recognized as philanthrocapitalism the movement was initially heralded in with the Band Aid Movement of mid-1980's over the Ethiopian famine that was happening. Bob Geldoff a humanitarian celebrity created the USA for Africa supergroup made up of the biggest music celebrities of the time who included such names as Michael Jackson, Madonna and Lionel Ritchie. The supergroup of popular artists created a massive production of "Do They Know Its Christmas", which became the fastest and biggest selling single of all time, and "We are the World" (Jones 1). The proceeds of ticket and merchandise sales went to help the famine relief efforts in Ethiopia. The movement was extremely successful raising over \$63 million or the equivalent of \$147 million today (Gavin). However, the lasting impact on the nonprofit sector was one of competition and commodification that has driven the industry to manipulative communication tactics using the *ethos* of celebrities and overly emotional *pathos* appeals. What we, as a society, are left with is a constant barrage of images similar to what can be found at the url: <https://www.kingsleyassociation.org/support-us> of Angelina Jolie and other celebrity advocates and the too sad to think about abused animal campaigns illustrated by the photo below taken by myself of mail I received.

(Fig. 13: North Shore Animal League America, photo courtesy of Stacia Wetherington)



(Fig. 14: Farm Sanctuary, photo courtesy of Stacia Wetherington)



These images create what Lillie Chouliaraki calls a “spectacle of suffering” (2006 10) and generate what Susan Moeller calls “compassion fatigue” (Musarò 318). The pressing question is do these images call us to action or become banal appeals that force

us to look away instead of help. If *logos* is based on good reasons then we must find the good reason for assisting these groups and good reason can't be based in the *ethos* of one individual or pity, but instead something more. While these are animals and not our fellow man, we may still find the *logos* is a sense of *caritas* to love and care for the world as God does. Guidance on mission and messaging for nonprofits can be found in the rhetorical theories of Aristotle's *logos*, Kenneth Burke's identification and Foss and Griffin's invitational rhetoric.

Chouliaraki's work on humanitarian communication gives insight on the importance of *logos* centered messaging. The *logos* she provides is rooted in cosmopolitan values or a sense of cosmopolitan citizenship that challenges the view that individuals are first responsible to their nation state. Instead, we are part of the ongoing search for universal rights and obligations that tie all humanity together (Linklater 23). This language of 'us together' is important because, in Chouliaraki's work, we see that it moves the audience beyond mere spectatorship and towards more meaningful committed service to each other. Truly, the point of advancing cosmopolitan citizenship is to emphasize a person's membership in two communities – city/state and humanity (Linklater 25). Chouliaraki points to positive image appeals that replace victimization images with images that focus on the sufferer's agency and dignity (Chouliaraki 2010 112). These types of images evoke emotions of tenderheartedness, empathy and gratitude by focusing on the benefactor instead of the persecutor and, by so doing "personalize sufferers by focalizing the appeal on distinct individuals as actors" and "singularizes donors by addressing each one as a person who can make a concrete contribution to improve a sufferer's life" (Chouliaraki 2010 112). Chouliaraki highlights that these types

of appeals preserve a sense of shared humanity that the shock effect imagery does not (2010 112).

Chouliaraki's concept of singularizing donors and addressing what contribution they can make and why that contribution is important to the organization and donor is illustrated in Kenneth Burke's theory of persuasion as identification. Identification language creates an environment of 'we that are alike' often fighting an 'enemy they' that are not like us. Burke's work aims to nail down human motivation which does through dramatism. Burke argues that the structure of human action is dramatic, based on interaction of the five sources of motive that Burke identified in *A Grammar of Motives* (1945) as the pentad: act, agent, agency, purpose, scene (what was done, who did it, by what means, to what end, and where and when?) (Burke qtd in Quigley 2). This also relates to Calvin Schrag's concept of communication "by, about and for" (15) wherein every utterance becomes altered depending on who speaks, what they speak about and to whom they speak. For nonprofits to maintain consistency in their mission/purpose and use appropriate messaging of the mission they must define each piece of Burke's pentad and keep in mind Schrag's by, about and for to avoid mission drift or off mission messaging.

Sonja Foss and Cindy Griffin's contemporary rhetorical theory of invitational rhetoric is ground in both Burke's identification theory and feminist theory. IR is a style rooted in equality, immanent value and self-determination that uses techniques of offering and the creation of a safe and freedom rich environment (330). Foss and Griffin explain that, whereas traditional rhetoric is infused with the patriarchal ideals of power and domination, invitational rhetoric (IR) is built upon the feminist ideals of equality,

immanent value, and self-determination (2). The rhetorical tradition handed down to us from Aristotle, the Sophists, Cicero, St. Augustine, and others is subject to creating environments of competition and manipulation. IR is enriched by feminist theory where it is explicated that women communicate with a goal of relationship building that is rooted in an ethic of care (Spitzak and Carter 418). Sally M. Gearhart's work opens a floodgate of conversation on the true nature of communication and rhetoric by putting forth the concept of women's communication as co-creative versus persuasive in nature. (198) Gearhart's co-creation model is significant in that it distinguishes between the intent-to-change model based on a conquest/conversion mentality and the co-creation of environment which enables the natural process of changing and being changed by others to unfold based on recognition of individual integrity spring from the recognition of each individual's "immanent value" (Spitzak and Carter 401).

The importance of historical metaphors of philanthropy and the three rhetorical theories of *logos*, identification and invitation were discussed in chapter 4 with the settlement house movement and the narratives of Hull House, Hill House and the Kingsley Association. The settlement house movement was rooted in *logos* of the social gospel. Advocates of the movement interpreted the kingdom of God as requiring social as well as individual salvation and sought the betterment of industrialized society through application of the biblical principles of charity and justice (Deichmann 203). Deep concern for the class fissures generated by the industrial revolution and the growing urban slums settlement advocates wanted to restore the capacity for cultured leisure to the working class by means of social interaction with middle-class reformers and reduced class distinction by stressing commonly shared tenets of Christianity (Butera 25). Hull

House in Chicago was one of the first settlement homes in the United States begun by Jane Addams. The organization struggled after the death of Jane Addams who was strong advocate for social change and justice. Rich Cohen states that after the death of Jane Addams Hull House lost a significant strength and focus on its purpose and that her shoes were just too big to fill, no one after could quite own and live the ideas of “Saint Jane” (Cohen). Often Addams’s successors didn’t even grasp some of what she might have meant by the socialization of democracy or Hull House as a “cathedral of humanity” (Cohen). Hull House provides an excellent example of mission slip, commodification of charity through the chasing of government contract money, lost *logos* and too much reliance on the *ethos* of one ‘celebrity’ which in this case was founder, Jane Addams. Hull House originated as a beacon of democracy and social change that fostered a sense of community through varied educational, cultural and support programs. Originally Hull house’s *logos* for support was found in relationships of reciprocity, responsibility, civility, equality and caritas. However, as illustrated with other examples of celebrity advocacy the *logos* attached to the mission is not clear and support was dependent on the *ethos* of Jane Addams. The leadership that followed were not sufficiently indoctrinated and were easily led astray.

Hill House of Pittsburgh too closed its doors after more than 50 years of service. Hill House was originally opened in the 1960’s as community center model which is a modern revisioning of the settlement house concept. There was never a mission statement guiding the organization and leadership steadily moved from the community center model ground *logos* of social justice, responsibility, civitas and caritas to a *logos* ground in market ideals and financial success. The community center’s identity is one of being

part of the social and cultural fabric of its community wherein community members can identify with the organization because a strong sense of ‘we that are alike’ is generated. Identification created between the community center organization and other members, including businesses, other organizations and individuals, is one of understanding of the unique needs and issues of that community. In other words, a strong community center breathes life into the community and acknowledges the strengths and weaknesses of that community. However, without a mission statement and leadership committed to maintaining that mission Hill House soon lost the identification with the community and focused more on financial concerns of staying in operation than in inviting participation with the organization. In fact, by the end Hill House had done more to alienate community members than invite. This pattern forced them into activities outside their purpose, such as real estate development, that led to their demise.

The story of the Kingsley Association is one of success and illustrates how a nonprofit can use *logos*, identification and invitation to create sustainable relationships that create ongoing financial support. Kingsley operates under a strong, simple and clear mission: “To inspire and promote our community growth as a physical anchor; social, wellness, and service program provider, as well as a thought leader” (Kingsley website). Clearly, even though the times have changed and people are faced with different social, educational and health needs, the Kingsley Association has been able to stick to its original purpose for existence while adapting and growing. This steadfast adherence to a strong *logos* grounded in the principles of the social gospel has made the Kingsley Association a success for over 120 years. The Kingsley Association remains a nonprofit that accepts charitable donations, however, their business model operates on a

membership basis that provides funding stability. The membership rates are very low making it affordable for most individuals, families and seniors. Kingsley touts a large membership and members are affectionate about the center many feeling like it is a part of their family. It should be noted that many donors are members of the Kingsley Association which illustrates strong sustainable stakeholder relationships directly built on the *logos* of the mission and vision of the organization. The commitment of members shows a strong sense of identification with the organization and the financial support in addition to membership illustrates how community members invited into be a part of the organization.

As illustrated throughout this work a strong mission statement is essential for the long-term success of any nonprofit organization. The question that plagues nonprofit leadership today is how to craft a mission statement that keeps the organization grounded, but also allows for growth and development. The following section will focus on the importance of mission statements that contain *logos*, identification and invitation and thusly directs those types of activities. Using those three rhetorical tools can assist nonprofits in resisting the draw of philanthrocapitalism.

Building the Mission

As has been stated repeatedly throughout this work, the heart of philanthropy is relationships and as a result most of the work in which nonprofits engage is communicative. Communicative centered activities include building social capital, building and maintaining volunteer relationships, mission statements, governance, fundraising and service delivery. Unfortunately, because the nonprofit sector has been predominately theorized through and economic lens that asks how and why nonprofits

exist in a market economy not much work has been done on the communicative nature of nonprofits that reflects the complexities of human interaction (Koschmann 140). Taking a communicative approach to understanding the nonprofit sector can help nonprofit leadership to craft mission statements that are grounded in *logos* and seek identification and invitation.

Nonprofits are experienced as social, interactive, relational and meaningful – in short communicative. This is very different than how we experience corporate organizations in financial or legal ways. A communication approach should therefore lead us to think about nonprofits in more phenomenological ways that understand nonprofits based on the lived experiences of relevant stakeholders, not just the status of nonprofits as legal or financial entities. “lifeworlds” of nonprofits as composed of spatiality (lived space), corporeality (lived body), communality (lived human relationships), and temporality (lived time; Merleau-Ponty, 1962). These existential themes define our lived experiences and shape our ongoing enactments and interpretations of social reality (Koschmann 141). Working from a socially constructed concept based on experience provides the opportunity to dig deeper into the underlying character of nonprofits (Koschmann 141). The character of the nonprofit sector is rooted in service delivery, social entrepreneurship, civic/political engagement, and even religious faith. These aspects of the nonprofit sector shape the lived experiences of those involved and comprise their social reality. The key insight from a communication perspective is that these existential qualities are created and sustained through ongoing patterns of interaction and enactment. Therefore, understanding nonprofits through communication as constitutive theory would seek to understand, explain, and direct our

attention toward the ways in which existential qualities are constructed and how lived experiences influence a host of relevant social outcomes.

Phillip K. Tompkins, organizational communication scholar, brings significant insight into considering nonprofits in terms of communication as constitutive of the lived experience in his book, *Who is My Neighbor? Communicating and Organizing to End Homelessness*. The book is ethnographic account of his decade-long work as a volunteer in the St. Francis Center, a day shelter sponsored by the Episcopal Church. The St. Francis Center provides homeless people in the Metro-Denver area with showers, mailboxes, and telephones, among other things to help them reconnect with society. The center and Tompkins himself are on the front lines in the struggle to abolish homelessness in the United States. Tompkins illustrates in the book the importance of semantics in changing the way a nonprofit is viewed and how the nonprofit views its work. Tompkins follows Heidegger and refers to the homeless as houseless as we are all homeless and homesick because “suffering from degrees of abeyance and existential liminality, a profound separation from our wholeness in spiritual solidarity with others” (Swartz 409). This view of the homeless allows us entry into their humanity since the houseless or poor are none other than ourselves and are thus deserving of our compassion and understanding (Swartz 409). “To “other” or demonize the homeless is to ignore our own unending struggle against alienation and our relentless and imperfect search for connection and community” (Swartz 409).

Tompkins works from a perspective that homelessness is not a housing or economic problem, but instead is a communicative problem resulting from the “breakdown of communication networks that provide social capital” (Koschmann 142).

Reframing poverty and homelessness through a communication perspective allows us to view organizations serving the homeless as “links that repair and prevent breakdowns in social capital” (Koschmann 142). Following this example nonprofit mission statements should constitute a reflection of not only their lived experience, but also that of their supporters and those they serve. Since communication choices have the power to call into being social realities that either restrict or enable organization activity, nonprofits must consider what kinds of social relationships are formed by the words they use, what identities they produce, and what *logos* they generate that guides continuing engagement in society (Koschmann 142).

Thus, mission statements don’t just represent organizations they are organizations and as such must contain the organization’s purpose, values and vision for the future (Ryan 3). Mission statements must also draw on commonly accepted nonprofit frames “which provide useful metaphors for thinking about the way things operate in different arenas” (Ryan 9). Frames are a heuristic tool for identifying the organization’s *logos* that connects to the *logos* of the organization’s supporters. Sarah Ryan, in her article “Missioning in the Nonprofit Sector: Assessing Nonprofit Organizations’ Efforts at Crafting and Electronically Disseminating their Formal Mission Statements” provides us with an example of an effective frame within education focused organizations. The frame Ryan uncovered is that “education’s primary purpose is to promote social change” (18). In Ryan’s study she found mission statements that included language about the needs of those served and the services provided but also addressed the lasting effects of their programs on society (18). Furthermore, Ryan found that “education was equated with the

uplifting of communities, the fight for social justice, and the betterment of American society” (18).

Examples Ryan provides include the following:

- The National Jewish Center for Learning and Leadership (CLAL) - promises to draw upon “Jewish wisdom [and] innovative scholarship” to “deepen civic and spiritual participation in American life.”
- A Better Chance, an organization that “works with students of color in sixth grade through college to help them gain access to broader educational and career opportunities.”
does so to assist the children it serves in “assuming positions of responsibility and leadership in American society.”
- The Boys Choir of Harlem, Inc. “prepares inner-city youth to become... successful Americans.” The Children’s Storefront views “each student’s daily achievement as a step towards a better future.” The Dalton School “prepares students to ‘go forth unafraid’” and attempts to foster in those students “a sense of responsibility toward others both within the School and in the community at large.”
- Fordham University’s mission statement goes even further, declaring that Fordham students are being prepared for “leadership in a global society.”

It is vital to the credibility of a nonprofit organization to not only provide a clear mission statement, but also manage messaging and activities that live within that mission.

Looking to one of the examples previously used in this work of Virginia Supportive

Housing (VSH) we can use Ryan’s ideas of framing and mission construction to analyze their mission. Taken from the VSH website the following is their mission statement:

“Our Mission

Virginia Supportive Housing’s (VSH) mission is to end homelessness by providing permanent housing and supportive services. Founded in 1988, VSH was the first non-profit organization in Virginia to develop and provide permanent supportive housing for homeless single adults. Since then, VSH continues its tradition of *Making Homelessness History*.

As Virginia’s largest supportive housing organization, we developed and we manage more than 650 housing units in 17 communities, and we serve hundreds of additional clients in permanent housing with private landlords.

The individuals and families we serve represent the lowest income levels in the Commonwealth—generally 30 percent or less than an area’s median income. Their financial situations often are compounded by challenges such as substance abuse, mental illness and physical disabilities.

To fulfill our mission we depend on a wide variety of funding sources including individuals, corporations, foundations, governments and faith-based communities” (Virginia Supportive Housing).

The first statement is good stating its purpose to end homelessness and the exact activities that it will undertake to accomplish its purpose. However, what is missing is their values and a clear vision of the future that frames their organization within a broader community context. The text then devolves into non-mission related information about what they do and who they serve. What that text does do that is positive is illustrates how VSH's activities consistent and focused on their singular purpose. To build in a strong sense of *logos*, identification and invitation VSH must address 'why does the homeless problem affect me' or 'why does it matter if our community has homeless people'. The focus must not just be on the individual plight of these individuals but extend to the impact it has on the community at large. Going back to the work of Tompkins we can find rhetoric that will accomplish this task by drawing on the commonalities and equalities of our human condition and the fact that our community is only as strong as its weakest links. Again, we revisit the idea of 'we together' that can reciprocally improve our lives. The idea of returning to a productive life would reflect on the importance to the community at large. Values of equality, common humanity, patience, empathy, integrity, respect and care should be highlighted.

Homes for the Brave, a nonprofit organization providing housing and services to homeless veterans, divides their mission statement into three parts, but clearly addresses the points made above and the implied frame is that by returning people to a state of productivity our community will be stronger. Also implicit in how the organization frames itself is 'helping others help themselves' which is a dominant frame for organizations serving the homeless in the United States. Taken from the Homes for the Brave website the following is their mission:

“MISSION STATEMENT:

With an emphasis on Veterans, we provide the housing and services necessary to help homeless individuals return to a productive and meaningful life.

VISION:

Our vision is to provide a model to enable homeless men, women and their families, especially those who have served our country, to attain safe, affordable housing, meaningful life activity and a livable income so that they may return to a productive and meaningful life.

VALUES:

1. It is essential to serve others with honesty, integrity, empathy, and patience;
2. Every individual deserves to be treated with respect and dignity;
3. By providing a non-judgmental environment and access to a comprehensive array of services, we demonstrate our commitment to putting those we serve first;
4. Hard work and responsibility lead to independence; and
5. Innovation is essential to developing creative solutions that are responsive to the evolving needs of our residents (Homes for the Brave).

The choice of words such as ‘productive’ and ‘meaningful’ provide ways for people to identify with the organization and those it serves in addition to the rhetoric used in the list of values especially ‘hard work’ and ‘responsibility’ which skirt the issue of someone believing that the homeless are lazy or don’t want to work. What does seem to be lacking is a clear invitation into the organization. It is for this reason that mission statements must address the supporter. Often nonprofit messaging only addresses the supporter with

language like: ‘your support will help this person’ or ‘your support will provide food and housing for this animal’, but this still leaves the supporter on the outside of the organization reduced to mere dollars. Rhetoric that includes the supporter in the mission statement can be simple with such terms as ‘together’, ‘we’, ‘our’. An example would be: “Together with our supporters we are making a significant difference in the lives of the homeless members of our community by providing housing and support services that are designed to return them to meaningful activity in our community.”

The crafting of a mission statement must first take into consideration the *logos* of the organization. It must address the question, “why am I here”. The answer should encompass more than the people, animals etc. that it serves, but the impact the work has on the broader community and humanity. If we look at the homeless example the organization must go beyond the assistance, housing and other services it provides to the community and clearly state how that assistance might impact the entire community and ‘me’. To accurately answer that question the organization must look at their unique community. What is important in one location may not be important in another. Is helping the homeless an economic issue? Is our community feeling economic hardship and increasing the workforce will improve that situation? However, it may be an aesthetic problem that getting people off the street will improve the feel, safety and look of the community. Once the organization has analyzed their unique community, they should identify their primary audience. Who is the stakeholder or potential stakeholder? Is this someone altruistically concerned with loving thy neighbor as thy self? Is this someone who is interested in the community being stronger with more productive members? Is this someone who may be purely motivated by aesthetic reasons? Once these pieces have

been identified the organization must identify the exact activities they will undertake to address the problem. This step provides focus and helps to prevent mission slip and the tendency to add programming just to obtain dollars. Using the examples of VSH and Home of the Brave we can craft a more comprehensive mission statement such as the following:

‘VSH together with you seeks to end homelessness in our community and restore the lives of men and women to their previously productive lives through housing and support services. It doesn’t just take a village to raise a child, it takes a village to help those who have reached a point where they can’t help themselves. Together we can provide the necessary programming to help the homeless return to homes, their lives and community participation.’

This example illustrates a clear *logos* care for thy neighbor and strengthened communities. This example illustrates identification with those that have productive lives and those who understand what it is like to need help from others while also extending an invitation to the audience to be part of the solution not just a donor.

A solid and encompassing mission statement not only provide direction for activity and messaging, but also branding. Understanding what drives brand equity is essential for nonprofits because this provides a vehicle by which they can avoid the *ethos* traps of celebrity advocacy and reliance on overly emotional *pathos* driven appeals. Brands convey personality characteristics and it is as important for a nonprofit as a for-profit organization to determine what personality characteristics it wants to convey to all stakeholders. The connection of brand and mission is unmistakable and important

particularly in the ever-competitive nonprofit environment where each nonprofit must carve out a unique image and importance of purpose. The following section will explore the connection between brand and mission and provide examples of good and bad brand equity in the nonprofit world.

Branding the Nonprofit Organization

David Aaker, in his book *Building Strong Brands*, defines brand equity as “a set of assets and liabilities linked to a brand’s name and symbol that adds to or subtracts from the value provided by a product or service to firm and/or a firm’s customers. The major asset categories are brand name awareness, brand loyalty, perceived quality and brand associations” (7-8). These asset categories work together to create awareness, provide reassurance, signal substance or commitment, help process and retrieve information, create positive attitudes and feelings and ultimately instill confidence in the purchase and give a competitive advantage (Aaker 9). Two other aspects of branding that Aaker discusses are brand identity and brand personality. Brand identity encompasses how the organization brands itself with characteristics revolving around brand as organization, as product, as person and as symbol. Brand personality bestows human characteristics onto the brand (Aaker 176-177). This makes it abundantly clear that brand is a psychological construct held in the minds of those familiar with the brand (Kylander and Stone 37). Brand management must manage these psychological constructs and understand that brand is not only what is projected but what is perceived (Kylander and Stone 3u7). In fact, nonprofit leadership increasingly defines brand as the essence or soul of an organization (Kylander and Stone 37). The role brand plays in the nonprofit world is different than the role brand plays in the corporate world. In the

nonprofit world brand drives broad social goals and must address a multiplicity of audiences and the advancement of these social goals is not reducible to a monetary metric (Kylander and Stone 37).

The interaction of mission, vision, values, personality and other brand identity elements creates an experiential promise through the functional and emotional values of the brand (Lin and Ryan 152) making it important for nonprofit organizations to understand what their messaging portrays about the heart of who they are and what they are accomplishing. Lin and Ryan found in their study of mission and brand in the airline industry that there is a positive relationship between mission statements and brand trust and that the relationship of mission statement and brand equity is partially mediated by brand trust. A mission statement includes information of interest to stakeholders, and the dissemination of that information can be used to create a business strategy that develops positive perceptions of an organization. Thus, trust is formed through a positive interaction with the mission statement.

This notion of trust is significantly more important for nonprofit organizations because unlike for-profit business the ‘purchaser’ and ‘product users’ are not the same. The ‘purchaser’ is often a donor and the ‘product user’ is the recipient of the goods or services. I argue that trust is found through *logos*. The over or misplace use of the *ethos* of an individual or celebrity advocate shifts the brand focus from the mission purpose to the personal brand of that individual. Trust is then generated between the belief in the character of the individual and the stakeholder and not built on the belief in the values of the organization or its ability to provide a social good. Furthermore, when nonprofits over use *pathos* appeals steeped in pity, horror, disgust and sadness their brand becomes

associated with these human feelings which can result in a loss of stakeholder trust in the organization's ability to positively impact the problem or result in "compassion fatigue" making people turn away completely from the work (Hibbert 726). Brands built on *logos* can unify the workforce around a common purpose, act as a catalyst for change and contributes to the professionalism of the organization (Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 59). There is no question that the role of strong branding in the nonprofit sector is essential to organizational success. Unfortunately, branding in the nonprofit sector is usually used as a tool for fundraising. Nonprofit leaders must develop their brands in a way that contributes to the sustainability of their social impact, serves their mission, and stays true to their organization's values and culture.

In addition to trust Laidler-Kylander and Simonin also highlight the importance of consistency, focus and partnerships as variables that build strong brands (60). There are three parts to consistency: internal, external and the consistency generated between internal and external. Internal consistency increased consistency in operations enhances program quality and drives the desire within the organization to spread best practices. This creates an increase in internal coordination resulting in more consistency in operations. Consistency over time and across borders is the "hallmark" of great brands and Campbell adds "that the 3Cs of branding are consistency, clarity and convergence" (Campbell qtd in Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 63). A study of financial services done by De Chernatony and Cottam found that consistent brands which are "integrated and coherent, can provide a sustainable competitive advantage" (De Chernatony and Cottam qtd in Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 63). Consistency is important for both for-profit and nonprofit brands however, consistency for nonprofit brand equity is of more importance

due to the greater diversity of the brand audiences (Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 63). While it has been suggested that the role of organizational and operational focus in brand equity for for-profit organizations is not a crucial however, for nonprofit organizations operational focus is critical in the development of strong external brand equity and operational efficiency and effectiveness (Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 63). Even the highly successful World Vision International organization had to revamp its messaging, *logos* and tag lines to increase consistency. Prior to 2004 World Vision maintained a lot of different messages and messaging styles across its varying locations and programs areas weakening its brand equity. In 2004 the organization set out to create more homogenous messaging and more universal approach to the brand. World Vision's webpage found at url: <https://www.worldvision.org/our-work> illustrates what World Vision has done to create this more cohesive and consistent branding.

Kylander and Stones depiction of how the concepts of trust cohesion, capacity and identity create a brand cycle that impacts reputation, positioning and leverage. Partnerships are important in the nonprofit world. Partnerships can include collaborative efforts between nonprofit organizations and for profit, as well as, between nonprofit organizations. However, partnerships can create problems with image similar to the problems with celebrity advocacy if they aren't chosen carefully. Relevance appears to be of key importance when selecting partnerships and the same can be said when considering celebrity advocacy. Partnerships should be selected with organizations that maintain similar values and activities. The right partnerships can also contribute to the relevance of the organization and its mission (Laidler-Kylander and Simonin 63). The World Wildlife Fund provides a good example of how the right partnerships build brand

equity for all parties involved. At WWF, part of accomplishing their mission objectives depends on the organization's ability to persuade some of the biggest multinational corporations to enter partnerships that lead the companies to change their business practices. WWF's global brand is crucial to its ability to establish these partnerships. "You're big, we're big, so we understand each other" (Emily Kelton, Director of Corporate Relations at WWF qtd in Kylander and Stone 8). In this way the brand establishes a level of sameness, equality and identification between WWF and the companies they want to influence and keeps the relationships tightly aligned with the mission. Ultimately, focused, consistent brands closely tied to the mission of a nonprofit organization elicits a high level of trust that provides organizations with the authority and credibility to deploy those resources more efficiently and flexibly than organizations with weaker brands. The importance of brand management in the nonprofit world is undeniable but the very nature of nonprofits as communicative constructs striving for social goals means that along with brand more personal and intimate communication must take place. Interpersonal communication theory can provide guidance on how to create personal and intimate communication that invites friendship.

Interpersonal Communication Theory and Inviting Friendship

Interpersonal communication is that communication that takes place between unique individuals within a relational context. The transactional perspective of interpersonal communication views interpersonal exchange as "continuous reciprocal influences between an individual and their context" (Estlein 23). This perspective allows us to see how interpersonal communication evolves within relationships and both negotiates and defines relationships. The transactional model clarifies the variety of

factors that mutually influence the stakeholder-nonprofit organization relationship (Estlein 23). Understanding interpersonal communication is heavily dependent upon understanding human behavior and individual characteristics (Daly and Knapp 13). What types of behavior are important varies depending on the relationship and the context of the communication. Hon and Grunig's work in public relations help to define those behaviors that are most important to fostering solid relationships – even friendship.

Hon and Grunig proposed that relationships, such as the nonprofit organization-donor relationship, can be measured by assessing the levels of trust, commitment, satisfaction, and power in the relationship (Waters 459). Trust in this instance means doing what the organization says it will do. In fact, organizations who demonstrate accountability have been shown to receive repeat donations from individuals who believe they are efficiently working towards their goals (Waters 459). Trust is a product of both identification and invitation. Hon and Grunig defined commitment as "the extent to which one party believes and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote" (qtd in Waters 460). Donors have diverse motivations or *logos* for giving to nonprofits and nonprofit organizations can benefit by tapping into this personal dimension after research has been done to understand its donors (Waters 460).

Commitment is rooted in identification but also relates to invitation and feelings of inclusiveness. Satisfaction serves to measure whether the parties involved have positive feelings about one another or that "a satisfying relationship is one in which the benefits outweigh the costs" (Hon and Grunig qtd in Waters 460). Relationship marketing scholars suggest that when parties are satisfied with the nature of the relationship, they are more likely to be committed to maintaining it (Waters 460). It stands to reason then

that investment in developing satisfying relationships with stakeholders is likely to produce beneficial long-term results for the organization, such as the evolution of annual gifts into major gifts (Waters 460). Elements of satisfaction are found through *logos* and identification and serves as a vehicle for invitation. Finally, Waters addresses the role of the balance of power in the donor/nonprofit organization relationship. How much power each party in the relationship believes they maintain weighs on the dynamics of the relationship. Power lends itself to ideas of authority and legitimacy. The donor should feel that the nonprofit has the authority to work in its field and the legitimacy to use their funding properly. Power can be situated in both identification and invitation. Literature on friendship reveals that in developing and maintaining friendships both parties must feel a sense of trust, commitment, balance of power and satisfaction. Thus, it is reasonable to see that interpersonal communication theory can guide nonprofit communication towards developing friendship with its stakeholders.

Waters goes on to explain ten specific cultivation strategies that are adapted from the public relations work of Hon and Grunig and the stewardship elements described by Kelley. It should be noted that these ten strategies relate the ‘rules of friendship’ laid out by Argyle and Henderson in their 1984 work, “The Rules of Friendship”. These ten strategies include:

- Access – this strategy focuses on the availability of both sides of the relationship to each other and their willingness to engage each other directly with concerns, comments or questions.

- Positivity – this strategy deals with actions of either side of the relationship that generate feelings of contentment for the other side – positive interactions generate trust and lasting commitment.
- Openness – willingness of both parties to communicate actively and honestly.
- Assurances - assurances occur when "each party in the relationship attempts to assure the other that it and its concerns are legitimate and to demonstrate that it is committed to maintaining the relationship" (Grunig qtd in Waters 461).
Organizations can demonstrate that they value their stakeholders by incorporating this strategy into its communication plan. By listening to their donors' organizations reiterate the importance of the donors' concerns and thereby enhances their commitment to the nonprofit-donor relationship.
- Networking – this is the opportunity for nonprofit organizations to build a variety of coalitions with different stakeholders which serves as a catalyst in building relationships and by illustrating an openness to work with outside organizations and individuals to develop ideas and approaches to solving problems directly links networking to financial efficiency and success.
- Sharing of Tasks – this is the concept that organizations' and publics' sharing in solving joint or separate problems and has become an increasingly important component in the development of lasting relationships since donors are increasingly wanting to be more involved in the work of the nonprofits they support.
- Stewardship – is compiled of reciprocity, responsibility, reporting and relationship nurturing.

- Reciprocity – exhibiting gratitude and timely acknowledgement of donations and support.
- Responsibility – related to trust where the nonprofit ensures that funds are spent for the programs or services for which they were intended.
- Reporting – open communication on the progress of programs supported by donors.
- Relationship Nurturing – this requires ongoing communication with donors in the form of newsletters, invites and other communication tools however, the contacts should be as meaningful and personal as possible and not done through mass emails or mailings that appear generic and contrived.

Overall, the idea illustrated by Waters is that the individual – nonprofit organization relationship should be treated like any other interpersonal relationship we maintain. In thinking of these relationships on a personal level an air of sincerity is generated.

Strong focused mission statements that exhibit *logos*, identification and invitation coupled with well-built brand equity based in those same concepts are necessary to build sustainable relationships and partnerships that exhibit trust, focus and consistency throughout. In a cyclical manner strong sustainable relationships and partnerships feed back into the strength of the brand equity. Many large nonprofits maintain well renowned brands, but even in these instances there can be a lack of *logos*, identification and invitation within the mission and the brand. These large nonprofits, while well known, are not immune to mission slip and off mission messaging. In some instances, the small nonprofit has an advantage due to more limited service delivery and geographic location.

The next section will analyze the mission, messaging and branding of UNICEF and Love 146.

Nonprofit Mission, Message and Brand Analysis

This section analyzes the mission, messaging and branding of UNICEF and Love 146. The analysis looks at how the organizations use *logos*, identification and invitation to construct their mission, vision, values and other messaging. The analysis of these two organizations will also use Water's adaptation of interpersonal communication theory to branding and relationship cultivation to see the importance of consistency, focus, trust and identity at work. These two organizations exhibit how Kylander and Stone's brand cycle works highlighting the importance of cohesion, consistency and identity on reputation and trust.

UNICEF

UNICEF stands for the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund as was created in 1946 to provide aid to children that were starving in Europe after WWII. UNICEF's mission is "to advocate for the protection of children's rights, to help meet their basic needs and to expand their opportunities to reach their full potential" (UNICEF). UNICEF operates in over 190 countries around the world and the programs include everything from fighting Ebola and Covid-19 to parenting, education and climate change (UNICEF). Originally founded to address and improve conditions impacting children's raw survival, UNICEF has gradually drifted further and further away from that aspect of their work. The shift to a focus on children's rights began in 1989 with the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The focus on rights has led UNICEF down a rabbit hole of programming justified under the idea that a child has a

right to clean air, clean water, war free zones and health. While all this makes sense UNICEF, even with its \$6.4 billion budget, is stretched for funding. UNICEF is trying to be all things to all people and as a result is not doing anything particularly well. The organization has “degenerated into a corrupt, self-perpetuating bureaucracy” (Stehle). UNICEF’s problems are financial and bureaucratic with nearly one third of their budget going to administrative costs (Stehle). What’s more is that in many of the countries where UNICEF holds fundraising campaigns, the organizations that oversee the fund raising keep 25 to 40 per cent of the money to cover their own expense instead of sending it to the international group. UNICEF’s mission webpage found at url: <https://www.unicefusa.org/about> and hovering over mission shows the lack of focus in UNICEF’s programming. Unfortunately, with such scattered and diverse, sometimes unrelated, programming nothing gets done efficiently or effectively. The webpage shows all those activities and program areas are part of its mission, but with so much diverse programming the *logos* of nurturing healthy happy children is lost. Stakeholders seeking to identify with the organization based on its work directly with children will find it difficult to determine which aspects most speaks to their personal *logos* for becoming involved.

Beyond the financial, bureaucratic and programming issues UNICEF faces it has been embroiled in scandal after scandal since the mid-1990’s when it was involved in the UN’s oil for food campaign. In the early part of the 21st century worldwide child deaths from preventable and treatable diseases increased resulting in a call from world leaders for UNICEF to trim down its overhead and reorient programming focused on “four simple interventions: growth monitoring, oral rehydration therapy, breastfeeding, and

immunization” (McElroy). During 2018 UNICEF struggled under several allegations of sexual misconduct. The agency first came under fire when Peter Newell, UNICEF consultant, was convicted for sexually assaulting a child over the course of three years beginning in 1965 (Gennarini). Later in 2018 the Guardian reported that the UN’s children’s agency admitted shortcomings in its humanitarian support to children who alleged that they were raped and sexually abused by French peacekeepers in Central African Republic. A statement by UNICEF Netherlands was the first public acknowledgement of the agency’s failure to provide support to some of the victims of alleged abuse by peacekeepers in the African nation. The announcement came as the aid sector and the UN face increasing scrutiny for their failings in managing internal sexual misconduct by their own staff (Guardian). In 2019 employees of UNICEF came forward with information about the work environment that is not representative of their stated values of empowering women and families (Lieberman). An independent taskforce report from the spring of 2019 found that there are “dysfunctional support from systems designed to provide checks and balances on the exercise of authority has led to increased stress, frustration among staff, resulting in worrying low-levels of trust in management” (Lieberman). The same report identified “multiple cultural issues across the global organization, including favoritism, lack of trust between management and staff, and concealment of unacceptable workplace behaviors” (Lieberman). “While acknowledging the strides UNICEF has made in diversity and gender balance, particularly in recruitment, the Task Force finds that there are groups of staff who still feel strongly that they are victims of an ‘us and them’ culture” (Lieberman). The UNICEF internal summary of the

report states that “the divides are ‘ossified’ and notes they increase the potential for, and the perception of, workplace abuse and microaggressions” (Lieberman).

The mission statement at first glance appears focused, but its general nature opened the door for a variety of program not directly impacting children’s lives. UNICEF would have been better served with a mission statement that stated what activities they would undertake to improve lives of children around the world i.e., something like Virginia Supportive Housing that states it seeks to end homelessness through housing and support services. Additionally, the importance of stakeholder engagement is lacking throughout the mission statement and most of their messaging. The organization rarely pays homage to the men and women on the front lines delivering food, medicine, research or other assistance and speaks of its work in bureaucratic terms. Furthermore, UNICEF’s webpage found at url: <https://www.unicef.org/what-we-do#survival> illustrates a lack of working with others to accomplish goals.

Bringing all kinds of stakeholders into this message would be more inviting by allowing people to identify with the *logos* of the organization. Something more like the following would work better, ‘together with local governments and individuals just like UNICEF is coordinating programs that reduce child mortality through nutrition, sanitation ...’. UNICEF has moved away from *pathos* laden appeals that show children in horrifying conditions. Instead, the imagery used is of happy people whose lives have been improved by the serves provided by UNICEF. The imagery is uplifting and inviting which avoids compassion fatigue. However, UNICEF’s never uses collaborative language or language that promotes identification. The messaging states what they do and for whom but does not mention the importance of partnerships or of like-minded

individuals collaborating for a better world. In general, the audience feels no sense of the collective or of 'we together'. UNICEF relies heavily on celebrity advocacy and advertises their ambassadors prominently. UNICEF uses these celebrities to build an *ethos* around their character that is lacking in the organization itself.

The brand colors, *logos*, tag lines and imagery are consistent across the organization's website and social media, which is good, but when that superficial outer layer is peeled back one can see that there is a lack of consistency in messaging on the ground and with partnerships, as well as, within the internal operations. However, a lack of trust is the most significant aspect harming UNICEF's ability to build and maintain relationships. In Waters article, "Increasing fundraising efficiency through evaluation: Applying communication theory to the nonprofit organization—donor relationship", he discusses the importance of 4 key aspects of interpersonal communication which should also guide the donor-nonprofit relationship. These aspects are trust, commitment, satisfaction and balance of power. Unfortunately for UNICEF their scandals and mismanagement have depleted trust making it difficult for donors to commit to the organization. Adding insult to injury is the fact that government and corporate partners are not satisfied with the organization and neither are individual donors. UNICEF is relying on its history and connection to the UN to survive, but in the changing world we live in it may not survive if it can't learn to cultivate solid relationships by being trustworthy, open, honest, accessible and honoring the values upon which it was originally founded: hope, equality, respect, care and transparency.

LOVE 146

Love 146, started in 2002 to end child trafficking, sits in stark contrast to UNICEF. From the story of its creation to its daily activities, Love 146 exudes an inspirational message steeped in a clear and focused *logos*. The organization's messaging seeks identification with the stakeholder and invites you to become part of the war they are waging on depravity. The story of the creation of the organization is told on their website and is worth recounting here. Rob Morris, founder and CEO, had a desire to learn more about combating human trafficking and while in Southeast Asia accompanied an organization's undercover personnel into a brothel that was suspected of exploiting children. What he found there changed his life forever. Rob Morris recounts the experience, "We found ourselves in a room looking through a glass wall where there were young girls wearing red dresses. Each girl had a number pinned to her dress — even the dignity of a name was stripped away. On my side of the glass wall, menus were handed out with prices for different sex acts that listed each girl by number. I struggled to comprehend the traumatic situation I was witnessing. The children sat motionless, watching cartoons on crackling TVs" (Love 146). He went on to say, "I'll never forget the look on her face: Was it fight? Or was it panic, the hypervigilance that so often follows trauma? Maybe it was disgust. In my heart, I hoped it was defiance.... her number was 146" (Love146). The way the story is told immediately seeks identification with anyone who would similarly be appalled by this situation and invites the reader to join the battle. The mission of the organization is, "Love146 journeys alongside children impacted by trafficking today and prevents the trafficking of children tomorrow" (Love 146). This language shows how the organization is not working alone but in partnership with those they serve to create change. It is simple and specific allowing for direction on

activities, however, going one step further with the statement to include the activities of education/prevention, community engagement and survivor care education/prevention, that they provide. This language ensures that their programs remain focused well after Rob Morris leaves the organization. Their vision is also clear and simple, “The end of child trafficking and exploitation. Nothing less” (Love 146). Figure 8 below shows the organization’s values written in not only inspiring tones, but the personification of the qualities provides an avenue for identification. Also, there is much collaborative language that draws on the importance of a wide variety of stakeholders. On their “Our Approach” page the organization uses clear language about the importance of “collaborations and the collective will to end child trafficking” and states, “We believe this is only possible through a bold, broad vision that cannot be achieved by only one person, organization, perspective, or approach. The movement of people who agree that no child should be trafficked encompasses a broad base of diverse stakeholders and supporters — people who disagree about a myriad of issues, but who all share the vision of the end of child trafficking” (Love 146). Contained in the language above is a clear call for identification with the *logos* behind its mission. This identification tactic illustrates what Burke discusses as a we against a common enemy. LOVE 146 webpage found at url: <https://love146.org/about/> and <https://love146.org/get-involved/> illustrate the organization’s clear invitation to join their fight. It is noteworthy that Love 146 does not solicit celebrity advocates and instead stands on the *ethos* of its mission and vision. The language they use illustrates the importance each partner organization and individual stakeholder in accomplishing their mission.

Love 146 adheres to the advice that Waters gives for branding that cultivates relationships. As previously discussed, the bedrock of strong sustainable relationships is trust from which commitment and satisfaction spring. LOVE 146's webpage found at url: <https://love146.org/about/#financials> illustrates the transparency and honesty that the organization wishes to convey to its stakeholders. Other aspects which Waters highlights that are critical to relationship cultivation that Love 146 clearly exhibit are access, openness, assurances, reporting, networking, sharing tasks, stewardship, reciprocity, responsibility and relationship nurturing. These techniques are illustrated by using language and policy stated throughout their website and social media.

The work and subject matter of Love 146 is grim but the imagery and language they use is not emotionally draining causing compassion fatigue. The pictures they use are of smiling people that give stakeholders optimism about ending human trafficking and about the possibility of recovery from this type of abuse. Overall Love 146 provides an excellent example of mission and branding for the 21st century. They exhibit a 'we together' philosophy that is ripe for individual support where nearly 50% of their revenue is obtained.

A Vision for the Future

In just a few short weeks at the beginning of 2020 the world changed forever. Businesses and nonprofits alike raced to find alternate business models that would keep them afloat in socially distant environment. Even while remaining separated from other people we were reminded of how interdependent we are upon each other. The Covid-19 virus brought the world to its knees humbling all her inhabitants and making abundantly clear that we are our brother's keeper. While much of the experience in dealing with this

new world seems negative it does present us and particularly the nonprofit sector with an opportunity to reevaluate how they are interacting with stakeholders through their missions, messaging and brand. Through a 'we together' mentality nonprofit organizations can invite stakeholders to be part of the mission and the work based on identification with the *logos* upon which they were founded. Large foundations and government funding can be part of a strategic development plan, but the bedrock of funding should be individuals and events, which are powered by individuals. In 2019 the largest source of charitable funding came from individuals and totaled \$309.66 billion. Trusting in the power of individual support firmly rooted in *logos* will allow nonprofits to be strategic with other funding sources and not feel the need to chase dollars. Individual donations come from the large gifts of major donors, planned to give (leaving of assets to a nonprofit upon death) and annual fund donations of small to medium gifts. The importance of all three of these is evident however, too little effort is often spent on the individuals who make up the annual fund where the relationship is reduced to continuous asks for funding. These individuals have the potential over a lifetime to donate large sums of money. Focusing attention on individual relationships would possibly have saved both Hull and Hill House and is the reason the Kingsley is still successful today. Stakeholder relationships should be cultivated just as other interpersonal relationships are cultivated. Strategies and language that reinforces a sense of the collective working in collaboration to accomplish organization mission is an essential part of relationship cultivation. Nonprofits must switch gears from depending on large corporate, foundation and government funding to a mindset of collaboration with individuals.

In conclusion, the disciplines of history, rhetorical theory and communication theory can provide guidance to nonprofit organizations on both the mechanics of crafting mission, messaging and brand and how to build individual donor relationships which should be at the heart of fundraising and other support. Metaphors of history help nonprofits identify from where their *logos* derives. The rhetorical theories of *logos*, identification and invitation provide advice on constructing mission statements, messaging and a brand that speaks to stakeholders on a personal level. Finally, interpersonal communication theory gives a roadmap for actual interaction and relationship development. The future of a healthy nonprofit sector is bound to individuals and utilizing the power of a ‘we together’ mentality will revitalize the nonprofit sector that can resist the neoliberally constructed philanthrocapitalism and return the industry to its original intent driven by the spirit of the collective.

Works Cited

- Aaker, David A. *Building strong brands*. Simon and Schuster, 2012.
- Aaker, Jennifer L., and Patti Williams. "Empathy versus pride: The influence of emotional appeals across cultures." *Journal of consumer research* 25.3 (1998): 241-261.
- Ackerman, Frank. *Reaganomics: Rhetoric vs. reality*. South End Press, 1982.
- Adams, Don. "Loving God and One's Neighbor: Thomistic Charity." *Faith and Philosophy* 11.2 (1994): 207-223.
- Aftyka, Leszek. "Philanthropy in Ancient Times: Social and Educational Aspects." *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University* 6.1 (2019): 149-154.
- Ameriks, Karl, and Desmond M. Clarke. *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- American Heart Association.
- https://www2.heart.org/site/SPageServer?pagename=donatenow_heart&s_src=pmxs_em19&gclid=CjwKCAjw88v3BRBFEiwApwLevWstgNsdMDZcpJu06ACXCaz9X68tSmA0Az1dtfKHBgAP0DPRa-SvQxoCdJ0QAvD_BwE
- Anderson, Lindsay. "Conspicuous charity." *Co-opting Culture: Culture and Power in Sociology and Cultural Studies* (2009): 273.
- Amossy, Ruth. "Ethos at the crossroads of disciplines: Rhetoric, pragmatics, sociology." *Poetics today* 22.1 (2001): 1-23.

- Arnett, Ronald C., and Annette Holba. *An overture to philosophy of communication: The carrier of meaning*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2012.
- Arnett, Ronald C. *Levinas's rhetorical demand: The unending obligation of communication ethics*. SIU Press, 2017.
- Asen, Robert. "Neoliberalism, the public sphere, and a public good." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103.4 (2017): 329-349.
- Aygün, Ömer. "The Included Middle: Logos in Aristotle's Philosophy." (2006).
- Banks, Patricia A. "High culture, black culture: Strategic assimilation and cultural steering in museum philanthropy." *Journal of Consumer Culture* (2019): 1469540519846200.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *The consumer society: Myths and structures*. Sage, 2016.
- Beckett, Andy. "Inside the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation." *The Guardian* 12.7 (2010): 2017.
- Bennett, Roger. "Individual characteristics and the arousal of mixed emotions: Consequences for the effectiveness of charity fundraising advertisements." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 20.2 (2015): 188-209.
- Benoit, William. "Isocrates and Aristotle on rhetoric." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 20.3 (1990): 251-259.
- Berry, Margaret E. *One Hundred Years on Urban Frontiers: The Settlement Movement, 1886-1986*. United Neighborhood Center of America, 1986.
- Bishop, Matthew, and Michael Green. *Philanthrocapitalism: How giving can save the world*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA, 2010.

- Bheel, Fateh Lal. "Origins of the Settlement House Movement." *Social Welfare History Project*, 26 Feb. 2018, socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/settlement-houses/origins-of-the-settlement-house-movement/.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The rhetorical tradition: Readings from classical times to the present*. Boston, MA: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1990.
- Bone, Jennifer Emerling, Cindy L. Griffin, and T. M. Linda Scholz. "Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations Of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric And A Move Toward Civility." *Western Journal Of Communication* 72.4 (2008): 434-462. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 2 Oct. 2016.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard university press, 1984.
- Braet, Antoine C. "Ethos, pathos and logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric: A re-examination." *Argumentation* 6.3 (1992): 307-320.
- Bremner, Robert H. *Giving: Charity and philanthropy in history*. Transaction Publishers, 1996.
- Britain Express. <https://www.britainexpress.com/>
- Britannica, Encyclopedia. "Encyclopedia Britannica." (1993)
<https://www.britannica.com/>
- Broadie, Sarah, and Christopher Rowe. "Nicomachean Ethics: Translation, Introduction, Commentary." (2002).
- Brough, Melissa, and Zhan Li. "Media Systems Dependency, Symbolic Power, and Human Rights Online Video: Learning from Burma's 'Saffron Revolution' and

- WITNESS's Hub." *International Journal of Communication (19328036)*, vol. 7, Jan. 2013, pp. 281–304.
- Buber, Martin, and Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt. *On intersubjectivity and cultural creativity*. University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A grammar of motives*. Vol. 177. Univ of California Press, 1969.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A rhetoric of motives*. Univ of California Press, 1969.
- Calhoun, Craig J., Edward LiPuma, and Moishe Postone. *Bourdieu: critical perspectives*. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Carey, Mittie K. "The Parallel Rhetorics of Ella Baker." *Southern Communication Journal* 79.1 (2014): 27-40.
- Charity Giving Statistics. Charity statistic <https://www.nptrust.org/philanthropic-resources/charitable-giving-statistics/> 2018, accessed 5 April 2021
- Cheney, George. "The rhetoric of identification and the study of organizational communication." *Quarterly journal of speech* 69.2 (1983): 143-158.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. "'Improper distance': Towards a critical account of solidarity as irony." *International journal of cultural studies* 14.4 (2011): 363-381.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. "The mediation of suffering and the vision of a cosmopolitan public." *Television & new media* 9.5 (2008): 371-391.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. *The ironic spectator: Solidarity in the age of post-humanitarianism*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. "Post-humanitarianism: Humanitarian communication beyond a politics of pity." *International journal of cultural studies* 13.2 (2010): 107-126.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. *The spectatorship of suffering*. Sage, 2006.

- Chouliaraki, Lilie. "The symbolic power of transnational media: Managing the visibility of suffering." *Global Media and Communication* 4.3 (2008): 329-351.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. "The theatricality of humanitarianism: A critique of celebrity advocacy." *Communication and critical/cultural studies* 9.1 (2012): 1-21.
- Christensen, Lars Thøger, and George Cheney. "Self-absorption and self-seduction in the corporate identity game." *The Epressive Organization: Linking Identity, Reputation, and the Corporate Brand*. Oxford University Press, 2000. 246-270.
- Code, Lorraine. *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Cohen, Rick. (2012) "Death of hull house: a nonprofit coroner's inquest". *Nonprofit Quarterly*. Retrieved from: <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/hull-house-death-nonprofit-coroners-inquest>.
- Condit, Celeste M. "In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion." *Women's Studies in Communication* 20 (1997): 91-116.
- Cook, Melissa A., and Annette Holba, eds. *Philosophies of communication: Implications for everyday experience*. Peter Lang, 2008.
- Crass, Chris. "Organizing Lessons from Civil Rights Leader Ella Baker." *Anarkismo RSS*. Anarkismo, 03 Mar. 2008. Web. 22 Mar. 2017.
- Cunniffe, Eileen. "Wait, What is Venture Philanthropy Again". *Nonprofit Times Quarterly* (2014) <http://www.nonprofitquarterly.org/venture-philanthropist-definition/>
- Cunningham, Hugh. "The multi-layered history of Western philanthropy." *The Routledge companion to philanthropy*. Routledge, 2016. 62-75.
- Daly, Mary. *Gyn/ecology: The metaethics of radical feminism*. Beacon Press, 1990.

- Daly, Mark L. Knapp John Augustine. *Handbook of interpersonal communication*. Sage, 2002.
- Daley, Patricia. "Rescuing African bodies: celebrities, consumerism and neoliberal humanitarianism." *Review of African Political Economy* 40.137 (2013): 375-393.
- Deichmann, Wendy J. "The social gospel as a grassroots movement." *Church History* 84.1 (2015): 203-206
- DeLaure, Marilyn Bordwell. "Planting Seeds of Change: Ella Baker's Radical Rhetoric." *Women's Studies in Communication* 31.1 (2008): 1-28.
- Dewey, John. "The Public and Its Problems" *Swallow Press* 1927
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Helmut K. Anheier. "The sociology of nonprofit organizations and sectors." *Annual review of sociology* 16.1 (1990): 137-159.
- Dolnicar, Sara, Helen Irvine, and Katie Lazarevski. "Mission or money? Competitive challenges facing public sector nonprofit organisations in an institutionalised environment." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 13.2 (2008): 107-117.
- Douglas, Mary, and Baron Isherwood. *The world of goods: Towards an anthropology of consumption*. Vol. 6. Psychology Press, 2002.
- Dyer, Richard. *Heavenly bodies: Film stars and society*. Routledge, 2013.
- Encyclopedia.com/Biographies. *Kenneth Duva Burke*. Encyclopedia.com, 2018, accessed 5 October 2020
- Estlein, Roi. "Parenting as a communication process: Integrating interpersonal communication theory and parenting styles conceptualization." *Journal of Family Theory & Review* (2021).

Fairhurst, Gail T., Jerry Monroe Jordan, and Kurt Neuwirth. "Why are we here? Managing the meaning of an organizational mission statement." (1997): 243-263.

Faseur, Tine, and Maggie Geuens. "Communicating the right emotion to generate help for connected versus unconnected others." *Communication Research* 37.4 (2010): 498-521.

Flynn, Daniel and Yunhe, Tian. "Nonprofit Deaths, Near Deaths and Reincarnations: Part 1 of 5, Hull House." *Nonprofit Quarterly* 2015 <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/nonprofit-deaths-near-deaths-and-reincarnations-part-1-of-5-hull-house/> accessed 10 January 2020

Foss, Sonja K., and Cindy L. Griffin. "A Feminist Perspective On Rhetorical Theory: Toward A Clarification Of Boundaries." *Western Journal Of Communication* 56.4 (1992): 330-349. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 1 Oct. 2016.

Foss, Sonja K., and Cindy L. Griffin. "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal For An Invitational Rhetoric." *Communication Monographs* 62.1 (1995): 2-19. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 1 Oct. 2016.

Freyhan, Robert. "The evolution of the Caritas figure in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* (1948): 68-86.

Friedman, Lawrence J., and Mark D. McGarvie, eds. *Charity, philanthropy, and civility in American history*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Friedman, Milton. "Capitalism and freedom." *University of Chicago* 1962.

Gauss, Allison. "5 Nonprofits with Consistently Great Branding." *Constant Contact*, 6 Jan. 2017, blogs.constantcontact.com/nonprofit-branding/.

Gavin, Edward. "We are the World: A Minute by Minute Breakdown." *Rolling Stone Magazine* March 2020 <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-features/we-are-the-world-a-minute-by-minute-breakdown-54619/> accessed 15 June 2020

- Gearhart, Sally Miller. "The womanization of rhetoric." *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 2.2 (1979): 195-201.
- Gilpin, Dawn R., Edward T. Palazzolo, and Nicholas Brody. "Socially mediated authenticity." *Journal of communication management* 14.3 (2010): 258-278.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Spectacles of race and pedagogies of denial: Anti-black racist pedagogy under the reign of neoliberalism." *Communication Education* 52.3-4 (2003): 191-211.
- Goldman, M. R. "Hill District of Pittsburgh, As I Knew It." *Western Pennsylvania History: 1918-2018* (1968): 279-295.
- Gómez-Lobo, Alfonso. "Aristotle's right reason." *Apeiron* 28.4 (1995): 181-230.
- Goodman, Michael K. "The mirror of consumption: Celebritization, developmental consumption and the shifting cultural politics of fair trade." *Geoforum* 41.1 (2010): 104-116.
- Graves, Clint G. "Constitutive Communication: An Introduction and Case Study in Campus Identity".
- Guilhot, Nicolas. "Reforming the World: George Soros, Global Capitalism and the Philanthropic Management of the Social Sciences1." *Critical Sociology* 33.3 (2007): 447-477.
- Haas, J. W. *Public speaking in a global context*. (2nd ed.). Plymouth, MI: Hayden-McNeil 2015.
- Hall, Robert. "Social Motivation." *Bank Marketing, May* 38.4 (2006): 12-13.
- Hansan, J.E. (2011). "Settlement houses: an introduction". *Social Welfare History Project*. Retrieved from: <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/settlement-houses/settlement-houses/> access 10 February 2021

- Hariman, Robert. "Cultivating compassion as a way of seeing." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 6.2 (2009): 199-203.
- Harvey, David. *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2007.
- Helmig, Bernd, Katharina Spraul, and Karin Tresp. "Replication studies in nonprofit research: A generalization and extension of findings regarding the media publicity of nonprofit organizations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 41.3 (2012): 360-385.
- Hibbert, Sally, et al. "Guilt appeals: Persuasion knowledge and charitable giving." *Psychology & Marketing* 24.8 (2007): 723-742.
- Hill House. *About Hill House*. 2019, Hill House, <https://www.hillhouse.org/about-hill-house/history/> accessed 10 February 2021
- Hon, Linda Childers, and James E. Grunig. "Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations." (1999): 107-108.
- Hyde, Michael J. "Emotion and human communication: A rhetorical, scientific, and philosophical picture." *Communication Quarterly* 32.2 (1984): 120-132.
- Irene Kaufman Settlement Records, 1922-1957 (bulk 1922-1936), MSS#78, Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania. Retrieved from: <https://digital.library.pitt.edu/islandora/object/pitt:US-QQS-MSS78/viewer> 10 February 2021
- Jackson II, Ronald L., and Michael A. Hogg, eds. "Neoliberalism" *Encyclopedia of identity*. Vol. 1. Sage, 2010 1-5.
- Jones, Andrew. "Band Aid revisited: humanitarianism, consumption and philanthropy in the 1980s." *Contemporary British History* 31.2 (2017): 189-209.

- Jonker, Kim, and William F. Meehan III. "Mission matters most." (2014): 5.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of practical reason*. Dover Publications 2004
- Kent, Michael L., and Maureen Taylor. "Toward a dialogic theory of public relations." *Public relations review* 28.1 (2002): 21-37.
- Kingsley Association Records 1894–1980, AIS 70:5, Archives Service Center, University of Pittsburgh. Retrieved from: <https://digital.library.pitt.edu/collection/kingsley-association-records> accessed 5 March 2021
- Kingsley Association. 2021, Kingsley Home Page, Kingsley Association
<https://www.kingsleyassociation.org/> accessed 5 March 2021
- Klein, Naomi. "Comment: You Won't Save the Planet if You Profit from the Wreckage: A Movement has Erupted Demanding Divestment from Fossil Fuel Polluters - and in their Sights are the Giants of the Green World." *The Guardian*, May 03, 2013, pp. 39.
- Koschmann, Matthew A., Matthew G. Isbell, and Matthew L. Sanders. "Connecting nonprofit and communication scholarship: A review of key issues and a meta-theoretical framework for future research." *Review of Communication* 15.3 (2015): 200-220.
- Koschmann, Matthew A. "Developing a communicative theory of the nonprofit." *Management Communication Quarterly* 26.1 (2012): 139-146.
- Kramer, Michael W. "Communication in a Fund-Raising Marathon Group." *Journal of Communication* 55.2 (2005): 257-276.
- Kylander, Nathalie, and Christopher Stone. "The role of brand in the nonprofit sector." (2012): 35-41.

- Laidler-Kylander, Nathalie, John A. Quelch, and Bernard L. Simonin. "Building and valuing global brands in the nonprofit sector." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 17.3 (2007): 253-277.
- Laidler-Kylander, Nathalie, and Bernard Simonin. "How international nonprofits build brand equity." *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 14.1 (2009): 57-69.
- Leberman, Amy. "'Unacceptable Workplace Behaviors' at UNICEF, Leaked Report Summary Says." *Devex*, Devex, 21 June 2019, www.devex.com/news/unacceptable-workplace-behaviors-at-unicef-leaked-report-summary-says-95077 accessed 20 March 2021
- Lewis, Laurie K., Brian K. Richardson, and Stephanie A. Hamel. "When the "stakes" are communicative: The lamb's and the lion's share during nonprofit planned change." *Human Communication Research* 29.3 (2003): 400-430.
- Letwin, Shirley Robin. *The pursuit of certainty*. Liberty Fund, 2012.
- Lin, YiHsin, and Chris Ryan. "From mission statement to airline branding." *Journal of Air Transport Management* 53 (2016): 150-160.
- Linfield, Susie. *The cruel radiance: photography and political violence*. University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Linklater, Andrew. "Cosmopolitan citizenship." *Citizenship studies* 2.1 (1998): 23-41.
- Lisi, Tom. (2019). "The legacy of hill house: from settlement house to real estate player to nonprofit in dire straits" *The Public Source*. Retrieved from: <https://www.publicsource.org/the-legacy-of-hill-house-association-pittsburgh/>
- Littler, Jo. *Radical consumption: shopping for change in contemporary culture: shopping for change in contemporary culture*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK), 2008.

- Lohmann, Roger A. "The commons: A multidisciplinary approach to nonprofit organization, voluntary action, and philanthropy." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 21.3 (1992): 309-324.
- Love 146. *About Love 146*, 2021, Love 146, <http://www.love146.org> accessed 2 April 2021
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After virtue*. A&C Black, 1981.
- Markham, Tim. "Celebrity advocacy and public engagement: The divergent uses of celebrity." *International journal of cultural studies* 18.4 (2015): 467-480.
- Marlière, Philippe. "The Rules of the Journalistic Field Pierre Bourdieu's Contribution to the Sociology of the Media." *European Journal of Communication* 13.2 (1998): 219-234.
- McCarthy, Kathleen D. "Noblesse oblige: charity and cultural patronage in Chicago, 1849 TO 1929." (1981): 0370-0370.
- McElroy, Wendy. "UNICEF's 'Rights' Focus Is All Wrong: Wendy McElroy." *The Independent Institute*, Dec. 2004, www.independent.org/news/article.asp?id=1443.
- McGoey, Linsey. *No such thing as a free gift: The Gates Foundation and the price of philanthropy*. Verso Books, 2015.
- McGoey, Linsey. "Philanthrocapitalism and its critics." *Poetics* 40.2 (2012): 185-199.
- McNay, Lois. "Gender, Habitus and the Field Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity." *Theory, culture & society* 16.1 (1999): 95-117.
- Michaels, Debra. "Jane Adams". *National Women's History Museum*. Retrieved from: <https://www.womenshistory.org/education-resources/biographies/jane-addams> accessed 4 January 2021

- Möckel, Benjamin. "Humanitarianism on Stage." *The Politics of Authenticity: Countercultures and Radical Movements across the Iron Curtain, 1968-1989* 25 (2018): 233.
- Montgomery, Barbara M., and Leslie A. Baxter. "Dialogism and relational dialectics." *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships* (1998): 155-183.
- Moe, Henry Allen. "Notes on the origin of philanthropy in Christendom." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 105.2 (1961): 141-144.c
- Muller, Jerry Z. *The mind and the market: Capitalism in modern European thought*. Anchor, 2003.
- Musarò, Pierluigi. "The banality of goodness: Humanitarianism between the ethics of showing and the ethics of seeing." *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 6.2 (2015): 317-335.
- Nodelman, Uri, Colin Allen, and R. Lanier Anderson. "Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy." (1995).
- Myers, Marshall. "The use of pathos in charity letters: Some notes toward a theory and analysis." *Journal of technical writing and communication* 37.1 (2007): 3-16.
- Norris, Trevor. "Consuming signs, consuming the Polis: Hannah Arendt and Jean Baudrillard on consumer society and the eclipse of the real." *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies* 2.2 (2005): 1.
- Larsen, Øjvind. "Philanthropy and human rights: the genealogy of the idea from antiquity to global society." (2013).
- O'Connor, William Riordan. "The uti/frui distinction in Augustine's ethics." *Augustinian Studies* 14 (1983): 45-62.

- O'donovan, Oliver. *The problem of self-love in St. Augustine*. Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2006.
- Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations: An inquiry into the nature and causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Harriman House Limited, 2010.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. "Report on Private Philanthropy for Development" retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/publications/private-philanthropy-for-development-9789264085190-en.htm> accessed 10 March 2020
- Payton, Robert L., and Michael P. Moody. *Understanding philanthropy: Its meaning and mission*. Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Perelman, Chaim. "The new rhetoric: A theory of practical reasoning." *The new rhetoric and the humanities*. Springer, Dordrecht, 1979. 1-42.
- Piferi, Rachel L., Rebecca L. Jobe, and Warren H. Jones. "Giving to others during national tragedy: The effects of altruistic and egoistic motivations on long-term giving." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 23.1 (2006): 171-184.
- Putnam, Linda L., and Anne M. Nicotera, eds. *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication*. Routledge, 2009.
- Quigley, Brooke L. "Identification" as a key term in Kenneth Burke's rhetorical theory." *American communication journal* 1.3 (1998): 1.
- Richey, Lisa Ann, ed. *Celebrity humanitarianism and North-South relations: Politics, place and power*. Routledge, 2015.
- Riesman, David. *Thorstein Veblen*. Transaction Publishers, 1953.

- Rogers, Laura E. "“Helping the Helpless Help Themselves” How Volunteers and Employees Create a Moral Identity While Sustaining Symbolic Boundaries within a Homeless Shelter." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 46.2 (2017): 230-260.
- Rorty, Richard McKay, Richard Rorty, and Rorty Richard. *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Rosenfeld, Lawrence B. "Set theory: Key to the understanding, of Kenneth Burke's use of the term “identification”." *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)* 33.3 (1969): 175-183.
- Ryan, S. E. (2007). *Missioning in the nonprofit sector: Assessing nonprofit organization’s efforts at crafting and electronically disseminating their formal mission statements*. International Communication Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.
- Sadala, Maria Lúcia Araújo, and Rubens de Camargo Ferreira Adorno. "Phenomenology as a method to investigate the experience lived: a perspective from Husserl and Merleau Ponty's thought." *Journal of advanced nursing* 37.3 (2002): 282-293.
- Salamon, Lester M., and Helmut K. Anheier. "Social origins of civil society: Explaining the nonprofit sector cross-nationally." *Voluntas: International journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations* 9.3 (1998): 213-248.
- Salamon, Lester M., ed. *The state of nonprofit America*. Brookings Institution Press, 2004.
- Salmon, Virginia. “Hull House”. Retrieved from: <https://immigrationtounitedstates.org/559-hull-house.html> accessed 10 January 2021
- Sanders, Matthew L. "Being nonprofit-like in a market economy: Understanding the mission-market tension in nonprofit organizing." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 44.2 (2015): 205-222.

- Sanders, Matthew L. "Theorizing nonprofit organizations as contradictory enterprises: Understanding the inherent tensions of nonprofit marketization." *Management Communication Quarterly* 26.1 (2012): 179-185.
- Schervish, Paul G. "The moral biography of wealth: Philosophical reflections on the foundation of philanthropy." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 35.3 (2006): 477-492.
- Schrag, Calvin O. "Communicative praxis and the space of subjectivity." (1992).
- Shockley, Gordon. "Philanthropic Investment in Cultural Capital Through the Nonprofit Arts." *Alexandria, VA: Donors Trust* (2002).
- Shoemaker, Pamela J. "News and newsworthiness: A commentary." *Communications* 31.1 (2006): 105-111.
- Sloane, Thomas O. *Encyclopedia of rhetoric*. Vol. 1. Oxford University Press on Demand, 2001.
- Soho Community House Records, 1938-1951, AIS.2017.03, Archives & Special Collections, University of Pittsburgh Library System. Retrieved from:
<https://digital.library.pitt.edu/islandora/object/pitt%3AUS-PPiU-ais201703/viewer>
accessed 10 March 2021
- Spitzack, Carole, and Kathryn Carter. "Women In Communication Studies: A Typology For Revision." *Quarterly Journal Of Speech* 73.4 (1987): 401-423. *Communication & Mass Media Complete*. Web. 1 Oct. 2016.
- Stefano Gennarini, J.D., and Ph.D. Rebecca Oas. "UNICEF Consultant Sexually Assaulted Boy for Years - C-Fam." *C*, 23 Feb. 2018, c-fam.org/friday_fax/unicef-consultant-sexually-assaulted-boy-years/.

- Stehle, Vincent. *Philanthropy.com*, www.philanthropy.com/article/the-new-republic-problems-at-unicef/ accessed 5 April 2021
- Swartz, Omar. *Journal of Communication & Religion*. 32.2 (2009) Vol. 32 406-410.
- Tompkins, Phillip K. *Who is my neighbor?: Communicating and organizing to end homelessness*. Routledge, 2015.
- Trethewey, Angela. "Cultured bodies: Communication as constitutive of culture and embodied identity." *Electronic Journal of Communication* 10.1 (2000).
- UNICEF. *About UNICEF*, 2021, UNICEF <http://www.unicef.org> accessed 20 March 2021
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. "What is authenticity?." *Discourse studies* 3.4 (2001): 392-397.
- Veblen, Thorstein. *The theory of the leisure class*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.
- Virginia Supportive Housing. *About Virginia Supportive Housing*, 2021, Virginia Supportive Housing <http://www.virginiassupportivehousing.org> accessed 5 March 2019
- Waters, Richard D. "Increasing fundraising efficiency through evaluation: Applying communication theory to the nonprofit organization—donor relationship." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40.3 (2011): 458-475.
- Weber, Max. *The theory of social and economic organization*. Simon and Schuster, 2009.
- Westberg, Daniel. "Right practical reason: Aristotle, action, and prudence in Aquinas." (1994).
- Whetten, D. A., and P. C. Godfrey. "Identity in organizations: building theory through conversations", 171– 207.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. "Emotion and culture: arguing with Martha Nussbaum." *Ethos* 31.4 (2003): 577-600.

Wilson, Gerald L., et al. "Church growth through member identification and commitment: A congregational case study." *Review of Religious Research* (1993): 259-272.

World Wildlife Fund. *About World Wildlife Fund*, 2021, World Wildlife Fund, <http://www.worldwildlife.org> accessed 15 March 2021

Wright, Mark H. "Burkeian and Freudian theories of identification." *Communication Quarterly* 42.3 (1994): 301-310.

Zizek, Slavoj. "A plea for ethical violence." *Bible and Critical Theory* 1.1 (2004): 2-2.

Zunz, Oliver. *Philanthropy in America*. Princeton University Press, 2012.