

Imagining Possible Futures 2030 When Driving Forces Interact



SCENARIO A STORY CONTRIBUTIONS BY CONVERSATION 2012 PARTICIPANTS



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.

To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>

or send a letter to Creative Commons, 444 Castro Street, Suite 900, Mountain View, California, 94041, USA.



planning ▲ strategy ▲ philanthropy ▲ coaching

P.O. Box 510257 ▲ Milwaukee WI 53203 ▲ 414-962-6696 ▲ www.garyhubbellconsulting.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Philanthrotech 2030: Trust,
Philanthropy and Technology in an Ever-Connected World *Jim Hodge* 1
- The Eve of Construction *Jeff Anderson* 5
- Future Trends *Musimbi Kanyoro*13

Gary Hubbell Consulting *Conversation* 2012



PARTICIPANT BIO

Jim Hodge

Associate Chair-Principal Gifts, Mayo Foundation

An Ohioan by birth and a graduate with his bachelor's and master's degrees from Bowling Green State University in Ohio, Jim spent his early career at Bowling Green as director of planned giving and later as director of Development. In 1985 Jim came to Mayo Clinic where he has been a senior development officer responsible for building important relationships with Mayo's philanthropic partners. Presently Jim is vice chair and director of the principal gifts program, which is responsible for strategic engagements with benefactors who have the capacity and inclination to make \$1 million-plus gifts to Mayo Clinic.

Jim is a member of the faculty at Indiana University-Purdue University in Indianapolis, giving frequent Master's Classes in Philanthropy, and an instructor in The Fund Raising School at IUPUI. Jim is a frequent lecturer on the topics of values-based philanthropy, transformational philanthropy, and working with entrepreneurs as philanthropists. He has served on the editorial board of *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* published by the Center on Philanthropy and is the author of the chapter entitled "Gifts of Significance" in the publication *Achieving Excellence in Fund Raising* by Jossey-Bass. He consults on fund-raising for Healthnetwork, His Holiness the Dalia Lama, and LiveStrong/The Lance Armstrong Foundation.

Jim was the co-founder of a multimillion-dollar for-profit business within Mayo Clinic called Mayo Clinic Preferred Response, a 24/7 service that provides nursing and medical advice worldwide to individuals and organizations such as NetJets. Among committee assignments at Mayo, he serves on the Executive Committee for the President's Discovery and Translation Program, which makes grants to projects that have the potential to transform the practice of medicine at Mayo and have potential for commercialization. He has received the Mayo Excellence Award for outstanding service to patients and staff of Mayo Clinic, the Mae Berry Award for Service Excellence, and the Mayo Excellence Through Teamwork Award.

This is Jim's second *GHC Conversation*.

Philanthrotech 2030:

Trust, Philanthropy and Technology in an Ever-Connected World

By Jim Hodge

Forever-wired will be the mantra of the ultra-connected person of 2030. Technology will control technology, and eventually all of our lives. Our very eyeglass lens will be connected to computers that can identify the building in front of us or the name and characteristics of a person approaching us. Devices will be (and are now) available to monitor the food in your refrigerator and the glucose levels in your bloodstream. Algorithms are being written that, when connected with multiple accelerometers on one's body, will predict a fall of an elderly person in a nursing home before she hits the floor. Smart scales are reporting on changes in weight for those with congestive heart failure. These advances will allow seniors to stay safe and stay longer in their homes as they age. Nonprofits will bring instantaneous information about worldwide natural disasters and plights of refugees. Technology will bring the world of "needs" to the connected masses. No one will be spared the future "Arab Springs" or Susan G. Komen/Planned Parenthood controversies.

Encounters, engagements, and experiences of mission-critical nonprofits will flow to our smart phones. We will have the ability to shape what messages come our way. As futurists have speculated, there may be a remarkable role reversal from businesses learning everything possible about lives and needs, wants and preferences of consumers on the Web and Facebook to a world where the consumer controls and shapes preferred relationships with the for-profit and not-for-profit worlds.

Who will become the "chosen nonprofit organizations?" Those who earn the highest trust with consumers and benefactors. Trust will remain the single most important social and business lubricant in 2030 and beyond. Transparency and trust will not be some fine place businesses and nonprofits reach and then it is sustainable. The new completely immersed benefactors will demand sustained and enhanced trust through micro stewardship reports, accountability, and efficacy milestones. Continuous "best in class" results will be pro forma in the hearts and minds of future benefactors. The "what have you done for me today" mindsets of consumers will be precisely the mindsets of benefactors. "How are you maximizing good with my gifts?" "Do I feel completely connected to the purposeful work of the American Refugee Committee or Red Cross through their electronic disaster relief information post hurricanes, earthquakes, and political turmoil?" The "sticky messages" of Malcolm Gladwell's *Tipping Point* and "contagious messengers" will rule the nonprofits' smart phones of the future.

The lines between the nonprofit world and business world will blur further. Social businesses will grow exponentially, maximizing purpose with some profit. Social businesses will be run as low-profit entities embracing the very best practices of the for-profit world with the reflective natures of the nonprofit world. A kinder and gentler for-

profit world will emerge where cooperative competitiveness will reign. Shareholders will want reasonable financial returns from their stockholdings but will be willing to sacrifice “maximization of return” to a hybrid model, including purposeful dividends that improve the lives of consumers, producers and the health of the planet. These conversations are occurring today at gatherings such as the Clinton Global Initiative, Aspen Institute, Stanford and Ted Talks.

Humans are hardwired for acts of agency and for altruism, and in 2030 we will be connected directly with meaningful ways to improve lives and the planet. Nonprofits will abandon the hunt-and-chase approach to philanthropy and replace it with Paul Schervish’s model of philanthropic “discernment.” We will no longer focus metrics upon money but rather upon important conversations about the role of philanthropy in the well-examined life. Technology and “Kahn Academy” will level the educational field for literally billions of the world’s poorest of the poor. MIT has already led the open-source electronic higher education platform where anyone anywhere in the world can tune into and virtually take classes from a world-class organization. Health care information will be a touch away and in multiple languages. Everything Mayo Clinic knows today will be known by the world tomorrow. Organizations that reach perpetual authenticity will make wise choices as to how to deploy resources and will welcome 24/7 advice and feedback from consumers and benefactors alike.

With all the technological enhancements to our lives, it will be the transparent organization that will survive and thrive. Maximizing joy and exploring human growth and development will occupy more mind space for for-profit and nonprofit organizations. More and more nonprofit organizations will engage benefactors in real-time on-site experiences that demonstrate mission-specific work. A vast expansion of nonprofits and ecotourism will fill the lives of truly engaged philanthropists. This will be the money-to-meaning transformation where material success will be put to spiritual purposes.

The brave new world of professionals in philanthropy will change. Rather than manage for financial targets alone, development leaders will mentor, coach and lead qualitative metrics based upon enhancing relationships with benefactors and potential benefactors. Furthermore, qualitative metrics will measure the relationship quotient development officers are building between benefactors and nonprofit leaders as well as the institutional mission and critical activities. Development officers will be taught relationship-building skills that genuinely connect benefactors with the good that is accomplished at a nonprofit and, ultimately, how together with nonprofits, benefactors can make their lives a gift to the world. Development officers and nonprofit leaders will be schooled in the psychology of constant connectedness. How to build trust initially will be the subject of conferences and CME courses. Nonprofit leaders will become aware of the psychological effects of crowding out behaviors, bystander effects, and compassion fatigue. Authenticity will rain the airways and the clouds of the ever-connected world of tomorrow.

Not only will change happen dramatically in connected environments, it will speed up exponentially. This will require building “trust accounts” with conscientious benefactors. For-profit and nonprofit organizations will extend trust to consumers before they ask trust in return. How this will be accomplished is the subject of conversations today conducted by leading-edge nonprofit leaders.

Technology is agnostic, as it can be put to good or evil ends. It will be the organizations of integrity that will rule the worlds of tomorrow’s philanthropy. It will be a hopeful and helpful, a generative and powerful future for philanthropy. Individuals will write their moral biographies based upon explorations of the importance of philanthropy in a well-examined life. Technology will take a second chair to trust in the well-examined life. We need to start now to build the foundations of the high-tech, high-touch virtual philanthropy of 2030.

Gary Hubbell Consulting *Conversation* 2012



PARTICIPANT BIO

Jeff Anderson

Executive VP and Chief Operating Officer,
The Oregon Community Foundation

Jeff Anderson is Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer at The Oregon Community Foundation (OCF). He's a native of Massachusetts but also spent much of his childhood in Tennessee, where his family moved in the mid-1960s. He's lived in Oregon since 1977.

Jeff previously served OCF as Senior Program Officer, where he managed the statewide Community Grants program and other activities of the foundation. Prior to joining OCF in 1998, Jeff was associate vice-president for development at Lewis & Clark College, where he coordinated a major comprehensive campaign from 1991 to 1997. From 1987 to 1991 Jeff was the Northwest field representative for the Youth Project, a national foundation providing grants and technical assistance to grassroots community organizations. He worked as a community organizer with Oregon Fair Share in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Prior to that, he worked in development at Vanderbilt University, his alma mater, where he received his B.A. in 1975.

Jeff has served on volunteer committees for Ronald McDonald House Charities of Oregon, KBOO community radio, Entrepreneur's Foundation of the NW, Grant High School Foundation, and the Black United Fund. He is currently President of the board of directors for Grantmakers of Oregon and SW Washington (comprising some 90 private, corporate, and community foundations, as well as government funders).

Jeff and his wife Joan have two children ages 23 and 21. They enjoy traveling in search of the kids and sunshine (which has worked nicely since the children chose colleges in southern California). He generally relaxes through listening to music, playing acoustic guitar, writing, reading, hiking, skiing and snowshoeing, and following the Red Sox (the latter not being very relaxing).

This is Jeff's first *GHC Conversation*.

The Eve of Construction

(An Op-Ed)

by Jeff Anderson

*The puzzled ones, the Americans, go through their lives
Buying what they are told to buy,
Pursuing their love affairs with the automobile,*

*Baseball and football, romance and beauty,
Enthusiastic as trained seals, going into debt, struggling —
True believers in liberty, and also security...*

*...we do try
To keep smiling, for when we're smiling, the whole world
Smiles with us, but we feel we've lost*

*That loving feeling. Clouds ride by above us,
Rivers flow, toilets work, traffic lights work, barring floods, fires
And earthquakes, houses and streets appear stable*

*So what is it, this moon-shaped blankness?
What the hell is it? America is perplexed.
We would fix it if we knew what was broken.*

— Alicia Suskin Ostriker (from "Fix," 2005)

*...when human respect is disintegratin',
this whole crazy world is just too frustratin',
and you tell me over and over and over again my friend,
ah, you don't believe we're on the eve of destruction.*

— P.F. Sloan, 1965

*"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any
nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure." — Abraham
Lincoln, 1863*

It might seem a stretch to invoke Abraham Lincoln's address at Gettysburg in describing America at the dawn of the 21st century, but if the violence of the country's divisions and problems were beyond compare to that of this century, the threat to the very idea of democracy was not. And many would argue that even the context of violence resonated with our time—except that it was a less visible and more insidious violence rooted in

decades of institutional decline and neglect. It wasn't a conflagration. But like rust, its effect was highly corrosive.

By the time the millennium rolled around, Americans concerned about such disparate issues as recession, taxation, war, greed, poverty, terrorism, inequity, the environment, and the cost of health care had been subjected to three decades of a basic, insistent, and expertly framed political message: "Government is The Problem. Above all, Distrust Government!" The campaign was fostered at its inception by conservative foundations that made sustained and highly strategic investments in think tanks that taught a new conservative movement to frame issues drawing on a few core American values: rugged individualism, hard work, and American exceptionalism; and on fears and myths about race, class, and religion. Those who held the view that government could help to remedy our ills had no persuasive response, and by 2011 those on the political left had their own reasons for disenchantment with government: e.g., restricted civil liberties following the 9/11 terrorist attacks; bailouts of the banks that had done so much to cause the collapse of the economy in 2007; and a Supreme Court that had delivered the White House to George W. Bush and then acted to do the same for corporations via its Citizens United decision. The two major parties were so polarized that a considerable ideological gap existed even between the Democrats farthest to their party's right and Republicans farthest to their party's left. Government was effectively paralyzed.

Americans' standard of living was also dropping. Households' net worth had dropped by \$5.5 trillion in the recession of 2007-2009, according to the Federal Reserve. The trillion dollar public debt was numbing. So-called "tax revolts" at the state level had resulted over time in bankrupt cities and counties and failing schools. High school graduation rates were abysmal at just the time that education became critical to success in a highly competitive job market. Studies indicated that for the first time in American history, children were likely to have a lower standard of living as adults than their parents. Resources for basic public services were scarce. The United States had the highest documented incarceration rate in the world; one of every ten young African-Americans was in prison. The income gap between the wealthiest Americans and the average American household was unprecedented; the ratio of compensation between the highest paid and lowest paid employees in many companies had skyrocketed to 500:1 from historic ratios generally a tenth that large.

Public trust of government and big business was at rock bottom. In 1958, 73 percent of the American people reported that they trusted the government in Washington to do what was right "most of the time" or "just about always." By mid-2009, even at a time when a new president enjoyed 60 percent approval ratings, only 20 percent said they trusted the government.

One sector stood apart, at least to an extent. Nonprofits and foundations were burgeoning in number: in the first ten years of this century, the number of nonprofits grew 60 percent—to 1.1 million public charities. The number of foundations grew in that time by 50 percent to about 76,000 grantmaking foundations distributing nearly \$46 billion to nonprofit and public agencies. Working to address myriad problems in local communities, this sector was not exempt from criticism, or free from abuses of 501(c)(3) tax status, but it had retained significant public confidence that its work was in the best interests of the community—in a national poll in 2010, seven in ten Americans reported that they trusted nonprofit organizations more than they trusted the government or businesses to solve society's problems.

As social and economic problems grew and government revenues shrank, some political leaders saw nonprofits as fair game for new taxation. For example, city governments experimented with PILOT (“voluntary” Payments In Lieu Of Taxes) programs to generate revenue from colleges and hospitals that owned valuable property that was normally exempt from property tax; at the national level, federal legislators were urged to adopt changes in the tax code that would inhibit charitable giving, such as caps on income tax deductions, to generate more tax dollars. But in an example of greater collaborations to come, foundations and nonprofit organizations organized effective opposition at the grassroots, and foundation boards in particular used their networking influence with policy makers and opinion leaders to blunt the tax increases on charitable groups.

Other political leaders looked at the nonprofit and philanthropic sectors more creatively. One consequence of the conservative drive to shrink government in the 1980s had been to increase the number of public services being provided through contracts with private nonprofit organizations, ostensibly more efficient than public sector agencies. Though its ultimate impact was hard to measure, President George H.W. Bush in 1989 had used his inaugural address to encourage philanthropy in place of public programs:

I have spoken of a thousand points of light, of all the community organizations that are spread like stars throughout the Nation, doing good. We will work hand in hand, encouraging, sometimes leading... We will work on this in the White House, in the Cabinet agencies. ...The old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in.

In the dark economic times of 2009, President Barack Obama went further, putting money where his mouth was, creating federal grant programs designed specifically to spread innovative, research-based nonprofit solutions to community problems, with community foundations and other groups serving as sponsoring partners.

All this while, a historic transfer of wealth between the “greatest generation” that came of age in WWII and their progeny the “baby boomers” was underway. Estimated in the mid-1990s to be potentially as great as \$41 trillion over the first 50 years of the 21st century (though shrunk by two recessions in the century's first decade), the transfer still represented a significant expansion of resources in the hands of an activist generation.

By 2012, a growing number of those who had acquired their own wealth—often pragmatically minded entrepreneurs—were also concerned about the rigid ideologies dominating the political arena, and started a variety of philanthropic and community-minded efforts. The \$33 billion Gates Foundation took on grand national and international challenges such as disease eradication, education reform, and economic development; Social Venture Partners facilitated donors’ twin commitments to give and to serve; B-corporations redefined business investment dividends to include social and environmental benefits; The Giving Pledge attracted high-end donors willing to make a public promise to distribute personal wealth for public benefit. These donors and business people displayed a communitarian spirit typical of many in the baby boomer generation.

The stage had been set for something new.

“The way forward must include such paradoxes as rigorous values, poignant data, strategic intuition, irrational insight, deliberate improvisation, soulful strategy, rational exuberance, and immeasurable outcomes.” —Paul Connolly, *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, July 2011

As expanded resources began to serve multi-generational idealism, hands-on attitude about community engagement and a willingness to take greater risks in philanthropy, change became noticeable. Seeing opportunity in a convergence of disparate factors such as compelling research on child development, a public education system searching for answers to declining graduation rates, rapidly increasing ethnic diversity, and an alarming income gap, mainstream foundations, including both private funders and community foundations, were motivated to search out new partnerships that might have the clout to influence public discourse and public investment. Business leaders concerned about developing a pipeline of workers able to fill modern jobs were ready to answer the call. Political leaders were inclined to piggyback on the favorable public opinion toward philanthropy.

In 2003, for example, five foundations came together to found Foundations for a Better Oregon (FBO). These partners, including a community foundation, three private foundations, and a corporate foundation, agreed that public education in Oregon was at a crisis point that required an extraordinary effort by philanthropy. FBO created The Chalkboard Project to promote accountability, stability and quality in the state's K-12 public education system. Over a 10-year period, Chalkboard moved toward a focus on teacher

quality and created a project that engaged teachers and administrators together in local districts to define supportive professional development plans that would lead to student success, with the valuable byproducts of improved teacher retention and compensation. The effort was embraced by grassroots organizations such as Stand for Children. The model earned multi-million dollar financial support from the state legislature for replication and began to spread rapidly. Eventually even teachers' unions became proponents. Some of the FBO partners also began independently to advocate for systemic change. The Oregon Community Foundation took advantage of its public charity status to endorse legislation and deploy its staff and board members into key advisory roles in state government, becoming full partners in development of a comprehensive, streamlined “birth to career” public education system.

In another Northwest example, Neighborhood Partnerships, a nonprofit organization spearheading a statewide affordable housing advocacy coalition, received support from the Northwest Area Foundation in 2010 to bring staff of Demos, a New York-based policy research group, to Oregon to conduct training for public agency employees and nonprofit organizations in how to frame issues more effectively, including how to frame debates about the positive role of government in solving economic and social problems.

Urged on by nonprofit organizations and using collaborative strategies, funders pressed successfully for tax policies favoring private giving, including more liberal rules permitting IRA rollovers for advised funds at community foundations. Funders encouraged their grantees to engage in grassroots lobbying via operating support grants. More grants focused on capacity building and leveraging public dollars. Foundations took a variety of new approaches toward support of local communities through their allocation of assets, program related investments, and loans in addition to grants. And—very importantly—leading foundations resisted what had been a trend toward employing quantitative measurements of “outcomes,” opting instead for more flexible measurements of change and a willingness to learn through trial and error. They insisted that failure WAS an option if something new could be learned from it, and that innovation without trial and error was impossible.

Other factors not exclusive to philanthropy and nonprofit work helped to sustain the momentum of emerging alignments. Early in the 21st century, technology had brought immediacy to nonprofit causes and the potential of change (indeed, regime-toppling revolutions in Africa and elsewhere) directly to the general public; web sites and social networks mobilized donors to pool resources; nonprofits' books were available online, assuring transparency. However, donor fatigue set in as cause-related marketing saturated the Web. The fragmentation of giving led to reinvigorated institutional, place-based giving as donors came to miss their more personal connection to the efforts taking place with their funds, and concluded that their donations could have little plausible long-term impact on international problems. Technology and social media grew into useful tools for local donors

to identify causes and manage pooled resources. Community foundations became able to serve larger geographic areas more effectively while retaining a personal touch.

By 2020, this type of effort was multiplying across the country. Where once the organizations that researcher Robert Putnam termed “mediating institutions” — the local Rotary, Elks, Odd Fellows, churches, and even bowling leagues — served to knit communities together, now service and advocacy organizations, teamed with foundation, business and government partners — attracted ever larger numbers of volunteers interested in making change. The combination of resources was powerful, as foundations wielded financial resources and powerful connections, while the universe of nonprofits brought local knowledge, volunteer power, and grassroots legitimacy to change-oriented efforts. Philanthropy, once a mysterious and relatively closed sector, was gaining an entirely new place in American life.

A ripple effect of foundations' assuming the “intermediary” role was to begin restoring luster to the idea of participatory democracy, and public structures as necessary and valued. Government was never likely to return to the mid-20th century role of a large centralized agent of change and entitlement à la The Great Society; but it could be the collaborative partner that had by far the greatest financial resources, the potential to replicate successful strategies broadly, and the most formal public accountability. It was no longer “the problem” but a necessary and vital part of the solution. Its partnerships with the philanthropic and nonprofit sectors also gave sanction to dramatically increased public investment in such long-term solutions to poverty as early childhood education, as traditional pork-barrel approaches and agency-centric public budgets gave way to outcomes-based budgets. For the first time in American history, elections hinged on the question of what was best for the future of the nation's children.

“Make no small plans. They have no magic to stir men's blood.” — attributed to Daniel Burnham

A corollary impact of the old drumbeat that “government is the problem” had been to shrink the ambitions of our public institutions. Lacking revenue and visionary leadership in elected roles, our largest common enterprise, government, had been reduced to tinkering with nearly moribund systems. The public's sights were seldom raised to genuinely visionary goals. Even protests on the left seemed to lack direction. The “Occupy” movement beginning in 2011 had focused on economic injustice, but not on the vision of what a just system could provide. Philanthropy, however, brought into its partnership with government a unique combination of strengths—a history of support for “big thinking,” and the capacity to use private resources for experiments serving the broad public interest without the scrutiny necessary when public funds were allocated.

Now, as we enter the fourth decade of the 21st century, we as a people are regaining an essential sense of optimism. Philanthropy's role as the venture capital for new ideas has reignited public faith that significant change is possible. The "innovation slowdown" that had characterized the past half century—in which change was rampant but real progress was negligible (iPhones notwithstanding)—is being replaced by spectacular advances in energy conservation, solar energy production, regional food systems, water purification, genetics-based treatment of disease, and many other fields. Electric cars, powered by solar cell stations, are the norm. The solar technology in windows of large commercial buildings generates enough power to heat the buildings. These and other technologies have been fostered from the research stage to mass production by partnerships among foundations, universities, government and individual donors. We have learned enough to know that unqualified faith in science and technology (suggested by the mid-20th century corporate slogan "Better Living Through Chemistry") does not serve us well. But neither does rampant cynicism. It's encouraging that the kind of philanthropy that resulted in Carnegie's libraries, spurred the eradication of smallpox, and underwrote the civil rights movement is resurgent again.

Obviously we are not yet out of the woods. The global environment has been polluted significantly; standards of living based on intense use of energy resources are still promoted in industrializing countries; poor people the world over want and deserve equal opportunities to enjoy healthy and rewarding lives. The investment and real estate markets are volatile, though long term trend lines have regained an upward slant. The future of capitalism that requires ever more consumption is uneasy, and we are still a mercantile nation in which those with money have disproportionate political influence. Income inequality is still severe. But recent studies indicate that Americans are happier than they have been for nearly seventy years—and the U.S. has moved from its 23rd place position in 2006 in the "Satisfaction with Life" index to the top ten.

We seem to know better how to navigate through our challenges. And it may be that America's one real claim to exceptionalism—its citizens' obdurate "do it yourself" attitude—is the rudder that has turned our ship of state toward safer waters since the first decade of the 2000s. Despite all, we are still able to flex our civic muscles, like the young country observed by de Tocqueville in the 1820s, with its astonishing propensity for "voluntary associations" to get vitally important work done. It's our nation's philanthropists and its visionaries, its civic volunteers and community organizers, its non-ideological leadership, its ecumenical partnerships with business, government, labor and faith communities, and its resolute commitment to a vital public sector with deeply engaged citizens, that is the new bedrock of an America "of, by, and for the people." And like the Union in the days following the sacrifices at Gettysburg, we're all the better for being motivated by hope.

Gary Hubbell Consulting *Conversation* 2012



PARTICIPANT BIO

Musimbi Kanyoro

President and CEO, The Global Fund for Women

Dr. Musimbi Kanyoro is an international leader and advocate for the health, development and human rights for women, girls and minority groups. She is currently President and CEO of the Global Fund for Women, the largest publicly supported grantmaking foundation that advances human rights by investing in women-led organizations that use Global Fund grants to promote women's human rights. The Global Fund for Women's model of social change philanthropy brings together grantees and donors to realize a better world for women.

Kanyoro's accomplishments include: spearheading efforts to include girls education and women's leadership to Packard Foundation grantmaking while Director for Population Program; as a champion for young women, she successfully led initiatives to ensure the representation of women under 30 on local, national and global boards; and was the first non-white woman to serve as general secretary (CEO) of the World YWCA, the largest women's membership organization that operates in more than 120 countries reaching more than 25 million women and girls annually. During her ten years at the World YWCA, the organization celebrated its 150th anniversary with a campaign that raised \$15 million dollars.

A true global citizen, Kanyoro has lived and worked in all parts of the world including Africa, Europe and the United States. Her extensive international experience has made her a sought after thought leader for media, government, advocacy and NGOs. She has written and published extensively on matters affecting the lives of women and children.

Kanyoro received her Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin and her D. Min. from San Francisco Theological Seminary in San Anselmo, California. She received her bachelor's degree from the University of Nairobi, Kenya.

She has been the recipient of numerous awards over the years, including the 2011 Changing the Face of Philanthropy Award from the Women's Funding Network, the African Women's Development Fund Women of Substance Award, Femmes Africa Solidarité Leadership in Peace Award, Women, Leadership, and Human Dignity Award for significant contribution to the advancement of human dignity, the Kenya Government Presidential Award in recognition of international leadership, and the Global Leadership Award on HIV and AIDS from the World Vision and International AIDS Trust. In addition, Kanyoro is a founding member of the Global Coalition on Women and AIDS and served on its leadership council for the first five years.

This is Musimbi's second *GHC Conversation*.

Future Trends

By Musimbi Kanyoro

FUTURE TRENDS



THE WORLD IN 2030 DRIVERS FOR CHANGE

2030 AT A GLANCE

- Face to face meetings replaced by virtual video-conferences
- Radical reduction of international passenger air travel due to increased oil cost and emission controls.
- Facebook and Al Jazeera become #1 information sources
- China is leader in alternative energy
- Brazil is a leader in agriculture

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

SHOCKS = DRIVERS

- 2030 ends a turbulent decade hallmarked by stresses that increase displacement, inequality, instability & conflict.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

SHOCKS

- Health shocks, e.g. major pandemic;
- Infrastructure shocks, e.g. major disruption of the internet;
- Governance shocks, including backlash against democracy as fraught elections and party politics fail to produce legitimate outcomes
- Climate shocks
- Resource shocks, eg. food & oil spikes. Floods and Tsunami.
- Geopolitical shocks, e.g. new high impact terrorist attacks or a nuclear exchange in East Asia or Persian Gulf;
- Economic shocks, more financial crisis similar to 2008.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

DEMOGRAPHICS

- Political instability
- 50% the population is under 20 in most African countries
- 70% of the world live in cities
- Job creation + education not keeping pace → youth radicalizing

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

SHRINKING STATE CAPACITY

- No match for growing organized crime and paramilitary;
- More “lawless” cities emerge, like Juarez and Tijuana in 2010
- More conservative governments
- No safety net
- Large number of privatized armies

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

NON-STATE ACTORS + SUPRANATIONAL “TRIBES”

- Explosive growth in loose clans
- Conservative forces + progressive social movements (eg feminists) -- increasingly inform, persuade & organize globally.
- Growing appetite for alternatives
- More conflict within religious groups, between ‘fundamentalist’ + ‘open’ beliefs.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

INEQUALITY + MIGRATION

- See growing levels of job polarization (between high and low skilled jobs) as new technologies compete with human labor.
- MIGRATION – flow of people across borders increases without adequate laws; exploitation, trafficking; ethnic clashes.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

NEW ALLIANCES

- Success in global justice advocacy requires building coalitions + the ability to communicate/ work with radically diverse sets of actors, both state and non-state, that can act as shared platforms for pursuing shared tasks.
- Many civil society groups focused on social services + dealing with inequality gap.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

TECHNOLOGY

- Technology outruns energy shortages; price of oil has dropped; becomes the 3rd source of energy after wind & solar.
- Biotechnology increases manipulation of genes.
- Increase access to ICT's – all handheld - but inequality gap exacerbated by unequal access; negative for women.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

WOMEN

- Women's voices about social inequality become louder.
- More women stand for public positions, control both investing & spending. Consumer patterns change as women, more than men, consider health and wellbeing, including those of future generations. Women's rights agendas begin to gain traction worldwide lead by radicalized youth.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

COALITIONS

- Women's leadership begins to encourage collaborations and coalitions across differences.
- Women connect with youth to form alliances that promote philanthropy and political change for social agendas.

Musimbi Kanyoro, Ph.D.

Diary of Musimbi Kanyoro in the Year 2030

By Musimbi Kanyoro

January 31, 2030

My grandson laughed a great deal today when I told him I used to take ten-hour flights to attend one-hour meetings. He could not comprehend the amount of time and resources and saw the extreme inefficiency. It is incredible that so much has changed in just two decades!

In 2010 fuel cost \$3 a gallon and we never imagined the current price of \$30 per gallon. I remember that in 2011, Nigeria went on strike when the government suspended the general fuel subsidy. Who would even consider a fuel subsidy for everybody today?

Well, some good has come out of the fuel shortages. Most cities report less automobile traffic, yet people continue to commute at the same, and often higher rates, because of increased urbanization globally. Without a doubt, the fuel shortages have impacted family life albeit, in a small way: My grandson spends more time with his daughter than I did with his mother.

Who would have thought the cost of fuel would be the answer to the reduction of carbon emissions? The radical reduction of air travel has grown a new niche market of “home office” installations. This is doing more for the environment than we ever imagined in the 2000’s. Businesses are in a race to equip their staff with the latest technology and right now, it seems like there should be some collaborative work between environmentalists and IT technologists.

Technological advances are defining the future. The other day, I was surprised to learn from a web journal of science that sequencing the human genome is no longer costly or time consuming. Engineering biological systems and materials no longer raises any eyebrows.

But I worry that the advancement in science and technology is causing a dilemma for development and social change philanthropists with regard to their investment priorities. Should resources be spent on supporting innovations that will leapfrog technology that might have the potential to provide clean energy and increase agricultural productivity by boosting yields, or should the resources be invested in the empowerment of people, policies and laws that shed light on the vulnerabilities of the poor? For me this is not a question of

either/or. With the changing world, we cannot avoid these questions just because there is less money for social agendas.

It seems that more and more, people are losing their sympathy and mercy for the suffering. It appears that humanity has become numb to the pictures that used to shock and ignite deeds of mercy. The current disasters are bigger and more visible but they play out like movies and the general public is simply an audience. The number of the world's populations who do not have access to electricity and rely on biomass for cooking continues to increase. Not only is hunger a perpetual problem, but it begs for new scientific solutions to reform the way we do agriculture.

Actualizing the potential for science and technology to support agriculture and development should not exclude improving conditions such as infrastructure for farmers and rural residents, making credit available, and advocating for systems of irrigation that need very little water. The focus must be both about creating scientific tools and addressing problems; building the capacity and benefiting from science.

February 21, 2030

Today we started planning a trip for my grandson, his wife and their daughter to visit San Francisco. We got to talking about California and railway networks that cross the state.

Railway networks fascinate my grandson. He imagines himself zooming at 300 miles an hour, in a fast train from Beijing to Chengdu, or better still Rio de Janeiro to Salvador. These countries are also well prepared for alternative energy. The US is behind in all kinds of transportation developments. I told him about millennium visionaries like the young lawyer who became the first Black president in the US, Barack Obama, and the millionaire Warren Buffet whose advice on the value of investing in railways was scoffed at by many Americans 20 years ago. Today, we know that choosing to go alone, as a super power, and neglecting the opportunity to learn from others, is costing us a lot in this country. I meet people of my generation who worked so hard and hoped to leave lots of money for their children and charities, but now they have to spend it making ends meet. Public transport is still a problem in the US. People still use all their money to fuel cars and the more they avoid air travel, the more it seems wise to move to railway transport and learn from the success of Europe, Japan and China.

March 21, 2030

We are still wondering what the world is going to look like as the news sinks in that the dollar lost its status as global reserve currency.

March was indeed a turbulent month in more than one way. So many reports of frequent data/identity theft and tracking internet use/access and now the whole growth of the internet has become a threat.

In 2011, the world was full of news about the Arab spring. March 2030 seems to be the global spring. Backlashes against democracy are lighting up sparks like bush fires in the dry season. Fraudulent elections and party politics are the order of the day but we saw it coming years ago. In the 2012 US elections, the agenda was to unseat the president, but there was no agenda beyond that. What the masses did not realize was that the rest of the world no longer feared or respected the US. This was the beginning of the fall of its super power status.

April 21

What a month! We had so much rain in some places and drought in others. It is shocking to see on the one hand, floods, and tsunamis and on the other, fires exacerbated by drought. Did I hear that in Northern Russia winter has refused to end? Here in California we have many frequent small earthquakes. Everybody whispers about “the big one.”

My grandson and I hold very different views when it comes to religion and politics. This is not just “a clash of civilizations.” He has no political stand or party allegiance, but claims to be “multi-religious” by making his own selections from the world’s religions. Sometimes we debate these concepts, but sometimes it is too hard to talk about them. I secretly admire his pragmatism.

May 21, 2030

Wow, the population figures hit nine billion. We are not ready for this.

More than half the world’s population is now urban, and the general assumption is that 99% of the ‘next billion’ will be urban too. 70% of the world’s population is under 20 years old. They need jobs and schools. Leadership gaps are beginning to show in civil society movements and governments. There are no social protection systems to provide safety nets

to the unemployed. Today, over 80% of people lack access to social protection of any kind (food shelter, cash, jobs, food schemes, pensions, etc.). Tackling this would require long-term financing, and a major advocacy push given frequent concerns that social protection systems create dependency.

June 21, 2030

I went to a lecture at Stanford today and I like what I heard. This young woman is a leader, and if she is elected to be the new president of the United States, I see hope. She said “it is the river, not the paddler that dictates the speed with which the boat moves, but the direction of the boat depends on the combined efforts of all those on board.” We are living in times where the drivers of change are visible and pushing on us. Working collaboratively to impact the forces of change can halt the momentum of negative impacts.

She stressed the significance of building coalitions between and beyond state and non-state players, and to push boundaries beyond our familiar safety. We are not going to mitigate global shocks until we work together across geographies, political fields, state and non-state agents, generations and genders. She said we must be a nation that embraces others and learns to tell the collective story of one world. I am still reflecting on this message.