Fall 2021

A City of Angels: Philanthropy and the Public Good in the Fragmented Metropolis

Kelsey Picken
Claremont Graduate University

A City of Angels:

Philanthropy and the Public Good in the Fragmented Metropolis

by

Kelsey Picken

Doctor of Philosophy

Claremont Graduate University
2021

APPROVAL OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

This dissertation has been duly read, reviewed, and critiqued by the Committee listed below, which hereby approves the manuscript of Kelsey Picken as fulfilling the scope and quality requirements for meriting the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Cultural Studies.

Joshua Goode, Chair
Claremont Graduate University
Associate Professor of Cultural Studies and History

David Luis-Brown
Claremont Graduate University
Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies and English

Robert Klitgaard
Claremont Graduate University
University Professor

ABSTRACT

A City of Angels: Philanthropy and the Public Good in the Fragmented Metropolis
By
Kelsey Picken

Claremont Graduate University: 2021

This dissertation will examine philanthropy and capital in Los Angeles in two parts: the first to produce a breakdown of the ideological assumptions of the most dominant forms of philanthropy in the United States—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns. The second part offers case studies for each of these forms to illustrate how the various institutional applications of philanthropy within the unique context of Los Angeles contribute to the transformation of the philanthropic model through the exchange of capital. Together, these chapters uncover distinct site-specific efforts that led to the successful active engagement of the citizenry in philanthropy, reducing the fundamental inequities of participation in the exchange of capital, resulting in the increased potential of serving the public good. By expanding beyond the criticisms of the exploitative foundations of philanthropy, I offer a reinterpretation of the notion that philanthropy is a technology of power that disseminates economic, social, and cultural control. Instead of upholding the values of the elite through reproducing a system that serves to remedy the exploitation of the relations of production, I reimagine philanthropy's methodologies as a means to include the citizenry more openly as an active social subject.

Ultimately, this dissertation evaluates the comparative efficacy of the three major philanthropic forms—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns—as they adapt to the dispersed social landscapes of Los Angeles during the 20th century. By expanding a

cultural studies theoretical framework to investigate the understudied field of philanthropy, this dissertation illustrates a genealogical approach to philanthropy facilitated by Los Angeles's foundational cultural institutions: the Hollywood Bowl, the Music Center, and the Los Angeles Public Library. Tracing each form of philanthropy through these institutions provides the opportunity to question and compare how their respective philanthropic efforts have contributed to the adaptation of applied transference of capital as a methodology to engage multiple subsets of the citizenry for the public good.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my friends and family for their unwavering support during this very long and strenuous degree. A few specific shout-outs are deserved: Tamar Saliban, Lourdes Hernandez-Cuellar, and Joseph Harper, each for your own way of helping me survive this process. I also acknowledge those who asked about my dissertation and pretended to be interested throughout my long spiels even when none of it made sense. Of course, I thank my Mom and Dad who continued to ask about my progress and, even when it felt as though there was none, remained a constant support system in both the best and worst of times. I would also be remiss if I did not thank my current cat, Ragnar, who offered countless moments of comfort regardless of the circumstance, and to Aslan, even though this dissertation outlasted him.

I also need to recognize the invaluable support of the Los Angeles Public Library staff who helped me uncover untapped resources, both within and outside of the library: Suzanne Im, Christina Rice, Sheryn Morris, Jim Sherman, and Glen Creason. Most importantly, I thank Judy Ostrander, not only for her time in providing an endless wealth of information to this research endeavor, but also to facilitating the success of the Save the Books campaign: your leadership, perseverance, and dedication for serving the Los Angeles community has not gone unnoticed.

In particular, I need to also recognize my committee, Dr. Joshua Goode, Dr. David Luis-Brown, and Dr. Robert Klitgaard. Your guidance, comments, and encouragement throughout this process were invaluable and have helped shape me into a better scholar, critic, and professional. Claremont Graduate University's Center for Writing and Rhetoric also served a major role in my success in completing this dissertation through accountability, limitless resources, and necessary feedback. To all those students and staff who attended the weekend and week-long bootcamps along with me, I will forever be grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

A City of Angeles: Philanthropy and the Public Good in the Fragmented Metropolis

> For all its successes, Los Angeles has not developed the political, cultural and philanthropic institutions that have proved critical in other American cities…this is a relatively young city, filled with recent arrivals who do not have the history of the kind of old-line families who have defined civic foundations.
>
> – Tim Arango and Adam Nagourney[1]

As Tim Arango and Adam Nagourney suggest in the above quote from an article in *The New York Times,* Los Angeles's lack of traditional, legacy-driven civic development has resulted in a perpetual division across its public-serving institutions. Citing the city's young age as a measurable marker of its lack of philanthropic institutions, they argue that this stems from the lack of a cohesive identity, which in other American cities, is established through last-named institutions. Civic engagement, described as the ways in which individuals, groups, or communities address the needs and concerns of the public to increase the quality of life for the citizenry, is directly tied the establishment of civic institutions through philanthropy. Yet, Arango and Nagourney, who rely on the established prejudiced East Coast rhetoric of city development, fail to recognize that in a city like Los Angeles, whose social and physical structures represent a mosaic of people and places, civic-minded individuals, groups, and communities all serve a purpose, not just the branding of family names like in New York City. Due to their obtuse interpretation of Los Angeles's philanthropy, Arango and Nagourney's remarks reveal the need for an interrogation of how a perceived void of philanthropy results in their claim that Los Angeles is a city that "never quite came together."[2]

---

1. Tim Arango and Adam Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart in a City that Never Quite Came Together," *New York Times* (New York, NY), Jan 30, 2018.

2. Arango and Nagourney.

Many urban historians and theorists identify the dispersed geography as the primary contributor to Los Angeles's fragmentation.[3] However, Arango and Nagourney uniquely pinpoint the lack of civic institutions due to low philanthropic participation as the cause of the social fragmentation instead.[4] The rhetoric of Los Angeles as a fragmented metropolis focuses on its physical landscape, but also contributes to a fragmented reading of the city's social, institutional, and philanthropic infrastructures, while this is in fact not the case. A recent study by Charity Navigator instead ranked Los Angeles higher in overall philanthropic practice than "established cities like Boston and Philadelphia," and even New York City.[5] While Arango and Nagourney state that Los Angeles is absent of "strong institutions that bind it together" as a result of a lack of philanthropy, the city possesses numerous historical examples of philanthropy that led to the establishment of its most foundational cultural institutions.[6] When traditional models of philanthropy are applied to the scholarly rhetoric of the "fragmented metropolis" of Los Angeles, defined by its dispersed geography, diverse cultures, and unique private and public character, the attempt to pinpoint an absence of named philanthropic institutions within a city

3. *See* Reyner Banham. *Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies.* (London: The Penguin Press: 1971); Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* (New York: Verso Books, 1990); Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967).

4. Arango and Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart."

5. Charity Navigator is an online charity evaluator whose rating system seeks to provide donors with confidence when donating to nonprofit organizations through financial health, accountability, and transparency. For study results, see "13th Annual Metro Market Study." *Charity Navigator.* https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=studies.metro.main.

6. Charity Navigator.

center as an indicator of a lack of civic engagement inevitably misreads how philanthropy functions in a decentralized city.[7]

While contemporary scholars often focus on the field of philanthropy as a homogenous form of power, these analyses of philanthropic practice conflict with the public perception that philanthropy predominantly exists to serve the public good through altruistic behaviors. These systemic criticisms focus on issues of exploitative practices and reproduced outcomes of the field are primarily embedded within "big philanthropy." The term serves to represent the excessive involvement of financial capital in philanthropy directed by individuals to specific causes or organizations that result in the shifting of public policies and social values. Many of Los Angeles's museums were indeed founded by so-called big philanthropists or engaged individuals, including the named Getty Center, Norton Simon Museum, Hammer Museum, and Broad Museum. Additionally, many named private foundations in Los Angeles have supported several cultural and civic projects, such as the Ahmanson, W. M. Keck, Ralph M. Parsons, and Weingart foundations. These already well-known institutions and foundations have served as catalysts to the display and collection of the arts in Los Angeles, creating a network of cultural spaces across the region from West Los Angeles to Downtown, and Pasadena to San Pedro.

On the other hand, many more unrecognized instances of philanthropy in Los Angeles have been historically conducted through voluntary associations. Voluntary associations, or like-minded volunteers who form a group to accomplish a shared purpose, were uniquely suited to Los Angeles's expansive landscape.[8] As distinct communities formed around Los Angeles due to

7. Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967).

8. Kathleen McCarthy, *American Creed: Philanthropy and the Rise of Civil Society, 1700-1865* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003), 13.

immigration, class, labor, or race, voluntary associations were established to serve in-group community-specific needs, as well as to charitably support the needs of others. One of these voluntary associations, named the Los Angeles Library Association, directly led to the establishment of one of the city's most fundamental public institutions, the Los Angeles Public Library. Due to Los Angeles's metaphorical reputation as being "silo-ized," where people are more likely to identify with their community or neighborhood rather than the city at-large, the volume of community philanthropic efforts—both large and small scale—that have contributed to the public good across Los Angeles are left unobserved.[9]

Scholarly critique not only focuses on big philanthropy but also interrogates grassroots philanthropy. This form of philanthropy, commonly referred to as grassroots philanthropy, represents the opposing philanthropic extremity of big philanthropy, but on a small scale. Grassroots philanthropy is defined as a "community-based effort aimed at making a small difference."[10] While more individuals are involved in this type of philanthropy, it is still considered small scale due to minimal financial contributions in a direct comparison to big philanthropy. As shown in a study conducted by Joanne Marshall, this type of small-scale community philanthropy represents an alternative or bottom-up approach to fundraising. Its weakness, she concludes, is that it serves as "a band-aid, not a solution.[11] The challenge with small-scale philanthropy is that it has a more minimal impact, often helping one individual or family at a time. While community trust is central to the long-term success if this fundraising

9. Arango and Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart."

10. Joanne M. Marshall, "Grassroots Philanthropy on the Prairie," *The Phi Delta Kappan* 93, no. 8 (2012): 38.

11. Marshall, 36.

style, trust alone cannot fulfill the extent of communal long-term social, political, and economic needs and thereby may be dismantled over time.[12] This type of philanthropy exists in response to the exploitative measures of capitalism which removes the ability to fund vital resources for smaller communities to thrive economically and thereby does not effectively promote a more equitable, inclusive form of capital exchange for the citizenry at-large.[13]

The academic focus on both big philanthropy and small-scale grassroots philanthropy, neglects to study the effects of the incorporation of the citizenry on a larger scale. A reimagination of the field requires the application of multiple forms of philanthropy with the intention of active participation and results that increase the well-being of the citizenry at-large. In other words, the current academic emphasis of critiquing big and grassroots philanthropy ignores the potential of the mass campaign, which combines a myriad of forms of philanthropy into one. The philanthropic framework developed in Los Angeles over the course of the 20th century consists of a multilayered approach to incorporating the citizenry across diverse spaces and populations, convincing individuals to donate but also to see themselves as part of a unified whole.

The misinterpretation of Los Angeles philanthropy also stems from a theoretical and practical resistance to recognize the need for a new model of philanthropy that supports a comprehensive interpretation of a post-modern metropolis. Its structure reflects a decentralized

12. Marshall, 37.

13. Louise Lief, "Social Justice Philanthropy Restructures to Focus on Power," Inside Philanthropy, February 12, 2020, https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2020/2/12/social-justice-philanthropy-restructures-to-focus-on-power

city, contrary to modern urban areas that emerged from the era of industrialization.[14] Traditional philanthropic models parallel the formation of modern cities and industrial legacies, thereby defining Los Angeles as a singularity in both its geographic formulation as well as its approach to philanthropy. Notably, Los Angeles does not fit into a traditional East Coast model of philanthropy, nor does it fit into a what has been defined as a "new philanthropy" by the West Coast.[15] As recognized in the practice of fundraising, whereas the East Coast model is based on legacy established through generations of accumulated capital, and then exchanged for cultural and social capital, the West Coast model is focused on new wealth created through the technological industry.[16] This contrast between models that account for either new or old money ignores the contributions of a constantly evolving, multicultural, and disjointed city with a mix of both old and new money in which its philanthropy matches neither framework.

Not only is the success of philanthropy in Los Angeles overlooked, the entirety of the field of the philanthropy is also understudied, resulting in a unique tension at the frontier of philanthropic theory and practice. To uncover the historical implications of the establishment of civic institutions and the engagement of individuals within philanthropy, this dissertation begins by exploring the discourse and ideological framework of the academic study of philanthropy in its entirety as well as its independent social forms and functions. Moreover, a fundamental

---

14. William Fulton, *The Reluctant Metropolis: The Politics of Urban Growth in Los Angeles* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2001), 12-14.

15. Ann Charles, "Traditional Philanthropy Gives Way to a New Power," *Business Ethics,* Accessed December 2, 2019, https://business-ethics.com/2010/10/15/1544-traditional-philanthropy-gives-way-to-a-new-kind-of-power/

16. Vindu Goel, "East vs. West," *New York Times,* November 6, 2016. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/giving/philanthropy-in-silicon-valley-big-bets-on-big-ideas.html

component within the field of philanthropy that requires further analysis is the role of capital. In the Marxist sense, capital is defined by the material exchange of money for goods; however, in philanthropy, other forms of capital are engaged in the exchange, building upon the social relations of capital, generally associated with the thought of by Pierre Bourdieu.[17] In other words, while philanthropy is assumed to be a form of giving, it is, in fact, a critical mechanism for the exchange or accrual of many forms of capital. When a donor provides measurable economic capital to an organization, they receive an often-hidden form social or cultural capital in return through recognition naming opportunities. As such, this dissertation seeks to uncover the intricacies of this exchange of capital by exploring three case studies, all of which take place in Los Angeles.

The aim of this dissertation is thereby twofold: first, to contribute to an emerging body of knowledge on philanthropy from a cultural studies perspective; and second, to critically analyze the application of capital as it relates to philanthropy. The questions that guide this dissertation include: How can reimagining philanthropy as a mechanism for the exchange of capital contribute to the theory and practice of the field? How is giving shaped by the contradictions between its perceived roles as a tool to achieve the public good while perpetuating social and cultural inequities created by capitalism? How can the practice of philanthropy prioritize the mobilization of the multitude to better ensure an intent to serve the public good? As a result, I argue that the forced appropriation of traditional philanthropic models to the City of Los Angeles restricts scholars, fundraisers, and donors from the opportunity to transform the current methodologies of the exchange of capital across the fragmented metropolis through philanthropy.

17. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education,* ed. J. G. Richardson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986), 242.

Specifically, Los Angeles's decentralization requires a critical study of bridging and bonding social capital within the practice of philanthropy. Bridging social capital is defined by working across different individuals and spaces, while bonding social capital brings people together based on similarities, focusing on in-group participation.[18] While capital is exchanged in all forms of philanthropy regardless of place, bridging and bonding social capital are best explored in Los Angeles because its landscape necessitates special attention to the ways in which individuals and institutions are connected by or separated from one another. These site-specific case studies thereby allow for a new interpretation of a previously misunderstood philanthropic state, uncovering the ways in which a post-modern model of philanthropy practiced by a diverse set of individuals can contribute to an inclusionary accumulation of social capital to cultivate a cohesive citizenry, especially through mass campaigns.

Ultimately, this dissertation evaluates the comparative efficacy of the three major philanthropic forms—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns—as they adapt to the dispersed social landscapes of Los Angeles during the 20th century. By expanding a cultural studies theoretical framework to investigate the understudied field of philanthropy, this dissertation illustrates a genealogical approach to philanthropy facilitated by Los Angeles's foundational cultural institutions: the Hollywood Bowl, the Music Center, and the Los Angeles Public Library. Tracing each form of philanthropy through these institutions provides the opportunity to question and compare how their respective philanthropic efforts have contributed to the adaptation of applied transference of capital as a methodology to engage multiple subsets of the citizenry for the public good.

---

18. Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Smith and Schuster Paperbacks, 2000), 22-24.

Philanthropy and Capital

Little attention has currently been given to the relationship of philanthropy and capital in the academic sphere. Philanthropy is not simply a "love for humankind," but rather an inherently social, complex, and imbalanced network facilitated through the transfer of capital within the non-profit sector.[19] Philanthropy thereby serves as a necessary reflection of the exploitative practices involving the accumulation and expenditure of capital as a result of the means of production. The biased motivations and behaviors of donors within the practice of philanthropy contradict the underlying altruistic theories of philanthropy in serving the public good. As such, first uncovering the interconnected relationship of philanthropy and capital is essential to expanding the possibilities of how the sector can better serve the public good through an understanding of the exploitative prerequisite of surplus capital accumulation from which philanthropy occurs as a remedy.

This dissertation's central focus of capital relies heavily on the framework and analysis provided by Hector Amaya in his work, *Citizenship Excess: Latino/as, Media, and the Nation*. Amaya, who filters his work through the materialistic underpinnings of Marx's writings on the role of capital, uniquely applies the theory of capital to the understanding of ideological political power accumulated through citizenship.[20] Adapted to highlight the ways in which excess capital grants privileges to those who possess it, Amaya argues that:

> citizenship is inherently a process of uneven political capital accumulation and that the unevenness follows ethno-racial lines. As important, the term *excess* signals that citizenship cannot be rehabilitated within the nation-state. This theory helps us see that excess happens when those in power can organize political markets in such a way that

19. Anand Giridharadas, *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World* (New York: Alfred P. Knopf, 2018), 7.

20. Hector Amaya, *Citizenship Excess: Latinos/as, Media, and the Nation* (New York: New York University Press, 2013).

> political transactions yield a surplus volume that they accumulate. The accumulation of such surplus political value, over time, becomes the basis for more and for easier accumulation.[21]

This interpretation of citizenship as it relates to capital within the accumulation of political power, value, and surplus reflects the same properties of the mechanism of philanthropy within the social sector. Surplus or excess capital possessed by those in power provides the ability to participate in guiding civil society and public policies through philanthropic means, as well as the capacity to accumulate further capital in the exchange of one form of capital into another. Individuals who do not possess surplus or excess capital cannot fully participate in the civic relations through philanthropy. By the very nature of the theory, for economic capital to be donated, possessing excess capital through exploitative means, bound up in ethno-racial oppression, is a prerequisite for the occurrence of philanthropy, returning the excess to the population from which it has been taken. As a result, philanthropy occurs at the space in which excess social, cultural, or economic capital resides.

Amaya's dedicated study of excess capital also establishes the foundations on which to interpret Pierre Bourdieu within the context of philanthropy and the public good. As previously mentioned, philanthropy is tied to a multiplicity of forms of capital: economic, cultural, and social. First, economic capital is most readily witnessed as financial capital or money. Central to philanthropy is the expenditure of economic capital, commonly referred to a financial donation, but economic theory does not account for the social exchanges of giving. As Bourdieu argues, a reliance of Marx's version of capitalism restricts the analysis of capital within the material relations of production, "reducing the universe of exchanges to mercantile exchange."[22] When

---

21. Amaya, 2.

22. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 242.

this materialistic focus expands to include Bourdieu's ideological approach, the embodied nature of the accumulation and transference of cultural and social capital contribute to the discourse of a multidirectional philanthropic exchange. Whereas economic capital is achieved within objective maximization of profit, social and cultural capital are accumulated to advance subjective ideological purposes.[23] Even as economic capital exchange embodies the essence of the practice of philanthropy, it only superficially exposes the implications of philanthropic participation and its consequences.

Public perception about philanthropy as a financially based contribution confirms Bourdieu's argument that "economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital."[24] The expenditure of economic capital can transfer or be exchanged into other forms. For example, philanthropy's essence as financial contributions, distributed as economic capital, superficially conceals the exchange of the other forms of social and cultural capital. Bourdieu's study of capital not only uncovers the complex system of the accumulation of capital, but directly informs the ways in which participating in philanthropy provides individuals with an exceptional opportunity to immediately exchange financial capital for other forms of capital that are usually only earned through legacy, inheritance, and dedicated time.

Unlike economic capital, cultural capital does not exist in a singular, tangible, or material form. Instead, it reveals the embedded relations of philanthropy to capital through three states that describe its distinct and comparative qualities: objectified, embodied, and institutionalized.[25] The embodied state is defined by the accumulation of knowledge, where "the work of acquisition

23. Bourdieu, 243.

24. Bourdieu, 252.

25. Bourdieu, 243.

is the work on one-self (self-improvement), an effort that presupposes a personal costs…an investment, above all of time."[26] Like institutionalized cultural capital, an embodied state must be accumulated over time and cannot be transferred between individuals, such as the inheritance of excess economic capital. Whereas economic capital has a measurable value and can be exchanged for goods of an equal value, cultural capital holds capital through its perceived value. This form of cultural capital can be measured through time to acquire a specific proficiency but can only be proven through the application of that acquired knowledge and cannot be traded for material goods.

Institutionalized capital is also earned over time but can be recognized through identifiable markers such as educational qualifications.[27] Nevertheless, both embodied and institutionalized capital are dependent on social conditions, where their "transmission and acquisition are more disguised than those of economic capital."[28] The objectified state, which includes cultural possessions, such as "writings, paintings, monuments, instruments, etc.," however, can be directly purchased, exchanged, and converted into economic capital.[29] These material forms of cultural capital are explicit and displayed as alternative forms of excess capital. In each of its states, cultural capital requires a direct participation of the individual upheld by the practice of philanthropy to economically support the institutions, embodiments, and objects of culture that maintain the earned, transferred, socialized, or purchased cultural capital.

---

26. Bourdieu, 245.

27. Bourdieu, 244.

28. Bourdieu, 245.

29. Bourdieu, 246.

Furthermore, cultural capital can be unevenly acquired, dependent on "the period, the society, and the social class."[30] Time, place, and class all affect the ways in which an individual can accumulate cultural capital. In other words, cultural capital is more easily acquired based on an individual's position within a stratified society, which is already dependent on an individual's already-attributed cultural, and even economic, capital. Philanthropy is a distinct producer of institutional spaces that allow for the accumulation of cultural capital. In philanthropy, through the donation of excess economic capital, the donor gains increased access to cultural capital of which they support, and thereby the opportunity to accumulate it further. Bourdieu defines social reproduction as "the reproduction of the structure of the relations of force between the classes."[31] Cultural reproduction similarly ensures that cultural values, relations, and institutions are maintained from one generation to the next. As a result, the philanthropic sector allows donors a means through which to uphold the relations of capital, ensuring social and cultural reproduction.

To make novel contributions to the study of philanthropy, this dissertation looks beyond the tangible and traceable material donations of economic and cultural capital and instead focuses on the resulting accumulation of social capital, imparted upon the individual donor in direct exchange for their philanthropically recognized donation. This unveiling of the exchange between the various forms of capital replaces the public perception of the pure altruism of the field with an understanding of the benefits received in return. Bourdieu defines social capital as "social obligations" or "connections," indicating an interwoven quality to the individuals who

30. Bourdieu, 245.

31. Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1990), 11.

actively participate in its production.[32] Many sociologists and theorists that have explored the term social capital, applying it to discussing the role of community in the success of schooling, neighborliness in the modern metropolis, or the legacy of slavery.[33] Bourdieu describes social capital as:

> the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition…which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word.[34]

members of these networks benefit from the accumulated capital of its members, which provide recognition to each member both within and outside of the group. In philanthropy, these durable networks form around causes and often take shape as philanthropic voluntary associations or membership groups. As a result, the growth of the network benefits its members in self-serving and self-sustaining ways. These credits continue to provide value for the individuals involved to encourage further participation, thereby continuing to increase the network's social capital.

Each of the forms are intertwined, and each contributes both directly and indirectly to the system of philanthropy. This understudied relationship between capital and philanthropy is critical to contributing to the theoretical knowledge for the field precisely because philanthropy is currently under a critical lens as to whether it still exists as an altruistic practice. As this dissertation will further analyze in the following chapter, philanthropy is described as a prosocial

---

32. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 243.

33. Glenn Loury, "A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences," in *Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination*, eds. P. Wallace and A. LaMonde (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1977), 153-188.

34. Bourdieu, *Distinction* (Milton: Routledge Kegan and Paul, 1984), 21.

behavior due to the promotion of social relations among donors and recipients.[35] A term established within the fields of social and behavioral psychology, "pro-social behavior" describes any type of behavior that is intended to help others, specifically "by a concern for the rights, feelings, and welfare of other people."[36] The compulsion to engage in this behavior is often developed by witnessing the behaviors of others. By observing first-hand or popularized media examples of philanthropy, individuals are encouraged to participate for the benefit of the accumulation of social capital through recognition. As I will explore in more depth, authors David Callahan and Anand Giridharadas openly criticize philanthropy, especially when conducted by individuals for purposes of self-interest. Philanthropy's restricted accessibility to include only those who possess excess capital or the ability to accumulate it quickly reveals the need for a critical analysis of the various discourses, ideologies, frameworks, and forms of philanthropy that shape these exploitative relations of capital.

While the accumulation of economic, cultural, and social capital is intertwined, and each plays an important role in the processes of exchange through philanthropy, the study of the role of social capital in philanthropy marks a rare opportunity for analysis in relation to different categories of social subjects, especially the multitude. Social capital accumulated through philanthropy—if accumulated by the citizenry at-large instead of just by a few individuals—provides the opportunity for distinction of philanthropy in Los Angeles for the public good. Unlike cities with a single, unifying center, Los Angeles provides individuals, groups, and the

35. Russell James, *Inside the Mind of the Bequest Donor: A Visual Presentation of the Neuroscience and Psychology of Effective Planned Giving Communication* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 2013), 11.

36. Kendra Cherry, "The Basics of Prosocial Behavior," *Very Well Mind,* April 30, 2020. https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-prosocial-behavior-2795479.

multitude the opportunity to partake in the accumulation of social capital that benefits the public good in inclusionary ways, instead of upholding the existing hegemonic and centralized social structures, even within the pre-existing exploitative foundation of philanthropy as a sector.

Philanthropy in the Fragmented Metropolis

Described as a "fragmented metropolis," Los Angeles's widespread, complicated, and diverse layout has long been seen primarily as the product of real estate speculation for urban renewal. Shaped more by developers than by industry, gentrification than by historical community formation, and joined more by freeways than by neighborhoods, Los Angeles is labelled as an inherently post-modern city, where it has no recognizable pattern, and is socially and physically decentralized.[37] The city's nonconformity to its predecessors has constantly required urban planners and scholars to create reasons as to why it is seemingly unmanageable and undefined compared to other urban centers across the United States. The existing literature on the field of philanthropy mimics the rhetoric of current scholarship to define Los Angeles without acknowledging its post-modern, decentralized, and unnormalized traits.

While the contemporary interpretation of Los Angeles as a fragmented metropolis relies on the upheld rhetoric of its disjointed landscape, the city's early discourse on fragmentation as it relates to philanthropy was more social than geographic. This was a direct result of ethnic minorities and immigrants as they moved in and out of the center of the forming city. Robert M. Fogelson, author of *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930,* argues that this movement was not always by choice and often by designed segregation. Fogelson expresses

37. Robert M. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930.* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967); Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* (New York: Verso Books, 1990); Carey McWilliams. *Southern California: Island on the Land.* (Layton: Gibbs Smith, 1973).

immigrants as the "dynamic component in the emergence of Los Angeles."[38] Not only did the movement of people and their social and cultural values contribute to the growth and dynamism of the city, but it also resulted in a polarization of multiple community centers and edges. As segregated communities emerged across the growing and sprawling space of Los Angeles, "the fragmented society of the white majority complemented the isolated communities of the ethnic minorities."[39] Due to white and other immigrant communities establishing distinct and separate centers across the city, the fragmented layout of the physical and social landscape requires a modified reading of the city.[40] The migration of the population through space and time transformed Los Angeles both socially and geographically, through which the continuous exchange of philanthropic capital has shaped and produced this enigmatic city.

The language of fracture and segmentation abounds in discussions of Los Angeles. First, Los Angeles has been interpreted as "an archipelago of ethnic, cultural, racial, and socio-economic islands."[41] Carey McWilliams, author of *Southern California: An Island on the Land,* identifies each disparate community as its own island because of its lack of integration with any of the other communities that surround it, as if they had no shared borders. McWilliams describes these islands in relation to the social stratification of the city: "Throughout Southern California, social lines do not run across or bisect communities; on the contrary, they circle

38. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 84.

39. Fogelson, 204.

40. Reyner Banhamm *Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies.* (London: The Penguin Press: 1971); Mike Davis, *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* (New York: Verso Books, 1990); Carey McWilliams. *Southern California: Island on the Land.* (Layton: Gibbs Smith, 1973).

41. Carey McWilliams, *Southern California: Island on the Land* (Layton: Gibbs Smith, 1973), 328.

around and sequester entire communities. The arrangement of social classes in horizontal clusters, rather than by vertical categories, is, indeed, a striking characteristic of the region."[42] While the origins of migration of various communities into distinct centers was based on movement in and out of the city, these communities were viewed as immovable, enclosed, and defined spaces, resulting in a myriad of distinct but homogeneous entities. McWilliams points to the exceptional horizontal landscape of the city as the contributing force in which communities become more disparate from one other, leading to distinct entities whose civic, social, and political identity remains unique from the whole.

Due to this socially fragmented composition of Los Angeles, voluntary associations formed to allow for gathering with other like-minded individuals. In fact, newcomers to Los Angeles indispensably used membership in voluntary associations to determine their social position within the new city. Following Fogelson's theory of the "quest for community," voluntary associations linked Angelenos to each other through shared interest and ability.[43] As a result, throughout the early development of Los Angeles and its cultural institutions, those who immersed themselves in community-building through membership in voluntary associations guided public opinion on leading social issues, while also unevenly accumulating social capital within the emerging city. Ultimately, voluntary associations helped to build community, simultaneously consolidating the fragmented metropolis "into a sociological mosaic—collectively homogenous, but individually heterogeneous," where the citizenry of Los Angeles sought to build a new cultural and social identity through civic engagement.[44]

---

42. McWilliams, *Southern California,* 314.

43. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 2.

44. Putnam, *Bowling Alone.*

Judith Miller, a former correspondent for *The New York Times*, suggests that philanthropy in Los Angeles is evidence of the lack of unifying civic institutions: "While there are incidents of huge philanthropy, there is, unlike New York, no sense of civic pride that obliges one to give in a sustained or systematic way."[45] In other words, her primary examination of philanthropy in Los Angeles is conducted by focusing on big philanthropy. Even in instances of big philanthropy, she interprets these moments as singular, disjointed, and non-reproducible. The suggestion of a lack of philanthropy in Los Angeles is not that philanthropy does not occur, but rather that it is not conducted in ways that focus on the perpetuation of family names as a form of social branding. The result of this reductionist lens is that Los Angeles philanthropy does not fit into a traditional framework, thereby left unacknowledged and understudied.

Beyond an initial criticism of Los Angeles as a mass amalgamation, Miller expands her analysis to compare the roles of individual neighborhoods and identities in Los Angeles with New York as they relate to philanthropy:

> As a relatively new city compared to those in the East, for instance, it has less of a tradition of giving. Its population is increasingly made up of immigrants who are not only new to the city but to the American style of charitable giving. The city's entertainment industry is notoriously volatile, as are the incomes of those who depend on it. Perhaps the greatest obstacle to philanthropy is the city's geography. In New York City, many of the leading cultural institutions are concentrated in the wealthiest neighborhoods, like the Upper East Side. But in Los Angeles, cultural institutions downtown are far from their well-heeled patrons in Pasadena, the traditionally Catholic and Protestant stronghold, and in the Westside, home of the entertainment industry and Jewish professionals.[46]

As this quotation suggests, Los Angeles' participation in philanthropy is mismatched in comparison to a traditional East Coast model for several reasons. Reflective of Miller's earlier

---

45. Judith Miller, "In Los Angeles, a New Generation Discovers Philanthropy," *New York Times* (New York, NY), December 8, 1997.

46. Miller.

comment on the lack of a "sustained or systematic"[47] giving framework, she fails to understand how the volatility of the culture industry, the disparate geographies of the Los Angeles landscape, and the dispersed financial capital outside of downtown all contribute to the city's illegible form of philanthropy. Her interpretation of big philanthropy follows the traditional form of the modern metropolis, focused on a city center, unlike the multiplicity of centers in post-modern Los Angeles. Therefore, Miller fails to apply an interpretation to philanthropy in Los Angeles that captures its diversified structure and the way in which that impacts the legibility of big philanthropy. Perceptions such as these continue to inform a false sensibility about the social behaviors of those who accrue capital and donate to institutions in Los Angeles instead of seeking to uncover its exceptionalism.

While the rhetoric of Los Angeles as a fragmented metropolis focuses on both the geographic and social characteristics of the city, this dissertation argues that Los Angeles's social exceptionalism provides the contextual site through which to investigate the role of capital in upholding or reimagining philanthropy. As Reyner Banham, a Los Angeles architectural critic, argues, "Once the history of the city is brought under review, it is immediately apparent that no city has ever been produced by such an extraordinary mixture of geography, climate, economics, demography, mechanics and culture; nor is it likely that an even remotely similar mixture will ever occur again."[48] Indeed, Los Angeles is an exceptional and post-modern city whose unique combination of characteristics complicates its analysis within a broader spectrum of scholarship and practice. By thinking beyond the traditional frameworks of philanthropic practice and encouraging further active participation of the citizenry, this dissertation uncovers the potential

47. Miller.

48. Banham, *Los Angeles,* 6.

to reimagine a philanthropy in which the embedded exploitation of capital accumulation and the resulting reproduction of elitist systemic values are dismantled through a more diverse, complex, and inclusive practice that fulfills the sector's intent to serve the public good

Chapter Outline

This dissertation will examine philanthropy and capital in Los Angeles in two parts: the first to produce a breakdown of the ideological assumptions of the most dominant forms of philanthropy in the United States—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns. The second part offers case studies for each of these forms to illustrate how the various institutional applications of philanthropy within the unique context of Los Angeles contribute to the transformation of the philanthropic model through the exchange of capital. Together, these chapters uncover distinct site-specific efforts that led to the successful active engagement of the citizenry in philanthropy, reducing the fundamental inequities of participation in the exchange of capital, resulting in the increased potential of serving the public good. By expanding beyond the criticisms of the exploitative foundations of philanthropy, I offer a reinterpretation of the notion that philanthropy is a technology of power that disseminates economic, social, and cultural control. Instead of upholding the values of the elite through reproducing a system that serves to remedy the exploitation of the relations of production, I reimagine philanthropy's methodologies as a means to include the citizenry more openly as an active social subject.

Specifically, to understand the multidimensional historical context of philanthropy since its conceptual approach was first documented in the 17th century, Chapter One explores the shifting discourses of its definitions and ideological frameworks. In contrast to the founding definition of philanthropy as an altruistic expression of the "love of humankind," 20th century

definitions shift towards a focus on the "voluntary action" of the individual, specifically in the exchange of surplus economic capital instead of time.[49] As a result, altruistic assumptions continue to be embedded within the action of donating, resulting in a tension between who gives and why. An examination of the ideological framework of modern philanthropy uncovers the ways in which philanthropic participation is motivated by the accumulation, exchange, and transfer of surplus capital. Chapter One concludes that philanthropy operates within a capital-centric ideology, deploying a practice that motivates individuals to participate through various philanthropic forms for purposes of self-benefit in the accumulation of new forms of capital while simultaneously serving the public good.

Chapter Two builds upon this ideological research to illustrate the forms of philanthropy as they relate to varying social subjects: big philanthropy by individuals, voluntary associations by groups, and mass campaigns by the citizenry at-large. This chapter illuminates the major philanthropic shifts embedded within each distinct forms of philanthropy, and how these affect the ways in which philanthropy occurs and transforms within the post-modern Los Angeles topology. Beginning with the Industrial Revolution, followed by Andrew Carnegie's publication of the *Gospel of Wealth* in 1889, an exponential growth of big philanthropy resulted in new forms of regulation and criticism of individual influence on the social sphere. Carnegie's participation in building Los Angeles's cultural institutions was met with excessive skepticism but laid the framework for individual such as Dorothy Chandler and Franklin Murphy to emerge as philanthropic leaders. Further, Chapter Two investigates shifts in the dynamics of voluntary associations in the United States throughout the twentieth century and the transition from social

49. Robert L. Payton and Michael P. Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission* (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 2008).

to economic capital in philanthropic participation, directly resulting in diminished civic engagement. Lastly, Chapter Two traces the emergence of the Ward-Pierce Model and the ways in which mass campaigns raised unprecedented funds through a newly organized, condensed, and measured model of fundraising to include the masses for the first time. Together, these philanthropic forms confirm the importance of the exchange of capital across various social units over time and their direct impact on civic engagement through philanthropy for the public good.

Part Two focuses on case study analyses of the application of these three major forms of philanthropy through individual and institutional histories. First, Chapter Three demonstrates how Los Angeles's most iconic civic and cultural institutions were the products of big philanthropy initiatives throughout the 20th century. These case studies illustrate how the critiques of Los Angeles's philanthropy by authors such as Judith Miller, Tim Arango, and Adam Nagourney misinterpret and overlook the embedded nature of big philanthropy within the city's landscape. The study of big philanthropy needs to be considered more broadly in Los Angeles, not as an inaccurately defined missing piece of Los Angeles, but instead in terms of how it has been uniquely practiced in the decentralized city. First, Andrew M. Carnegie, while considered a founding father of philanthropy, is little recognized for his work that was particularly informed by, and contributed to, the fragmented communities of Los Angeles, through funding branch libraries across the city. Additionally, Dorothy B. Chandler, albeit a founding figure of 20th century cultural Los Angeles, is also understudied for the depth of her contributions to building social capital across the city through her unique campaign tactics. Lastly, Franklin D. Murphy contributed to the growth of philanthropy in Los Angeles by facilitating the distribution of capital amassed by others for the public. Together, these case studies illustrate how big philanthropy in Los Angeles uniquely set the foundation for the growth of cultural institutions in

the city, how individuals carved out philanthropic space within Los Angeles through various big philanthropic approaches, and the lasting consequences of this form of civic engagement, leading to their bestowed labels as Pathbreaker,[50] The First Lady of Culture,[51] and Culture Broker,[52] respectively.

Chapter Four then looks at the role of voluntary associations in forming some of Los Angeles's most iconic cultural institutions. Shaping culture and moving capital within and beyond the center of Los Angeles around the turn of the century, the Los Angeles Library Association and the Hollywood Bowl Association each attempted to create the foundations of civic institutions three separate times prior to mobilizing enough public support to sustain them as imperative institutions to constructing the image of Los Angeles. Chapter Four examines the ways in which the private groups of the Los Angeles Library and the Hollywood Bowl were established and dissolved, leading up to the formation of the Los Angeles Public Library and the Hollywood Bowl as institutions, and how these groups directly adapted to the shifting demographics and needs of the citizenry in a new and growing metropolis.

Finally, mass campaigns, facilitated by the Los Angeles Public Library, the Hollywood Bowl, and the Music Center are the focal points of Chapter Five. Here, this dissertation examines the highlighted participation of the masses in the multi-layered campaigns of each institution. This chapter first covers the Save the Bowl campaign which occurred in 1951 as financial

---

50. "Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy in the Hall that he Build." Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy. https://www.medalofphilanthropy.org/pathbreaker-charting-andrew-carnegie/

51. Margaret Leslie Davis, *The Culture Broker: Franklin D. Murphy and the Transformation of Los Angeles* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007), 64.

52. Margaret Leslie Davis, "The Culture Broker," https://margaretlesliedavis.com/the-culture-broker/

complications arose to sustain the summer season performances and the Hollywood Bowl was forced to shutter. This "whirlwind campaign" was the first in Los Angeles to appropriate the Ward-Pierce fundraising model.[53] Completed in two-week's time, and supported by daily recognition in *The Los Angeles Times,* the Save the Bowl campaign led to the successful reopening of the Hollywood Bowl for the remainder of the season. Moreover, the efforts, headed by Dorothy Chandler, came to define her position as the "first lady of culture" within the philanthropic scene of Los Angeles, later utilized in instituting the Music Center campaign that reshaped the city's disparate communities to share in a centralized cultural collaboration.[54]

As opposed to the previous mass campaigns in Los Angeles that celebrated individuals, the Save the Books campaign relied on the power of the citizenry through civic engagement following the unmitigated disaster of the arson at the Central Library in 1986 which destroyed over $10 million of its public collections, igniting the first and only fundraising campaign of its kind in the nation. Chapter Five concludes that the Save the Books campaign provided a new template for philanthropy by the citizenry in the divided city. In this case study, the citizenry's dedication to mass philanthropy uniquely established a lasting public-private partnership that continues to enhance the services and programs for the largest and most diverse population served by any public library system in the United States.

The overarching historical and contemporary focus of the field on big philanthropy ignores successful philanthropic practice that incorporates the citizenry as an active social subject for the public good. The institutional dependance on big philanthropy to meet fundraising

---

53. Scott Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States: Its Role in America's Philanthropy* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990).

54. Davis, *The Culture Broker*, 64.

goals and needs, paired with the focus of academic critique on this particular form, leads to the misinterpretation of the motivations of individuals who participate in philanthropy, the neglect of the expansive network of influence that philanthropy possesses over the public good, and the impact of reproducing uneven accumulation and exchange of capital. This results in an expansion of the "hierarchy of legitimacies" to include philanthropy, where cultural values and taste are determined and upheld by individuals and within institutions, instead of shaped by the citizenry.[55] The narrow and limited definitions and criticisms of philanthropy as it pertains to individuals thereby uphold social relations, discouraging civic engagement, and abandoning providing participatory access to all. As such, the role and influence of big philanthropy needs to be reframed not as a manipulation of the masses, but as a form of philanthropic efforts that require the further incorporation of the citizenry for the public good.

As previously discussed, Los Angeles has typically been ignored from philanthropic conversations precisely because it fits into neither a traditional East Coast nor the new technologically-driven West Coast philanthropic framework.[56] Instead, its philanthropy matches the patchwork fabric of its metropolis. In other words, Los Angeles as a site-specific case study allows for the close analysis of the ways in which philanthropy reflects the disparate parts of the vast city. Built through its social and geographic context, Los Angeles has shaped a new form of philanthropic exceptionalism. As philanthropy in Los Angeles becomes more central to social and cultural scholarship, an historical lens is necessary to provide context to the analysis of the role of capital and fragmentation over time. The study of Los Angeles's philanthropy and its adaptation across its forms over the course of the last century reimagines the traditional model of

55. Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 81.

56. Charles, "Traditional Philanthropy Gives Way to a New Power."

how a legacy is bestowed upon the individual, replacing it with a vision where the contributions of an active citizenry can be recognized for generations to come.

Ultimately, this dissertation proves that historical, social, and geographic context is essential for understanding how philanthropic participation relies on a site-specific exchange of capital between various social subjects. By examining three foundational civic and cultural institutions that promulgate the individualistic and communal qualities of Los Angeles, this dissertation proves that, in contrast to a more individual-centric philanthropic approach, the return to the use of campaign tactics can generate an alternative approach to its contemporary form and function by reincorporating the citizens at-large. The whirlwind campaign's condensed form—a predetermined timeframe of short period for identifiable outcomes—can increase participation by the public to share in the exchange of capital more evenly, in direct contrast to big philanthropy and voluntary associations. Similarly, the whirlwind campaign's inclusive model, which focuses on the participation of the citizenry, can greatly expand the relevance of the configurations of power and influence of philanthropy for the public good. If one can better understand how philanthropy contributes to the uneven accumulation and exchange of capital, it becomes possible to reimagine and reconstruct this capital-centric ideological framework into a model where mass philanthropy can lead to new social relations, bringing communities together instead of reproducing their exploitative structures for the public good.

PART I

CHAPTER 1

The Foundations of Philanthropy

> The nonprofit and voluntary sector is at once a visible and compelling force in society and an elusive mass of contradictions. – Peter Frumkin[57]

The nonprofit and voluntary sector, also referred to as the third sector, is a mechanism through which individuals and institutions come together to act in the collective interest of the public good. The "third sector" is the term for the non-profit sector through which institutions and organizations form for community, voluntary, and not-for-profit activities. Nevertheless, this sector also forces a myriad of organizations to define themselves by unified guiding, and sometimes contradictory, principles. While the third sector allows for both private and public participation, its provision of benefits to individuals, in addition to its positionality in direct opposition to business and government, results in perceived contradictions in its role to achieve the public good. Frumkin, author of *On Being Nonprofit,* argues that the nonprofit sector thereby generates the necessity for a more detailed examination of its influences on social relations. In other words, philanthropy's platform for a continuous exchange of economic, social, and cultural capital results in a sphere of ongoing influence that impacts the social relations of individuals, groups, and communities.

To understand philanthropy as a complex network of influence, one must first understand the historical emergence of the philanthropic discourse. The shifting attempts at defining what philanthropy is—as opposed to what it is not—is one of the key factors in the generation of the

57. Peter Frumkin, *On Being Nonprofit: A Conceptual and Policy Primer* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 1.

misconceptions of its theoretical role and practical implementation. The distinct critical analyses on the role of philanthropy as it relates to its positive and negative consequences on the public good are indicative of philanthropy's embeddedness across the forms of social, cultural, and economic capital. By identifying the shifting perceptions of philanthropy since its inception in the 17th century, this chapter locates the contradictory tension produced at the frontier of theory and practice. In other words, the construct of philanthropy as an ideology, as well as its role as a methodology, requires a simultaneous examination of both the theory and practice.

By exploring the discourse and ideological framework of the field of philanthropy, this chapter first exposes the ways in which different forms of philanthropy take precedence over others, with an extensive critical emphasis on big philanthropy. Moreover, the chapter uncovers the similarities and differences between philanthropic ideologies, whereby practice defines itself by donor-centricity, yet the theory of philanthropy remains capital-centric. Then I examine transdisciplinary contributions to the field regarding the scientific and humanistic study of philanthropic participation. The chapter provides a historiography of the ever-emerging field to illuminate a deeper and more critical understanding of the interwoven complexities of social relations within the foundations of philanthropy.

Defining Philanthropy

The term "philanthropy" is often used interchangeably with "charity," but the two differ in important ways. Although all tax-exempt institutions fall into the category of being in the public interest, a charity is required to benefit the public by improving the quality of life of the community and beyond. Notably, twenty-nine types of organizations currently fall under the

"nonprofit" or philanthropic 501(c) legal tax-exempt category.[58] The sector is often viewed as a homogeneous consolidation of organizations acting in the public interest, but while over 1.5 million organizations report as tax-exempt in the United States, only about 300,000 report as "charitable."[59] As sociologist Francie Ostrower explains, charity typically refers to organizations that serve the poor, who require "the relief of severe and immediate needs."[60] Importantly, donations that are designated to any of the wide-ranging types of nonprofits are considered to be philanthropic, "whether or not they are directed to poor recipients."[61] Therefore, philanthropy is a much broader theory "which includes charity, but includes the wider range of private giving for public purposes."[62] In other words, while these terms are often used interchangeably, philanthropy and charity are not mutually exclusive, thereby creating the initial basis for confusion within the field of study.

One explanation for the transposition of terms is that, as philanthropy adapted over time, it served multiple purposes, people, and places. Hugh Cunningham, emeritus professor of social history, suggests that there are "strata of philanthropy"[63] that illustrate how Western philanthropy

58. "Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization," Department of the Treasure Internal Revenue Service, January 2020. https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p557.pdf.

59. "The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2019," National Center for Charitable Statistics. https://nccs.urban.org/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2019#the-nonprofit-sector-in-brief-2019.

60. Francie Ostrower, *Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 4.

61. Ostrower, 4.

62. Ostrower, 4.

63. Hugh Cunningham, "The Multi-Layered History of Western Philanthropy," in *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy,* eds. Tobias Jung, Susan D. Phillips, and Jenny Harrow (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2019), 42.

interpreted the function of donations over several centuries. Starting with Ancient Greece, philanthropy was interpreted as a form of returning generosity from gods to humans, or from rulers to ruled, which was later adapted to the wealthy providing gifts to the larger public.[64] This reinterpretation of what it meant to donate was later adopted by religion, and then set to serve as a solution for increasingly evident socio-economic disparities, defined as charity due to its service to the poor. These early strata illustrate that philanthropy and charity were synonymous concepts because all donating was viewed as a methodology of those in power to support the base or general populace.

The term "philanthropy" as it was originally applied to giving in Ancient Greece, does not reemerge until the end of the twentieth century, at which time it came to be in direct opposition to "the lazy shape of charity."[65] Simply stated, philanthropy became an active participation in shaping the public good, whereas charity was seen as a passive form of giving to the poor. Over the next century, philanthropy attempted to distinguish itself by generating a common well-being across various spaces, activating support for causes beyond the urban plight of poverty. As such, philanthropy evolved into a "gap filler," at times working with, and at others against, the role of the government.[66] The division of public and private funds and organizations would come to define a uniquely American formation of philanthropic participation, as well as necessitate the demand for more regulation and visibility to reduce the autonomy of the sector.

Another explanation for the misnomer of charity and philanthropy as synonymous is that the sector philanthropy serves is defined more often by what it is not. As highlighted by Dennis

64. Cunningham, 43.

65. Cunningham, 49.

66. Cunningham, 51.

Young, public policy emeritus professor and author of *If Not for Profit, For What?*, a non-profit is defined in direct relation to the for-profit sector. Its descriptions continue to be written in negatory format, including that the organizations must be non-distributing, non-proprietary, and non-coercive.[67] While Young concludes that organizations within the philanthropic sector must remain flexible and diverse, implemented alongside social and public policies, philanthropy needs to be defined in the affirmative.[68] Currently, the malleable definitions of the nonprofit sector, the philanthropy that occurs within it, and the pursuit of the public good, ensure the permanence of complexities in uncovering the broad impact that philanthropy has on social relations at-large. In other words, the ability to perceive the influence that philanthropy possesses over the public good, conducted through nonprofit organizations, must occur through an examination of what philanthropy is, not just what it is not.

In the search for a foundational definition of philanthropy, the Miriam-Webster Dictionary proposes that philanthropy is "the desire to promote the welfare of others, expressed especially by the generous donation of money to good causes."[69] This definition informs two primary analyses: first, that philanthropy remains intrinsically connected to providing for others; second, that it is specifically restricted to gifts in the form of monetary exchange. While this definition expands the potential of philanthropy to not be exclusively conducted through a donation from the elite few to the poor masses, it still suggests that philanthropy is a one-way financial transaction. In this view, the elite and poor masses are reduced to homogenous social

---

67. Dennis Young, *If Not for Profit, for What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship* (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1985), 11.

68. Young, 161-162.

69. "Philanthropy," *Miriam Webster Dictionary*, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy.

classes instead of as sets of singularities. The inflexible focus on financial capital ignores philanthropy's surrounding discourse within the field of the relations of production, as well as the complexity of the social networks that enable these relations. In other words, the restricted use of financial capital for a donation limits the possibilities of uncovering a more thorough understanding of the multidirectional exchanges that take place during the act of philanthropy.

Sociologists Herzog and Price expand the definition of philanthropy from a basic transaction of giving focused on the donation of financial capital to the "actionable point in which impact can be actualized through forms of giving."[70] Herzog and Price argue that, beyond giving money, forms of giving also traditionally include time and action.[71] Notably, Herzog and Price add in the element of a required action, making the practice of philanthropy more active as opposed to passive. In other words, without some sort of transaction or exchange, regardless of the form of giving, philanthropy cannot occur. Nevertheless, the use of "giving" further implies a one-way action instead of an exchange. Lastly, their inclusion of the word "impact" further implies that the act of giving embedded within philanthropy is results-driven. As a result, many organizations are expected to be accountable to their donors through reports which illustrate the aforementioned "impact" via visualized statistics of progress amongst the beneficiaries of its mission. Herzog and Price thereby conclude that while philanthropy is complex, it can still be more clearly defined by its key characteristics: action and impact.

Even though this definition accounts for both the inputs and outputs of the act of philanthropy, it does not incorporate how or why participants become involved. As such, Payton

---

70. Patricia Herzog and Heather Price, *American Generosity: Who Gives and Why* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 2.

71. Herzog and Price, 6.

and Moody, authors of *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission*, reexamine the terminology of philanthropy, including that it is not just an actionable point, but that it entails "voluntary action for the public good."[72] They thereby include the additional notation that participation in the love of humankind requires an action, but also a voluntary willingness to do so. In other words, philanthropic participation cannot be forced but must be activated within individuals, groups, or communities. Moreover, Payton and Moody have expanded beyond the simple inclusion of the necessity for action, but also as a means to its ends: the public good. Payton and Moody define the public good as a vision that is forged through philanthropy for the benefit of "public others."[73] While this definition of philanthropy highlights its purpose and not just its action, it continues to imply an othering of those who philanthropy serves, creating a distinct difference between donors and users. In effect, this definition reenforces that philanthropy is a movement of capital from one set of social class to another but enhances the inclusion of donors and beneficiaries as they both relate to the formation of the public good.

In order to produce an inclusive and adaptive understanding of philanthropy, one must look beyond its current restrictive definitions. Essentially, defining philanthropy does not simply mean defining it as a term. In fact, philanthropy is at once a term, a field, a concept, a sector, a practice, and a theory. As Payton and Moody aptly describe, philanthropy should be conceived of as a "multiplicity."[74] Payton expands this explanation to demonstrate that there are a variety of approaches to interpreting philanthropy and its social role:

---

72. Payton and Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy* (Indiana University Press: Bloomington, 2008), 6.

73. Payton and Moody, 60.

74. Payton and Moody, 6.

> "Some approach philanthropy from the vantage point of the structure of the society and its institutions, and see in it only the expression of class struggle, domination, alienation, and false consciousness. Others look on philanthropy as a subset of exchange—social as well as economic."[75]

By understanding philanthropy not simply as a term, but as a force that operates within society that contributes to our institutional and social histories, as well as to our contemporaneous imaginations, its embeddedness as an exchange within social structures, values, and norms can finally be observed.

To avoid historical confusion while simultaneously understanding the complex context of the shifting and emerging dynamics of philanthropy, Kathleen McCarthy, professor of history and Director of the Center for the Study of Philanthropy, encourages the search for a definition for philanthropy that "abandon[s] current biases"[76] of the imagination of contemporary philanthropy. As she illustrates, the perspective that philanthropy is "the coupling of lavish generosity and lavish wealth"[77] only emerges in the United States during the Industrial Revolution when wealth was consolidated through profits to only a few privileged men, who, in turn, became revered for returning it charitably to the public through their estates. Contrary to seventeenth-century philanthropy in Europe, philanthropy in the United States was not saved only for the legacies of the elite but "was the practice and prerogative of many."[78] In other words, contrary to contemporary public perception, early American philanthropy was defined by its favored participation of the masses, including women and minorities, for the public good.

---

75. Robert L. Payton, *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988), 38.

76. McCarthy, *American Creed*, 3.

77. McCarthy, 3.

78. McCarthy, 3.

These contemporary biases against philanthropy, however, affects the flexibility to provide a satisfactory, all-encompassing, and uncomplicated definition upon which the sector can rely. In other words, philanthropy as a field must at once reveal its complex system of the exchange of capital while also affirming and encouraging the participation of the citizenry for the public good. In essence, a definition that does not include philanthropy as a form of exchange—as opposed to its synonymous application with "giving"—and ignores that it entails multiple forms of capital—financial, but also cultural and social capital—will continue to evade a successful critical analysis as a field of study. Cultural Studies uniquely provides the lens through which to uncover this complex network, beginning with the above examination of the failure of the definitions of philanthropy, but also through a close reading of the ever-changing philanthropic discourse.

Philanthropic Discourse

Philanthropy is an elusive and provocative concept that can be compared to the ambiguous and shifting concept of "culture," with many scholars struggling to construct a comprehensive terminology, or at least varying interpretations. As a result, the lack of a precise definition exposes the field to an ongoing debate over the discourse surrounding the theoretical and practical implications of philanthropy's systematic role within the relations of production.[79] In the existing scholarship, this diffusion of indefinite qualities leads to questions about its current and future applications such as: "Why has the nonprofit sector been such an enigma and a mystery even to well-educated people?"[80] "How will its influence be used? How is it being used

79. Siobhan Daly, "Philanthropy as an Inherently Contested Concept," *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 23, no. 3 (2012): 535-557.

80. Young. *If Not for Profit, for What?* 1.

already?"[81] "What if money was spent trying out concepts that shatter current structures and systems that have turned much of the world into one vast market?"[82]

In an attempt to begin providing answers to these questions, Young offers that one reason that philanthropy as a field enables critical fundamental questions is that "there is no simple way of associating nonprofit organizations with a clear-cut purpose."[83] Not only does the term philanthropy have an elusive meaning, but the sector as a whole lacks a clear discourse. Distinguishing between variations in the definitions of philanthropy is essential to uncovering the consequences of its seemingly malleable function, but the exploration of its shifting contexts and discourse provides the methodology for unveiling the underlying tensions in the public perception of philanthropy, its intended purpose, and its actual outcomes.

As previously discussed, philanthropy as a term is connected to serving the public good as a derivative of the love for humankind. A term directly attributed to Greek origins in the 17th century, deriving from the word "philanthropos," philanthropy pulls from *philein,* which means "to love," and *anthropos,* translated to "human beings."[84] Nevertheless, these origins inherently facilitate a tension within the discourse of philanthropy between its perceived roles as both a mechanism for the public good as well as a technology of power for the elite. A central controversy embedded within the field resides within its altruistic roots paired alongside its

81. David Callahan, *Wealth, Power, and Philanthropy in a New Gilded Age* (New York: Vintage Books, 2017), 19.

82. Edgar Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance* (Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2018), xiii.

83. Young, 1.

84. "Philanthropy," *Miriam Webster Dictionary*, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/philanthropy.

modern history in the recognition of elite individuals who have used philanthropy as a tool to redistribute financial capital amassed from the exploitation of labor for the purposes of upholding social stratification and cultural reproduction. As such, the first major contention in contemporary philanthropy is the emerging—or rather, resurging—power of big philanthropy.

The mistrusted role of elite individuals is not a new or novel concept to contemporary philanthropy; rather its roots are embedded in modern philanthropy at the transition to the Industrial Revolution. At this turning point, skepticism of the power of the elite to shape the course of society's values and cultural norms through philanthropy in the name of the public good became a central feature, yet these fears are newly reemerging. Anand Giridharadas, journalist and author *of Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World,* argues that philanthropy is a system designed to allow the elite to maintain the dominant system of relations while appearing to act as leaders of progressive and positive change:

> What these various figures have in common is that they are grappling with certain powerful myths—the myths that have fostered an age of extraordinary power concentration; that have allowed the elite's private, partial, and self-preservational deeds to pass for real change; that have let many decent winners convince themselves, and much of the world, that their plan to 'do well by doing good' is an adequate answer to an age of exclusion; that put a gloss of selflessness on the protection of one's privileges; and that cast more meaningful change as wide-eyed, radical, and vague.[85]

As the above quotation suggests, the populace is enveloped in the myths that philanthropy is a force for the public good, and only from the positionality of the elite does the potential for power and influence through philanthropy emerge. The normativity of a hegemonic participation in the practice of philanthropy perpetuates the sentiment that individuals are truly successful when also "doing good," facilitated by participating in philanthropy and its assurances to serve the public good. The trust and distrust of philanthropy, therefore, hinges on the

85. Giridharadas, *Winners Take All,* 11-12.

perception of the relation between wealth and public good. The persuasiveness of these myths results in this perpetual tension between altruism and self-interest.

Moreover, Giridharadas suggest that the ability to shape change is disguised as acting in the interests of the common, while the priority of the elite is the protection of the current system of production.[86] Based on the way philanthropy has emerged since the Industrial Revolution, Giridharadas argues that these acts of big philanthropy are permitted to be conducted in the self-interest of the elite, in accordance with personal goals to amass wealth through capitalism to shape and shift public policy as best suits their current and future needs. As Giridharadas explicitly states, "when elites assume leadership of social change, they are able to reshape what social change is—above all, to present it as something that should never threaten winners."[87] Philanthropy provides a crucial outlet to counterbalance the greed of capitalism through the opportunity to allow a portion of amassed wealth to be returned to the public laboring and non-laboring forces from whence it came. In essence, the elite are not only benefiting from myths that support the discourse of philanthropy as an altruistic behavior, but also from the ability to uphold cultural values and class systems through the pursuit of legacy-building, defining the current and future imaginations of the representation of the public good.

The expanding concentration of wealth in the last century is leading to greater concern for the use and misuse of contemporary philanthropy, demonstrated by even further scholarly

---

86. The term "common" is also drawn from Hardt and Negri within the theory of the multitude. For the purposes of this dissertation, the common may be used interchangeably with multitude, although other authors use it in their own texts as synonymous with "public," for example, the "common good." *See* Hardt and Negri, *Empire, Multitude, Commonwealth; Robert Reich, The Common Good* (New York: Penguin Random House, 2018); *Robert Reich, Just Giving: Why Philanthropy is Failing Democracy and How it can do Better* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018).

87. Giridharadas, *Winners Take All,* 8.

publications questioning the relationship between wealth, power, and philanthropy. David Callahan, public policy author and editor, reveals what he calls the "New Gilded Age."[88] Historically, the "Gilded Age" in America defines the nineteenth-century increase in political and corporate corruption, with the upper class becoming significantly wealthier, widening the capital and class gap: "the start of a crisis period of capital accumulation characterized by overproduction and the rise of class antagonisms which erupted intermittently into broad social upheavals."[89] His reference to this historical moment highlights his concerns regarding the wealthy once again being in a position of social, political, and economic power, upholding the social relations of production, in addition to cultural reproduction.

Callahan states that "we face a future in which private donors—who are accountable to no one—may often wield more influence than elected public officials."[90] This shifting sphere of accountability, where skepticism surrounding the power within government and business sectors now overlap with the non-profit sector, provides the wealthy with an apparatus through which to more discreetly increase their influence under the guise of doing good. The rising power of wealth could further "push ordinary Americans to the margins of civic life in an unequal era."[91] In other words, as elite philanthropists mobilize their presence within the hegemonic paradigm of philanthropy, the interests of the citizenry may be misrepresented—or further, ignored—with no accountability required.

---

88. Callahan, *The Givers,* 7.

89. Richard Schneirov, "Thoughts on Periodizing the Gilded Age: Capital Accumulation, Society, and Politics, 1873-1898. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 5, no. 3, (2006): 191.

90. Callahan, *The Givers,* 7.

91. Callahan, 9.

A cultural studies framework provides the possibility to provide the terminology required for a deeper understanding of the composition of the normative interpretation of philanthropy as a network of exchange that perpetuates the myths of the elite. Bourdieu's illustration of the forms of capital uncovers the intricacies of the exchanges, but this unequal exchange that takes place with the ideals to uphold the hegemonic normativity of society is best expressed through the theory of cultural reproduction. As Bourdieu explains, cultural reproduction refers to the mechanisms through which culture is sustained across time. Groups of people, notably social classes, act to reproduce the existing social structure to preserve their advantage.[92] As it applies to culture, reproduction is the process by which aspects of cultural are passed by individuals, families, societies, and other social institutions. Thereby, just as in Marx's base and superstructure model, the interaction between individuals results in the transfer of accepted cultural norms, values, and information, which are both shaped and maintained through these social relations.

Philanthropy is also a form of a system of values, often passed down from generation to generation. Its embeddedness in American society as a moral obligation also indicates that philanthropy itself—not just what we support with our philanthropy—has itself become a cultural norm. Just as was similarly illustrated by Giridharadas and Callahan, the practice of philanthropy by the elite can serve to uphold cultural norms and values. Cultural reproduction is thereby noteworthy in the discussion of philanthropy because, as Giridharadas continues to illustrate:

> all around us, the winners in our highly inequitable status quo declare themselves partisans of change. They know the problem, and they want to be part of the solution. Actually, they want to lead the search for solution. They believe that their solutions

92. Bourdieu, *Distinction*.

> deserve to be at the forefront of social change…Because they are in charge of these attempts at social change, the attempts naturally reflect their biases.[93]

The values of the few are determined to be the values of the many. As the elite classes have amasses substantial surplus capital to have the ability to determine how to make significant social change, even if their intentions are good, the outcomes are a direct reflection of their perspective of the needs of society, as opposed to reflections of the citizenry at large. As Bourdieu further explains, cultural reproduction serves the purpose of "the transmission of existing cultural values and norms from generation to generation."[94] As the elite gain a larger concentration of wealth and thereby surplus capital, through which they can increase their participation in a philanthropic exchange of capital, they become increasing able to determine the current and future shape of society. Ultimately, upholding these values becomes intrinsic to social preservation: "It encourages wealthy individuals and communities to hoard their resources and preserve their advantages…while displacing the costs of complex social problems onto the populations least able to pay for them."[95] Foundational to philanthropy since the origins of the first Gilded Age, the desire for legacy-building serves as the motivation through which to use donations to uphold the norms and values through which legacies will be sustained.

On one hand, philanthropy is perceived as a practice that possesses an intrinsic influence that favors those who hold excess capital. As further argued by Reich, Cordelli, and Bernholz, in the introduction to their volume, *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies: History, Institutions, Values*, there is a fundamental inequality in the exercise of philanthropy, both historically and

---

93. Giridharadas, *Winners Take All,* 5.

94. Bourdieu, *Distinction*.

95. George Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006), 114.

contemporaneously. Reich, Cordelli, and Bernholz exemplify that "philanthropy is not just a beneficent activity or funding mechanism. It can also be a form of power."[96] For example, tax incentives are not only provided to nonprofits which are charitable and public-serving, but also for member-serving groups. Therefore, as Reich states,

> The public policies that regulate philanthropic giving treat donors in deeply unequal ways. The policy instruments in the United States designed to structure giving are…powerfully inegalitarian, amplifying the voice and preferences of the wealthy over and above their already louder voice in virtue of the size of their fortunes.[97]

As much as philanthropy is embedded within society, it is not inherently a democratic process for the common good. Individuals or institutions may gain uneven leverage by participating in philanthropy, regardless of their motivation, because they have the tools to shape the image of the common good.

On the other hand, even while arguing that philanthropy holds innate inequalities in practice, Reich identifies that the system of philanthropy could still be transformed to better serve our American democratic values and the common good. Working from a descriptive and normative approach, Reich asks, "what is the appropriate role…of philanthropy as an institutional structure within democratic societies?"[98] Reich suggests that much of the reform needed is within the sphere of public policy. He states that if incentives for participation were altered, the role of private foundations, nonprofit institutions, and individuals would also quickly shift. By changing the incentives of philanthropic participants, the outcomes could be directed

---

96. Robert Reich, Chiara Cordelli, and Lucy Bernholz, *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies: History, Institutions, Values* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016), 1.

97. Robert Reich, *Just Giving: Why Philanthropy is Failing Democracy and How it can do Better* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 69.

98. Reich, Cordelli, and Bernholz. *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies,* 6.

towards results that would openly serve the public good. Until then, however, he concludes that these inequalities "need not shake the legitimacy of philanthropy," but that it should inform the public of the need for philanthropic reform to help the system succeed as originally intended.[99] Defining the common good as "our shared values about what we owe one another as citizens who are bound together in the same society—the norms we voluntarily abide by, and the ideals we seek to achieve," Reich summarizes that philanthropy retains the ability to shape the imaginations of the American citizenry for the benefit of the common good if individuals feel morally obliged to participate in a shared society.[100]

While Reich sees philanthropy as an effective system that can serve the common good, he also notes that Americans have come to focus less on the common good, in the multi-generational shift from "the Greatest Generation to the Me Generation, from we're all in it together to you're on your own."[101] Instead, individuals continue to focus on the controversies of big philanthropy as an influential technology of power instead of the opportunities of shared values and a shared society. As such, Reich calls for a return to a focus on the common good as philanthropy's primary mission, enabling increased participation by the many to act as private individuals for public ends.

Similarly, while the sector remains complex and contradictory, Frumkin believes that "local nonprofits contribute in important ways to community cohesiveness, social solidarity, and what some call social capital."[102] As discussed in the Introduction and to be explored throughout

---

99. Reich, *Just Giving,* 104.

100. Robert Reich, *The Common Good* (New York: Penguin Random House, 2018), 18.

101. Reich, *The Common Good*, 4.

102. Frumkin, *On Being Nonprofit,* 24.

this dissertation, the inclusion of social capital within the discourse of philanthropy will allow for a reinterpretation of philanthropic practice and theory as an exchange of capital beyond its current perception as a one-time, one-way transaction of financial capital. Frumkin's inclusion of social capital in his interpretation for the potential outcome of the common good warrants additional insight into how philanthropy intersects the social relations of individuals, institutions, and the community at-large. In other words, philanthropy is not just a one-time monetary exchange or voluntary action, but a sphere on ongoing influence that impacts the social relations of entire communities. This visible and elusive influence of the sector is both the constructive and destructive nature of the embeddedness of philanthropy within civil society.

While attempting to refocus public perception away from the charade of big philanthropy towards the inclusion of the citizenry in the quest for the public good, the historiography of the field unveils that the field remains convoluted and contentious. The underlying tension must continue to be uncovered: that which lies within the ideological framework of the field in regard to both its theory and practice. As philanthropy enters further into popular culture, it must not be represented only through the lens of wealth and power; rather, as a complex system that both enacts influence through the inherent relations of production in society and as one that simultaneously permits the redistribution of capital through unique exchanges for the public good. As such, the forms of philanthropy—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns—will be further explored in the following chapter to examine how distinct historical shifts and the role of various groupings of individuals affect each the way in which capital is exchanged in the third sector.

Ideological Framework

Contemporary philanthropic practice is driven by one central ideology, known as donor-centricity.[103] Under this framework, the field bases itself within the subjectivity of the donor and their individual intentions in the composition of their philanthropy. Contrary to a mission-centric approach, donations are designated based on the desires of the donor, guided by institutional priorities and needs. Donor-centric philanthropy becomes an instrument to support individualistic values, upholding socially constructed norms and perpetuating inequities. These normative qualities are then expressed in outcomes desired by donors instead of by the needs of the users or recipients of the programs or services rendered by a nonprofit organization. Because philanthropic participation is determined by the exchange of capital—economic, cultural, and social—donor-centricity is, in fact, capital-centricity. As donors act in the interest of an exchange of the forms of capital, they look to the highest rate of exchange through their donation; what form of capital can be accumulated by distributing another? In other words, the ideological framework of donor-centric philanthropy is synonymous with the terminology afforded to the practical application of the theoretical notion of capital-centric behaviors.

Donor-centered fundraising is a term that was popularized after Penelope Burk published a book by the same title in 2003. Burk defines donor-centered fundraising as "an approach to raising money and interacting with donors that acknowledges what donors really need and puts those needs first."[104] In other words, as the primary measurable struggle of non-profit organizations is donor retention and the need to increase total funds raised, the strategy to meet

---

103. Penelope Burk, *Donor-Centered Fundraising* (Chicago: Cygnus Applied Research, Inc, 2003).

104. Burk, 22.

donors' needs by catering to the individual encourages donors to remain tied to the organization, becoming both more loyal and more generous. This model requires the institution to substitute its own needs, and thereby the needs of the beneficiaries of that philanthropy, with those individualized interests and values of the donor. While this approach may benefit specific areas of need and increase the loyalty and generosity of certain individual donors, there are also several challenges to the approach that offset its potential benefit.

First, the donor-centric methodology indicates a broken system of philanthropy, where the donor is the central social subject, as opposed to the beneficiary. Edgar Villanueva, award-winning philanthropy executive and author, argues that the dispersal of capital by individuals entitles them to allocate funds based on their preferences, generating long-lasting effects. The discrepancy between the donor's allocation of capital and society's greatest needs is a direct continuation of colonization.[105] By following the donor-centered model of fundraising, public policies and social relations are guided by the designation of funds to restricted areas of interest based on individual cultural and value-based systems, ignoring the needs of the Other.[106] Especially in the case of applying for funding from a private foundation, organizations must demonstrate their alignment with its values through a rigid application process. Instead of a grant-distributing organization catering to the needs of the community, an often-homogeneous board of directors determines which needs of a qualified pool of applicants will be funded. As a result, Villanueva argues that certain initiatives are disregarded even though a genuine need

105. Edgar Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divide and Restore Balance* (Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2018), 34.

106. Villanueva, xi.

exists. This ideology to put the donor's interests ahead of the public's needs upholds social relations originating from the era of colonization and race-based social hierarchies.

In fact, Villanueva's critical examination about the role of philanthropy in larger society refers to philanthropy as "racism in institutional form."[107] By uncovering the differences between those who are designated as experts to find solutions through philanthropy and the communities that philanthropy is designed to serve, he argues that the only way for philanthropy to move forward for the public good would be to "decolonize wealth."[108] In other words, Villanueva argues that philanthropy needs to illuminate and undo white supremacy, the savior mentality, and internalized oppression systems within philanthropy.[109] Like whiteness, philanthropy does not work in isolation: "it functions as part of a broader dynamic grid created through intersections of race, gender, class, and sexuality."[110] If the field reconfigured who is in charge of money management, it could better understand the ways in which humans have used currency to stand in for human relations and move towards a process of healing. In the end, Villanueva argues that we need to focus less on wealth as the target of the issues, but on the ideologies that are operating to uphold the systems that create it.

While the donor-centricity model has the ability to increase the quantity of donor participation at large, it instead focuses primarily on the contributions of long-term, loyal donors. Rather than acquire new donors, the donor-centric model results in the recirculation and replication of values and ideals, avoiding the incorporation of new, diverse ones. This shift to

---

107. Villanueva, 3.

108. Villanueva, 2.

109. Villanueva, 5.

110. Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness,* 73.

focus on loyalty instead of acquisition in the non-profit sector originates from the application of the loyalty business model.[111] Adrian Sargeant, co-founder of the Institute for Sustainable Philanthropy, argues that using measurements of "donor satisfaction" can help an organization understand how to better relate to donors for retention and loyalty, measuring the lifetime value generated by each donor instead of encouraging more diverse and broad participation.[112] As a result, Sargeant recommends employing "value determinants to focus on the key forms of utility that may be derived from the fundraising relationship."[113] Donor-centric philanthropy encourages focusing on individual relationships as lifetime investments. While this sustains and develops an organization's fundraising growth, it ignores the role of the diversified interests, access to new networks, and the ability to fund a broader range of initiatives based on the needs of the beneficiaries through an inclusive incorporation of a new constituency of donors.

Nevertheless, while donor-centricity is a model that may encourage engagement beyond a more traditional model, the uneven accumulation of capital through the relations of production results in unbalanced understandings of the needs of the public. As Callahan highlights:

---

111. The loyalty business model, also known as the service quality or commitment-loyalty model, operates under the strategic theory that increases in a focus on loyal of stakeholders leads to satisfaction and thereby profitability. For more information, see Rob Markey, "Are You Undervaluing Your Customers? It's Time to Start Measuring and Managing Their Worth." *Harvard Business Review.* Jan-Feb 2020. https://hbr.org/2020/01/are-you-undervaluing-your-customers; Amy Gallo, "The Value of Keeping the Right Customers." Oct 29, 2014, Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2014/10/the-value-of-keeping-the-right-customers; Jia Wertz, Don't Spend 5 Times More Attracting New Customers, Nurture the Existing Ones." Sept 12, 2018. Forbes. https://www.forbes.com/sites/jiawertz/2018/09/12/dont-spend-5-times-more-attracting-new-customers-nurture-the-existing-ones/?sh=2c7107505a8e.

112. Adrian Sargeant, "Donor Retention: What Do We Know and What Can We Do About It?" *Nonprofit Quarterly,* August 15, 2013, https://nonprofitquarterly.org/donor-retention-nonprofit-donors/

113. Sargeant.

> The empowerment gap between the wealthy and the general public wouldn't be as troubling if the economic and social views of the donor class tracked closely with how ordinary Americans see the world. But…that's not the case; the wealthy often want different things for society than their fellow citizens do.[114]

Not only are individuals with surplus capital uniquely positioned to "dispose" of their surplus, but their perspective of the world does not overlap with the views of the public at-large.[115] As Callahan further states, "Alexis de Tocqueville famously praised civil society as a conduit for myriad people's voice. And while that remains so, there's no denying the role of top philanthropists in shaping just which of these voices speak most loudly."[116] Those who directly determine the needs of others have misguided perceptions based on the inability to remain objective in the interpretation of society's needs. When the beneficiaries of the support are ignored, the power of philanthropy is distributed in biased and hierarchical ways, perpetuating, rather than diminishing, the effect upon the citizenry.

Even though philanthropic practices unequally advantage some individuals, pro-donor-centric arguments highlight that this model concretizes a central element of philanthropy required for donor retention and generosity: trust.[117] Many variants on the essence of philanthropy's principles as they specifically relate to the relations constructed within philanthropy, whether between a donor and a fundraiser or a philanthropist and an organization's

---

114. Callahan, *The Givers,* 60.

115. Andrew Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," (1889), 5, https://production-carnegie.s3.amazonaws.com/filer_public/ab/c9/abc9fb4b-dc86-4ce8-ae31-a983b9a326ed/ccny_essay_1889_thegospelofwealth.pdf.

116. Callahan, *The Givers,* 211.

117. Dareen Coleshill, "What is a Donor? And What is Donor-Centric?" *Development for Conservation.* May 23, 2017. https://developmentforconservation.com/2017/what-is-a-donor-and-what-is-donor-centric/.

mission, the mobilization of a donation requires trust between the two entities. In the donor-centric model, the organization must illustrate its reputable mission and measurable impact, as well as its financial competencies.[118] As previously noted, this core principle of trust is also central to the definition of social capital. The examination of donor-centric fundraising is not one which ends at the social relations of the donor to the organization, or their retention and the dollar amount of their donation. Rather, the increase in loyalty and generosity is a direct result of the capital which is exchanged and accumulated through the philanthropic process. This revelation thus reiterates the point that donor-centricity is embedded within philanthropy as a model that is, at its core, capital-centric.

The dominant ideological framework of contemporary philanthropy of donor-centric fundraising currently neglects to explicitly incorporate and critically examine the practice of the exchange of capital through philanthropy that makes the practice functional and relevant. Robert Putnam, political scientist and author of *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, has initiated the study of the relationship between social and economic capital on philanthropic participation through "dense social ties."[119] Putnam argues that social capital directly correlates to the growth and dissolution of civic engagement through philanthropically minded social groups. Notably, Putnam further breaks down social capital into two forms: bridging and bonding social capital, which both play central roles in the practice of philanthropy.

---

118. As previously explored in the Introduction, Charity Navigator acts as a third-party analysis of the capabilities, competencies, and effectiveness of non-profit organizations, specifically in regard to their finances. Thereby, Charity Navigator's rating for an organization, in essence, informs a prospective donor as to whether or not they may trust the organization to which they chose to donate.

119. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 21.

Specifically, bridging social capital, an inclusive network that creates links to "external assets and for information distribution," is beneficial to building new connections across disparate factions. On the other hand, bonding social capital is exclusive and relies upon "strong in-group loyalty."[120] The accumulation of both forms of social capital take place in the organization of philanthropy across all social subjectivities. Whereas mass campaigns are more successful through the accumulation of bridging social capital, voluntary associations necessitate bonding social capital. As Putnam explicitly states, "social capital, particularly social capital that bonds us with others like us, often reinforces social stratification."[121] In other words, as social units are constructed and reconstructed into fragmented clusters, social capital serves to, at times unite, and at others obstruct, networks and equity. As such, bonding and bridging social capital can create both inclusionary and exclusionary practices, guiding who is able to participate.

While a fundamental requirement for participation in the practice of philanthropy requires excess or surplus capital, social capital can be witnessed around the globe in communities who are without economic resources but high in trust. For example, neighborhood support groups and other forms of voluntary associations have served a key role in combating poverty and violence, providing opportunities for empowerment and revitalization through cooperation and trust, or social capital.[122] Those who possess it are able to participate in more influential ways, and thereby the trajectories of philanthropic theory and practice continue to diverge. Thus, while social capital can enhance the community experience and serve the public

120. Putnam, 22-23.

121. Putnam, 358.

122. *Social Capital and Poor Communities,* ed. Susan Saegert, J. Phillip Thompson, and Mark R. Warren (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2005).

good, it is often accumulated and shared in uneven ways, leading to social stratification and fragmentation.[123]

Hector Amaya's *Citizenship Excess: Latino/as, Media, and the Nation* highlights the ways in which excess capital grants privileges to those who possess it. Individuals who have surplus capital can shape civil society and public policies. According to Amaya, excess capital becomes the technology through which influence is enacted. After uniquely accumulating it from the labor of the masses, the ability to redistribute capital as desired provides the tools to influence society at large. This interpretation of citizenship as it relates to capital, the accumulation of power, value, and surplus, mimics the mechanism of philanthropy. Amaya states that this power "is deployed to aggressively shape politics, culture, and the law," similarly to the abilities of those who have the financial capital to shape civil society and public policies, reproducing the cultural and social systems which they value as their own.[124] By distributing amassed capital back to the laboring and non-laboring populace, based on individual interpretations of the needs of society, the distributed funds diminish the opportunity for progress for the public good. These ethno-racial lines expressed by Amaya are represented within philanthropy as well, as the system of philanthropy continues to uphold the status quo and dominance of the elite in direct contrast to the citizenry in the field. In other words, philanthropy allows not only for the accumulation of capital, but the method for continued accumulation over time in the exchange without diminishing returns.

123. Daniel S. Brisson and Charles L. Usher, "Bonding Social Capital in Low-Income Neighborhoods," *Family Relations* 54, no. 5 (2005): 644–653.

124. Brisson and Usher, 2.

As previously indicated, Bourdieu's theory of the forms of economic, cultural, and social capital equally applies to philanthropy, which should not be seen as a simple form of giving, especially just in terms of economic or financial capital; rather, it is a complex exchange and interrelation of multiple forms of capital that affect the social relations that surround this exchange. As Bourdieu introduces: "The social world is accumulated history, and if it is not to be reduced to a discontinuous series of instantaneous mechanical equilibria between agents who are treated as interchangeable particles, one must reintroduce into it the notion of capital and with it, accumulation and all its effects."[125] The reduction of economic capital as a simplistic financial exchange is to ignore that social and cultural capital is also accumulated and converted into economic capital in certain conditions.[126] In the unique exchange of capital in philanthropy, which takes place in a private form but with public recognition and within cultural and social institutions, converts economic capital into social and cultural capital. In return, this allows for the further conversion of social and cultural capital back into economic capital. As a result, philanthropy is inherently driven by capital-centric motivations when the individual donor is provided with the power and ultimate decision-making on their philanthropic designations.

Even though philanthropy possesses the potential to seek out opportunities for reform and representation, the field as a whole continues to neglect the power of the voices of those who serve as the experts within their communities, reproducing social stratification through the uneven accumulation of social capital. In other words, the social relations are not just within one's own network but are also influenced by the power relations to the Other. As McCarthy argues, the distribution of excess capital through philanthropy provides the "power to define, by

125. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 241.

126. Bourdieu, 243.

creating institutions… becoming vehicles for the assertion, refutation, and reformulation of the hegemonic interpretations of different groups."[127] Having excess capital puts an individual in a relation of power to those who do not, and the ability to define the needs of the Other shapes and dictates those relations. Moreover, defining the Other also helps to solidify in-group loyalty, further "creating social capital by forging communities of like-minded peers and strengthening the bonds of civic engagement."[128] Therefore, those with excess capital have the ability to create, define, and uphold power relations through philanthropy.

The potential for the creation of disparities between the outcomes of forming social capital in homogenous and heterogenous community are illustrated by Hawes and McCrea in their study, "Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor, and We Might Buy Them Dinner." They build upon Soss, Fording, and Schram's Racial Classification Model (RCM), where measured policy processes and outcomes show disparities in decision-making for minority groups in relation to welfare and justice.[129] Accordingly, by testing multiple social control hypotheses on state-level data between 1997 to 2009, Hawes and McCrea find that social capital enhances social trust and empathy in homogeneous contexts, but favors paternalistic and punitive social controls in diverse contexts.[130] By linking immigration and generosity, they show that individuals in communities which experience higher immigration are less generous than in communities which remain more

127. McCarthy, *American Creed,* 4.

128. McCarthy, 5.

129. Joe Soss, Richard C. Fording, and Sanford S. Schram, "The Devolution of Color: Race, Federalism and the Politics of Social Control," *American Journal of Political Science* 52, no. 3 (2008): 536–553.

130. Daniel P. Hawes and Austin Michael McCrea, "Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor and We Might Buy Them Dinner: Social Capital, Immigration, and Welfare Generosity in the American States," *Political Research Quarterly* 71, no. 2 (2018): 347.

homogenous with low immigration levels.[131] In other words, in urban areas where the populace is more diversified and philanthropic causes are increasingly racialized, social capital shifts from an indication of building trust and empathy for heterogenous causes and instead resorts to investing in causes and policies that reflect a desire to maintain homogenous values.

As the core principles of donor-centered fundraising are being reexamined, the result is a clash of philanthropic philosophies, a tension that occurs directly at the boundary between the theory and practice of philanthropy. As this body of literature has illustrated, philanthropy is a complex area of study whose discourse and ideologies are generated and regenerated based on the subjective position of the donor to their giving. To shift the ideologies of philanthropy away from a donor-centric approach where individuals determine the flow of capital, organizations need to instead invest in a community-centric approach.[132] The full incorporation of the populace into the practice of philanthropy provides the potential for increased shared distribution of social, cultural, and economic capital. As such, additional scholarly philanthropic literature is needed for research on the role of philanthropy as it relates to the exchange of capital upon the public good. This dissertation seeks to fill the void on the interplaying role of social, cultural, and financial capital in the creation of inequal systems and structures through the field of philanthropy. Once theory and practice become more closely connected rather than at odds with one another, awareness of the discrepancies between its role as both a service and entrepreneurial sector can help to enforce philanthropy's role to serve the public good.

---

131. Hawes and McCrea, 355-356.

132. Vu Le, "How Donor-Centrism Perpetuates Inequity and Why We Must Move Toward Community Centric Fundraising," *Nonprofit AF,* May 15, 2017, https://nonprofitaf.com/2017/05/how-donor-centrism-perpetuates-inequity-and-why-we-must-move-toward-community-centric-fundraising/.

Transdisciplinary Contributions

The study of philanthropy in academia originated in the field of social work as early as the 1800s, but disciplinary approaches have recently expanded to include sociology, economics, psychology, and business administration. In particular, business schools have showed significant increases in including social benefit content because "many [business students] wish to eventually serve on the boards of nonprofits or become philanthropists themselves."[133] Some of this adaptation to include philanthropy in business is that "even for-profit corporations know they can attract talent by calling attention to their socially-oriented activities."[134] However, this blending of for-profit and non-profit sectors contributes to the increased blurring of lines between the sectors, and thereby philanthropy's role in serving the public good.

There are two approaches to determining the reasons for which individuals donate: the theoretical, humanistic approach, and the practical, scientific approach. The former of the two traces personality types in conjunction with institutions and giving vehicles, while the second uses surveys and data to record the underlying conditions under which donors are motivated to donate. The simultaneous study of both approaches highlights the divide between the two and, more importantly, uncovers a further argument as to the truth of what motivates donors. The revealed motivations are rooted in the prosocial act of philanthropy and the way in which it provides an advantage to the self through the accumulation of social capital, with the added benefit of serving the public good. In other words, the transdisciplinary approaches to the study

133. Jenny Sarti, *The Giving Way to Happiness* (New York: Penguin Random House, 2015), 65.

134. Sarti, 65.

of philanthropy have uncovered alternative conditions through which donors are mobilized away from a materialist ideology in search of prosocial recognition.

The human condition of social desirability continues to facilitate the myth of individual participation in philanthropy to "feel good," but critical scholarship has uncovered that philanthropy should no longer be attributed purely to altruistic behaviors, contrary to its altruistic origins.[135] Once the government encroached upon philanthropy through higher taxation on large estates and other tax-deductible incentives, motivations began to move away from the altruistic model and into a self-centric one. The roots of philanthropy as a prosocial behavior and acting in the interest of the public good, in direct contrast to donor-centric or capital-centric motivations, encourages disparate perspectives on measuring and defining the purpose, implementation, and participants of philanthropy.

Whereas more traditional disciplines such as economic theory define public and private in relation to goods and exchanges—the limits of which Bourdieu critiques[136]—the innovative applications of a combination of disciplines to the study of philanthropy seek to make the sector more efficient, and thereby have a higher impact with limited resources.[137] Nevertheless, the data continues to be broad and varied, leading to extensive applications and conclusions. In other words, while multiple disciplines have attributed to the increase of information held on who gives and why, the data has not helped to produce a more clear-cut definition of philanthropy or relieved the tensions between its theory and practice.

---

135. Sarti, 8.

136. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 242.

137. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* xxvii.

In the search for clearer classifications of donors and their motivations within philanthropy, authors within sociology have initiated personality trait studies to summarize the various underlying indicators of philanthropic participation. First, one of the most recent publications identifying distinct giving types is from Prince and File, who developed the *Seven Faces of Philanthropy* to examine the individualistic reasons that result in a donation to an institution. Labelled as Communitarians, Devout, Investors, Socialites, Altruists, Repayers, and Dynasts, these "seven faces" were created as a way to more effectively practice fundraising by understanding individual motivations. Even though these attributes are generalized across an entire population of donors, this identification of donor types is helpful to segmenting specific engagement and cultivation strategies for more effective fundraising.

Ranging in demographics and motivations, these donor types illustrate various ways in which an individual might relate to an institution. For example, an Altruist can be labelled as the "selfless donor," one who gives "because they believe it is a moral imperative, and because it helps them grow as human beings or evolve spiritually,"[138] whereas the Investor is typically motivated by a combination of the cause and the tax benefits. As such, the Investor is likely to donate to a "wide range of nonprofits and are the segment most likely to support umbrella nonprofits such as community foundations."[139] These "faces" serve as a broad illustration of how motivations, identification, segmentation, and individualization of the philanthropic experience can improve the outcome for the individual and the institution, as well as for the field as a whole.

---

138. Russ Alan Prince and Karen Maru File, *Seven Faces of Philanthropy: A New Approach to Cultivating Major Donors* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), 16.

139. Prince and File, 15.

Similarly, using a thorough blend of quantitative and qualitative data, sociologists Herzog and Price, in their book *American Generosity: Who Gives and Why,* demonstrate that donors can be grouped into five giving types: Planned, Habitual, Selective, Impulsive, Atypical.[140] With Impulsive givers measuring in as the largest group at over 40%, these individuals indicated an "instinctive need" to support the cause of an organization.[141] Linked to impulsive trends created by internet technologies, we are seeing a move away from the habitual and selective donor who gave to the causes they were involved in for their lifetimes, which continues to fuel the field's donor-centricity approach to enhance donor loyalty. Although Herzog and Price have made significant strides towards identifying why donors give through their social psychological approach to social and personal orientations, the issues of the larger components of philanthropy, including institutions, often continue to be obscured.[142]

Instead, the field of philanthropy has come to rely on more contemporary scholarship through the methodology of psycho-social frameworks on philanthropic participation, looking at prosocial behaviors and alternate motivations for giving. Russell James, Jr., leading philanthropic psychologist, studies individual donors' behaviors and motivations through methods including surveys, as well as hear-rate and oxytocin monitors. Understanding the donor and their motivations is vital to developing effective short- and long-term fundraising strategies as donor-centric policies become more standardized across non-profit institutions. As James, Jr. states: "Understanding the why of behavior gives you the tools you need to build custom approaches for your situation, adapt current approaches to new environments, understand when

140. Herzog and Price, *American Generosity,* 120.

141. Herzog and Price, 121.

142. Herzog and Price, 159.

certain approaches won't work, and avoid brute force trial and error."[143] Determining effective language, marketing strategies, and explanatory concepts can all be identified through these psychological studies to inform better connections to donors.

On the other hand, simply asking why people give does not uncover the authentic motivations of donors as biases affect the outcome of individual responses. For instance, when donors are surveyed, by an institutional representative or by a friend, over 80 percent state that their primary reason for giving is simply to "create lasting improvements that would benefit people in the world"[144] with no return benefits. When results such as these are examined against marketing data, however, publications that include tax-benefit language often result in a higher response rate. Moreover, more and larger gifts often come in at the end of the year, at the tax-deduction cutoff.[145] In other words, while donors do not indicate taxes as a motivator to donating, their behaviors prove otherwise. As a result, as much as 75% of survey response variation indicates a "social desirability bias," reinforcing that individuals guide their behavior based on what they think others will think of them.[146] While the biased data does not directly inform the study of why individuals donate, it allows for the opportunity to discover and further examine individuals, society, and institutions as they interrelate towards the outcome of achieving the public good.

---

143. James, *Inside the Mind of the Bequest Donor,* 11.

144. James, 266.

145. James, 13.

146. Anton J. Nederhof, "Methods of Coping with Social Desirability Bias: a Review," *European Journal of Social Psychology* 12, no. 3 (1985): 263.

Derived from these transdisciplinary contributions, philanthropic studies relies on a measurable standard for determining who gives and why based on the prospect's linkage, ability, and interest, also known as the LAI principle.[147] This principle identifies potential donors for the purposes of fundraising, moving an individual into the donor continuum through moves management.[148] Contrary to the principle that ability is synonymous with capacity, ability is the foremost determination of an individual's giving. Ability simply indicates the "financial capacity of the gift source to give a gift at the level the nonprofit deems appropriate," where a donor must have the means to contribute.[149] Without surplus capital, an individual does not have the ability to distribute their time or money to others.

One downside to this approach is trust. Even with an indication of linkage to a cause, those without sufficient funds cannot participate financially.[150] As Prine and Lesem argue, ability is the least determining factor in whether an individual will give, but rather that capacity—high and low—will determine one's participation. Even low-capacity donors will donate. In fact, they will give a higher percentage of their income than those with high capacity. This argument that capacity is indicative of engagement completely disregards the interconnectedness of ability and capacity: without a capacity, there can be no ability. Individuals who have no ability to donate

147. Timothy L. Seiler, "Individuals as a Constituency for Fundraising," in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising,* eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame (Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016), 53.

148. Blackbaud, "Moves Management Best Practices." https://www.blackbaud.com/support/howto/coveo/renxt/bb-moves-mgmt.html..

149. Seiler, "Individuals as a Constituency for Fundraising," 53.

150. Katie Prine and Elisabeth Lesem, "Prospective Donor and Donor Research and Database Management," in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising,* eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame (Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016), 71.

due to a lack of capital cannot engage even if they have high interest and linkage. Inversely, if an individual has a high capacity but no interest, they will also fail to engage in philanthropy.

Determining the engagement of an individual in philanthropy is not just dependent on the social capital tied to ability and linkage, but also interest. Interest is one often of the most illuminating factors of the principle because it uncovers the involvement between the donor and the institution or cause. For the majority of donors, interest is derived from an authentic, personal experience.[151] As such, the individual must self-identify as having a connection to the institution or its mission. These connections determine the relationship of the exchange of capital. For example, those who donate their time instead of funds, often due to a lack of financial capital but high in interest, are recognized separately from donors. As a result, the amount of social capital derived from volunteering and donating is distinctly different. The importance of the volunteer is undervalued, and the philanthropist is thereby often privy to more social capital. In the end, the individual's interest, alongside their ability, determines their form of participation.

Lastly, linkage, intertwined with measures of ability and interest, finalize a donor's engagement or connectedness and likelihood to be philanthropic. Linkage is defined as the "direct connection of an individual to an organization, whether as a board member, volunteer, or donor."[152] It can also be "geographic, emotional, or professional,"[153] where the prospect is connected to an organization's cause due to their social, economic, or political identity. Linkage no longer has to be direct but can instead come from in-group loyalty, dense social networks, and

151. Seiler, "Individuals as a Constituency for Fundraising," 53.

152. Prine and Lesem, "Prospective Donor and Donor Research and Database Management," 75.

153. Seiler, "Individuals as a Constituency for Fundraising," 53.

trust associated with already-established social capital. Linkage is contemporaneously determined by "philanthropic tribes."[154] These tribes are forms of dense social networks specific to philanthropy, the result of already-accumulated social capital that brings philanthropists together. As a result, the combination of linkage, ability, and interest serve to compile the scope of the social subject's likelihood to participate in philanthropy for a particular cause or organization, accounting for individualistic and measurable differences.

While various fields of study have approached new practical methodologies to uncover the intrinsic qualities of who gives and why, the field remains understudied as it relates to the theoretical exchange of capital. As the field continues to exist as a multiplicity, unhoused within any specific academic discipline, the origins of its establishment and the disciplines that account for its original interpretation contribute to both a historical and contemporary framework for understanding the role of social subjects in the nonprofit sector. The study of the practical and theoretical approaches together highlights the divide between the two and, more importantly, uncovers a further argument as to the discourse, definition, origins, and historiography of philanthropy. In the end, the transdisciplinary contributions continue to reveal that motivations are rooted in the prosocial act of philanthropy and also provide further insight into the way in which philanthropy provides an advantage to the self through the accumulation of capital, with the added benefit of serving the public good.

Conclusion

Understanding philanthropy as an emerging field provides the framework through which to understand its various forms, as well as the reasons for which individuals participate.

154. Callahan, *The Givers,* 44.

Philanthropy's malleable definitions, shifting ideologies, and limited models have previously hindered an in-depth theoretical study of the field, yet also allow it to act as a dynamic and adaptive practice as it continues to materialize within the academic and institutional sphere. Currently, as a transdisciplinary field that emerged from social work and has more recently been absorbed into the study of economics, business, sociology, and psychology, theoretical approaches continue to emerge to enhance the quality and promised altruism of its practice.

Nevertheless, the relations of production which have led to the conditions for its emergence remain constant. The historiography presented in this chapter attentively compiles and critically analyzes academic research as a foundation for the understanding of philanthropy through a more theoretical lens. By interrogating the early history, development, and shifting narratives of philanthropy alongside contemporary debates about its language and discourse, I have uncovered the indelible shift towards a need to individualize the donor, all indicated by the emergence of the 21st century donor-centered fundraising model. In addition to the practical approach focused on the individual, studies on individual personality traits and individualized motivations for philanthropic participation are directly intertwined with the donor-centric approach.

As such, a "radical reimagination" of the ideological framework and discourse must also incorporate the circumstances which lead to a linkage, ability, and interest of prospective donors to engage in the exchange of capital.[155] To move away from the individual donor as the center of philanthropy, the prerequisite must look beyond the missions of organizations to the beneficiaries in need of the philanthropic support, towards the needs of their communities. A citizenry-centric approach is one way to again shift the power of the few to the power of the

155. Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth,* xiii.

many, returning to a philanthropic approach that recenters its attention on the promotion of the public good. To illustrate the necessity and possibility for this shift, the following chapter illustrates the major historical transitions within various forms and functions of philanthropy. Presenting a genealogical framework of philanthropy unveils the potential for a continued reimagination for its future, responding to the ways in which individuals, groups, and the citizenry inform and shape the exchange of capital.

CHAPTER 2

The Shifting Forms of Philanthropy

> The philanthropy of the past leaves its material record, its buildings, its legal documents, its charitable gifts, its assumptions and practices, in layer after layer. The present adds a topsoil of the latest projects, but the lower layers continue to exercise their influence, sometimes in the form of outcrops from earlier ages of giving. – Hugh Cunningham[156]

The study of philanthropy must reflect upon the evolution of the methodologies to identify its function in contemporary society. Some layers of the exchange of capital remain hidden, yet others are highly visible. For instance, philanthropy permeates the social fabric of the urban environment through naming opportunities in physical spaces across nonprofit institutions. Nevertheless, the exchange of materialistic forms of capital for ideological systems leave little evidence. Both explicit and implicit traces of past philanthropy do not simply indicate the power and influence of legacies by generous individuals, but rather highlight a microcosm of social relations between donors, beneficiaries, and capital. Each trace provides insight into the ways in which individuals, groups, and communities engage with philanthropic institutions, directly contributing to the way in which capital is exchanged through the sector's changing formations.

The evolution of philanthropy is not a direct, linear progression, but rather a constantly shifting sector with simultaneous transitions. Each form of philanthropy results in a similar function, where all donors receive some form of recognition, ranging from a naming opportunity to a tax deduction, even when donating anonymously. However, capital is exchanged and accumulated in uneven ways, especially as it is distributed amongst individuals, groups, or the citizenry. Specifically, the role of the citizenry has incessantly been placed at odds with individualism "for preeminence in our political hagiology," where individuals are more likely to

156. Cunningham, "Multi-layered History of Western Philanthropy," 42.

be recognized as heroes or legends than groups.[157] To uncover the importance of the shifting ideologies embedded within philanthropy and the exchange of capital, an emphasis needs to be the role of the specific philanthropic forms in conjunction with the transformation of social, economic, and cultural context and values.

The study of the development of the three most social-centric forms of philanthropy—big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns—presents the opportunity to uncover how transformational historical contexts shape the ways in which people are included or excluded from participating in the exchange of capital. The layers of these types of philanthropy are identified through major changes created by contentious historical periods, groundbreaking published literature, and innovative formation of new philanthropic strategies. From the origin of consternation for big philanthropy tied to the Industrial Revolution, to the formation of hierarchical contemporary mass campaign methods, these historical shifts demonstrate contributory and disruptive engagement in philanthropy over time, especially in relation to the shifting social contexts of race, class, and gender, in addition to perceived and real values of material and ideological forms of capital.

This chapter thereby produces a genealogical record of these shifts to provide a foundation for interpreting philanthropy in Los Angeles. The citizenry's engagement with philanthropy has been primed by a combination of these historical shifts and its own contemporary site-specific context to create its most indelible cultural institutions. Moreover, this chapter informs the way in which the use of capital shifted over time and how this impacted the ways in which individuals participate in philanthropy—as individuals, as groups, or as part of the public. In the end, illustrating the ideological and practical shifts towards and away from the

157. Putnam. *Bowling Alone,* 24.

inclusion of the citizenry throughout the 20th century highlight the potential of philanthropy to relocate the notion of serving the public good from the possible to the real.[158]

Big Philanthropy

Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution's transformation to economic and social relations directly connected philanthropy with excess capital for the first time. Many far-reaching social changes occurred as a result of industrialization, including a shift from social welfare programs and services funded by the government to those supported by private wealth. In the United States, the transition from an agricultural to industrial economy took place over more than a century, with its rise as an industrial giant transpiring after the Civil War. One of the direct consequences of the changing economic and social landscape was that a small faction of foresighted business moguls adapted to new manufacturing processes, modes of labor, and use of materials. Like their fellow industrialists, individuals such as Andrew M. Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller shifted the relations of production to allow for a new and expanding tactic for amassing surplus capital, but they also became celebrated figures in the media for applying their excess capital to serve the public good through philanthropy.

Prior to the Industrial Revolution, government was ill-prepared to manage an increase in poverty and a decrease in health. From widows and orphans to disabled soldiers and the elderly, the government failed to fully support the growing needs of a more diverse populace. At the same time, "private fortunes were few and wealth neither widely enough distributed nor

158. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 411.

sufficiently fluid to permit large-scale or sustained private giving."[159] These major changes in production not only distributed increased wealth to more individuals, but also allowed for the distribution of aid and ideas through new means of communication and transportation. Alongside the demand for social reform and the need to fill the gaps left by government, the term "big-scale philanthropy" emerged in the United States at the turn of the 20th century.[160] Consisting of individuals with substantial excess financial capital to shift social and cultural values, the positionality of big philanthropy to act as the mechanism through which to fill these gaps invoked an opportunity for the elite to step into the social sector with much-needed financial support.

Even though the Industrial Revolution facilitated a new opportunity for amassed capital to be directed toward solving society's greatest perils, the usage of the term "big philanthropy" was solidified within a discourse of distrust that emerged during the Gilded Age. In a period associated with corruption, distinguishable individuals used their excess capital to provide private donations through their large estates. Out of the 14,000 millionaires during the 18th and 19th centuries, Carnegie and Rockefeller shaped this new form of philanthropy by "draining off their vast accumulations of wealth."[161] In other words, philanthropy emerged as a methodology for redistributing excess capital to the public as a means to offset some of the plight caused by industrialization amid increasingly dense urban areas. Using their philanthropic contributions to

159. Robert Bremne, *American Philanthropy* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988), 23.

160. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 33.

161. Cutlip, 34.

correct the ills of society, which they simultaneously helped to create, sustained their power and influences within the industrial complex as well as the social.

At the turn of the 20th century, the Cleveland Committee observed and regulated the funds raised and spent by nonprofit organizations as big philanthropy continued to emerge. In 1910, the Committee published a report showing that "six givers were still contributing 42 per cent of the total raised for the seventy-three organizations soliciting gifts, the remaining 58 per cent coming from only 6,000 donors."[162] Moreover, the report also illustrated that between 1907 and 1909, the amount given to charity in Cleveland had increased 22%, but that the number of donors had decreased by 11%.[163] As the quantity of financial capital distributed was accounted for by few individuals, even fewer individuals participated in philanthropy as a whole. In fact, Rockefeller accounted for almost a quarter of the total raised, funding public priorities through his private foundation, but still holding most of his surplus capital within his foundation instead of redistributing it for the public good. In other words, this report not only highlights the trends of the majority of American cities, but also shows the reach of big philanthropists.

Today, the use of "big philanthropy" to express a sinister view of the power of the individual in philanthropy for the public good has become as commonplace as "big data" or "big government," with the "big" simply denoting a level of excess or complex involvement within its related sector. In each case, there are remedial explanations for the need of entities to be involved in an excessive way. Nevertheless, the "big" superimposes itself as a pejorative term. While the antagonism expressed towards the role of the individualization of philanthropy has at times

---

162. "1910 Report," *The Cleveland Jewish Community Federation*, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland Records, Western Reserve Historical Society.

163. "1910 Report."

subsided, it has never been completely subdued. Because Carnegie has been credited as the "father of modern philanthropy," the image of the individual philanthropist as a billionaire business mogul continues to be ever-present.[164] This conflicting image of the philanthropist as a shrewd and manipulative individual with prosocial intentions upholds the lingering debate on the consequences of the lasting individual influence over the public good within the third sector.

The ways in which big philanthropy is constantly "shaping the communities we all live in, often in transformative ways" can therefore be both interpreted as a positive and negative consequence.[165] Philanthropy continues to be driven by the private power of individuals, especially through the potential of achieving a notable legacy based on those that have the promise of existing in perpetuity, such as Rockefeller and Carnegie. The direct relationship between the exchange of economic capital for social capital became a new benefit to the discourse of philanthropy. The Industrial Revolution's seismic shift to the connection of capital and philanthropy continues to inform the way in which big philanthropy is shaped today as a capital-centric ideology whereby individuals hold the ability to shape the public good for all.

Private Foundations

Following the amassed fortunes garnered through the Industrial Revolution, individuals created new strategies to manage the movement of wealth, such as the "last-named foundation."[166] Considered a donation during one's lifetime and not part of one's estate, these privately named foundations were designed to hold wealth, direct funds according to the

---

164. "Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy in the Hall that he Build." *Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy*. https://www.medalofphilanthropy.org/pathbreaker-charting-andrew-carnegie/

165. "Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy."

166. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 34.

individual's values, and transfer only 5% of its principal to the benefit of the public good on an annual basis. To develop legacies while also using the non-profit sector as a means to avoid standard taxation, foundations served as a tool for individuals to form their own permanent philanthropic organizations. Whereas an outright donation to an institution, cause, or individual in need could make a singular impact, private family foundations hold wealth in perpetuity, providing an unending source of social capital. This not only provided the individual with the opportunity to control their wealth but also their image.

Rockefeller single-handedly created the model of the new enterprise of a private foundation model that would come to shape the future of private philanthropy for the public good.[167] In response to Rockefeller's initial request to set up his foundation, the U.S. Senate declared that, "From the start, the mega-foundations provoked hostility across the political spectrum…Setting up do-good corporations was merely a ploy to secure the wealth and clean up the reputations of business moguls who amassed fortunes during the Gilded Age."[168] Even with his close ties to big business, presidential candidate Theodore Roosevelt opposed Rockefeller's proposals for the creation of private foundations, claiming that "no amount of charity in spending such fortunes [as Rockefeller's] can compensate in any way for the misconduct in acquiring them."[169] The perpetuated fear of individual power in the form of economic capital upholding

---

167. Raymond B. Fosdick, *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation* (New York: Harper, 1952).

168. Joanne Barkan, "Plutocrats at Work: How Big Philanthropy Undermines Democracy," *Dissent Magazine,* October 22, 2013, https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/plutocrats-at-work-how-big-philanthropy-undermines-democracy.

169. Peter Dobkin Hall, "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600–2000," in *The Nonprofit Sector: A*

inequities and suffering for which the government was still held responsible for solving maintained uncertainty within the social sphere. The State of New York approved the request after considering potential consequences of this new entity, forming the national basis of the private foundation that continues to be scrutinized today.

The last-named foundation allowed the power of the individual to be masked as an impersonal entity. To avoid the direct suspicion of the public against any particular individual within the discourse of big philanthropy, the private foundation was built to become a separate entity from the individual in the eyes of the government as well as the public.[170] These less taxable and traceable accounts of economic capital provided new opportunities for the desire to create a legacy. Instead of imparting the profits made from industrialized means to solve any immediate needs through the exchange of economic capital for immediate social capital, the private foundation can now hold and invest 95% of its accumulated capital, ensuring that its capital accumulation lasts in perpetuity.

The named private foundation also had the ability to maintain control over the movement of capital back into society. This control exists in the form of designating the funds to specific causes or needs. As the philanthropic foundation holds a place in the third sector, outside of business and government, they are able to determine these needs based on their own criteria and values.[171] Because the needs that exists are too great for any one foundation to solve, alongside

---

Research Handbook, eds. Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 47.

170. Erica Kohl-Arenas, "Critical Issues in Philanthropy: Power, Paradox, Possibility, and the Private Foundation," in *Funding, Power, and Community Development,* eds. Niamh McCrea and Fergal Finnegan (Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2019), 23-28.

171. Kohl-Arenas, 27.

the desire to be able to decide which causes are worthy to be prioritized over others, private foundations have moved to a model in which they request applications from organizations to prove both their need and merit for funds. Nonprofits now must apply to private, grant-making foundations on a scheduled timeline, with prohibitive requirements and restrictions for eligibility, for a limited funding amount. Even upon receiving the fund award, the organization must continue to report back with transparent records of accounting and measurable impact. This elusive yet total control over the circulation of capital transformed the way in which capital could be held onto in perpetuity, responsible only for returning 5% of that for the public good.

The Gospel of Wealth

To dispel further controversy regarding big philanthropy, Carnegie publishing a pair of articles entitled "Wealth" and "The Best Fields for Philanthropy" that would come to be known as *The Gospel of Wealth*. Carnegie published these articles in the *Atlantic* in 1889 to a readership consisting of over 30,000 subscribers.[172] These publications served to distinguish himself from the early distrust of the interconnectedness of business, wealth, and philanthropy. Carnegie describes philanthropy as a necessary function of society, supporting the reduction of ills produced by modernity, and to direct the nation towards progressive relations between rich and poor.[173] At the time *The Gospel of Wealth* was published, it "caused a sensation by posing a radical idea: men of means should distribute their wealth during their lifetimes for the betterment of mankind, rather than enjoying lavish lifestyles and bequeathing vast sums to their (male) heirs

172. Cullen Murphy, "The Atlantic: A History," *The Atlantic,* 1994, https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1994/11/the-atlantic-a-history/

173. Andrew Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," 8.

(wives and daughters should be comfortably provided for)."[174] In other words, Carnegie called upon the elite to donate during one's lifetime in the interest of the public good, not just through the customary provision in estate plans which traditionally benefitted society and the family after death.

To further encourage the outright distribution of funds, Carnegie also requested the elite to view their role in philanthropy as:

> "a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial results for the community—the man of wealth thus becoming the mere agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience and ability to administer, doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves."[175]

His philosophy broke away from the tradition of accumulating for the strict purposes of legacy-centric social capital in perpetuity. This tradition of estate giving sought to serve the self and the self's legacy, infusing the family name as the symbol of accumulated wealth.

In addition to identifying the participation of the wealthy in philanthropy as a duty, Carnegie also strikingly remarks that the elite should determine the allocation of these funds for the best impact on the public good. Similar to the allocation of funds from private foundations, Carnegie sought that big philanthropists should determine the best application of the funds, ignoring the masses in identifying the needs to advance their communities. While lifetime giving sought to change the shape of society caused by removing capital from circulation, the methods through which it was redistributed was still controlled by the big philanthropists whose values differed from others whom they sought to support.

---

174. "Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy."

175. Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," 8.

The call for a shift back to outright giving instead of through legacies, *The Gospel of Wealth* led to uncovering new ways to further include business ventures and for-profit investments within the non-profit sector. Big philanthropy no longer exists solely in the form of individual outright donations, estate gifts, or last-named foundations. Instead, it has also recently incorporated business tactics, referred to as "Philanthrocapitalism" or "Venture Philanthropy." The merging of the for- and non-profit sectors modifies the current impression of philanthropy as an independent sector, reminding the public of early big philanthropists such as Carnegie and Rockefeller and the interwoven relationship between business profits and the controlled redistribution of capital. In other words, the application of business and investment models provides the opportunity for the incorporation of new methodologies to accomplish the goals the nonprofit sector, yet for-profit models uphold a risk of circumventing the public good through an inherent search for profit, making these models more disruptive than contributory.

Driven by celebrity and political endorsements and paired with the failings of the government, Philanthrocapitalism coalesces individuals with surplus capital as advocates of a type of "philanthropy led by the world's wealth creators…applying business techniques and ways of thinking to their philanthropy."[176] Originally published as "How the Rich Can Save the World," Bishop and Green renamed their book within its first year to specifically remove hesitancy and cynicism from readership surrounding the power of the elite as opposed to the power of philanthropy. Their suggestion for a "giving revolution" is exhibited as a way to bring new and innovative methodologies to some of the world's largest social issues in a field that

176. Matthew Bishop and Michael Green, *Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009), x.

feels stagnant, unmoving, and outdated.[177] Venture philanthropy is described as a way to move more quickly on systemic issues that have yet to be overcome through traditional routes of philanthropy.[178] Nevertheless, the consolidation of power of the world's elite to provide for the needs of the Other can be as easily destructive as constructive, where the collective power of the public can no longer provide a counterbalance to the designated distributions of surplus capital by big philanthropists. As a result, the divergence between the arguments for and against philanthropy indicates the inherent challenge of determining the role of individuals and business in the public good, who should determine its role, and through what means it should be funded.

East and West Coast Philanthropy

Although the evolution of big philanthropy can be traced from the Industrial Revolution to contemporary venture philanthropy, the two proposed models of East and West Coast philanthropy continue to neglect a form that encompasses philanthropic activities within Los Angeles. Writers such as Arango, Nagourney, and Miller determine that family lineage is non-existent in Los Angeles, indicating a limited understanding of this evolution of big philanthropy and how it is memorialized. While many names visibly line the interior and exterior walls of the most prominent buildings and institutions across the city, its lack of a central, unifying downtown presents a unique challenge to reading the prominence of any particular donor. The city's divided nature ensures that the power of one family or foundation cannot determine the values or identity of the whole. in fact, the fragmentation makes the city impervious to the explicit powers of big philanthropy because its post-modern decentralization requires big

177. Bishop and Green, 30.

178. Thomas Billitteri, "Venturing on a Bet," *The Chronicle of Philanthropy,* June 1, 2000.

philanthropists to engage with each community separately to establish social and cultural capital recognition across its disjointed landscape.

If big philanthropists want to be recognized outside of one tight-knit community, they must fund opportunities across disparate spaces. For example, the Broad Family Foundation established both the Broad Stage in Santa Monica and the Broad Museum in Downtown. Or, even on a more minute scale, the Mark Taper Forum was funded on Bunker Hill compared to the Mark Taper Auditorium less than one mile down on Normal Hill. Los Angeles's lack of a single cultural center dilutes the influence of big philanthropy on the quantity of cultural institutions that reside within the city. Instead of bringing all people together for these cultural experiences, Los Angeles has divided its cultural centers, forcing individuals and communities to choose their experience based on the cultural identity of the center and the self, as well as accessibility to what is provided within reach of each community.

Contrary to common public perception, Los Angeles has long been a center for philanthropic achievements through its cultural institutions. The elite who had invested in Los Angeles' growth in the early 1900s had, in fact, invested in a city that did not quite yet exist. The civic imagination of Los Angeles' history consisted of a "civic fantasy" that attracted residents to the city's multiple centers.[179] Los Angeles simultaneously constructed its mystique, not by hiding its shortcomings but by framing them within its image. Cultural centers became a way to display these desired visions of identity or a version of a "fantasy city" and to shape the future of Los Angeles through art.[180] This simultaneously coincide with an elitist-based "boom in public art

179. Mike Davis, *The City of Quartz* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), 25.

180. Sarah Schrank, *Art and the City: Civic Imagination and Cultural Authority in Los Angeles* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 164.

and cultural monumentality that has gone hand-in-hand with a cultural depression in most of the inner city."[181] These two seemingly contradictory elements of Los Angeles's image as both a cultural center and perilous wasteland support the role of the city as both utopic and dystopic. The application of big philanthropy thereby served as a method through which to develop institutions to produce an imaginary of what the city could serve its public instead of how it actually functioned, upholding and reproducing cultural values of the elite.

To illustrate the role of big philanthropy and its various approaches within the City of Los Angeles, the study of big philanthropy needs to be explored through individuals whose names are less discussed. Contrary to the leading private foundations and big philanthropists that appear in contemporary headlines such as Ahmanson or Broad, Los Angeles's most indelible big philanthropists are Andrew M. Carnegie, Dorothy B. Chandler, and Franklin D. Murphy. Carnegie's philanthropy in Los Angeles was particularly informed by, and contributed to, the fragmented communities of Los Angeles, even though his contributions were shameful to the city due to a lack of its own big philanthropist. On the other hand, Dorothy B. Chandler significantly contributed to building social capital across the city through shifting the formation of the whirlwind campaign to one that incorporates all forms of philanthropy and connects the disparate parts of the city. Lastly, Franklin D. Murphy facilitated the distribution of capital amassed by other big philanthropists for the support of civic institutions across the city. These unique examples illustrate that big philanthropy in Los Angeles is informed by the larger social, political, and economic shifts of philanthropy across the United States, but that the city has experienced its own distinctive, site- and cultural-specific shifts within big philanthropy.

181. Davis, *The City of Quartz,* 78.

Voluntary Associations

A Social Consciousness

Voluntary associations are primarily public-serving or member-serving. As highlighted by Paul Arnsberger et al., the tax-exempt delineations between a 501(c) and a 501(c)(3) illustrate the differences between public- and member-serving groups as they were originally defined.[182] Out of the over 1.5 million tax-exempt organizations in the United States, only about 400,000 are deemed to be "charitable."[183] For example, under the Internal Revenue Code 501(c)(3), religious, educational, charitable, scientific, or literary organizations are invested in activities that are conducted for the betterment of society. As such, these associations are categorized as charitable nonprofit entities. On the other hand, Code 501(c) includes fraternal associations, social clubs, business leagues and others which are categorized as directed towards member-facing benefits.[184] Thereby, while a 501(c) can also make a charitable impact on the larger public, its primary benefits are to its members. As such, one of the main benefits to members of a voluntary association, like donations through big philanthropy, is social capital.

Like the opening for big philanthropy to pervade the social sector in absence of government services for the rapidly modernizing society of the 19th century, individuals who wished to combat the poverty and illness, both in and surrounding their communities, voluntarily grouped together to form these associations. The American voluntary association thereby became

182. Paul Arnsberger, Melissa Ludlum, Margaret Riley and Mark Stanton, "A History of the Tax-Exempt Sector: An SOI Perspective," *Statistics of Income Bulletin* (2008): 105.

183. Brice McKeever. "Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2018: Public Charities, Giving, and Volunteering. *National Center for Charitable Statistics.* nccs.urban.org/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2018#highlights. Accessed March 22, 2021.

184. Arnsberger, Ludlum, Riley and Stanton, "A History of the Tax-Exempt Sector," 123.

a unique tool for turning charity into philanthropy: an active form of civic engagement to better the community as a whole instead of a passive administration of capital for the betterment of the Other. The Industrial Revolution spurred a civic engagement by the populace, from a state of patriotism, but also from the desire to break from traditional, imperial, and British-centric philanthropic models.[185]

Unlike the origination of voluntary associations in 17th century England that were "initiated from the top-down by gentlemen and merchants with schemes for the lower orders [into] a middle-class alternative to the elite world of patronage and power," Friedman and McGarvie show that the American voluntary association was not only be available to those with financial capital, but also for those with social capital, time, or passion for the betterment of the public good. [186] Early American philanthropy was unique compared to that previously seen in Europe because it incorporated the larger citizenry.

Civic engagement by the public through voluntary associations was also seen as one of the exceptional characteristics of American democracy. De Tocqueville's interpretations of the uniqueness of the right to association by the American republic are highlighted extensively in his writings in *Democracy in America*:

> "Americans of all ages, conditions, dispositions constantly unite together…I have frequently admired the endless skill with which the inhabitants of the United States manage to set a common aim to the efforts of a great number of men and to persuade them to pursue it voluntarily."[187]

---

185. Amanda B. Moniz, "Giving in America: A History of Philanthropy." *History News* 72, no. 4 (2017): 28.

186. Robert Gross, "Giving in America: From Charity to Philanthropy," in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History.* eds. Mark McGarvie and Lawrence Friedman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 37-38.

187. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Penguin Books, London, 2003), 596.

The voluntary association and the right to self-interest within the efforts to achieve the public good as an American form of democracy stood out as one of the most significant discoveries of the investigation.[188] De Tocqueville argues that philanthropy through the right to association is vital to the advancement of the American public good through a willingness of individuals to serve in the interest of the whole. Moreover, it is key to the maintenance of a democratic republic on the principles upon which it was formed, while also allowing the individual to benefit from the network of associational ties.

By the early 19th century, participation by the public at large in philanthropic endeavors was more fully embedded as a way of life and seen as part of American culture. Starting in the 1850s, voluntary associations rapidly spread across the United States showed an increase in the participation of private citizens in the expansion of social and cultural groups for the public good.[189] In particular, as Cutlip summarizes:

> "In the closing decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth there came into the consciousness of American life a new emphasis upon social problems and new faith in the progressive spirit that was to reshape America. This increasingly sensitive social conscience was reflected in the rise of great numbers and varieties of social agencies, associations and institutions."[190]

The growth of volunteer groups like these across the United States increased exponentially, especially in the mid-to-late 19th century and into the 20th. As a social consciousness infiltrated American culture, voluntary associations served as a way for individuals to come together. To uncover how this trend pervaded social life, Putnam's data

188. de Tocqueville, 596.

189. Gerald Gamm and Robert Putnam, "The Growth of Voluntary Associations in America, 1840-1940," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, no. 4 (1999): 514.

190. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 23.

investigates the relationship between the rise of the voluntary association and social capital in group formation and the challenges presented to enhancing or maintaining civic engagement. Importantly, these membership-oriented organizations were ways through which the American public could come together for civic engagement.[191] As philanthropy moved from the individual to the group, it became a form of civic engagement instead of a form of excessive influence over the public good.

Group philanthropy, just like big philanthropy, provides a unique opportunity for the accumulation of social capital. Whereas in social capital is accumulated through the outright exchange of capital and named legacies, voluntary associations provide social capital through the collective backing of the durable network of the individuals involved in the group.[192] Bourdieu defines social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition…which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively owned capital, a 'credential' which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the word."[193] A voluntary association is one example of this durable network. In essence, the network provided to individuals through a public- or member-serving association benefits those recognized as leaders or members of the group and incentivizes members to maintain their membership status to continue to benefit from the collective capital.

For Bourdieu, social capital is only one part of the whole of relations to production and reproduction, but so much so that it can be acquired and applied to determine one's standing

191. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 51.

192. Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 21.

193. Bourdieu, 21.

within each of the other forms of capital. Therefore, the accumulation of capital is embedded within the voluntary association, generating disparities between in-group and out-group citizens. As previously examined, these in- and out-group forms of social capital are also referred to as bridging and bonding capital. Networks in bridging models of social capital "are better for linkage to external assets and for information distribution," whereas bonding social capital implies an exclusive network that creates a "strong in-group loyalty" and helps members by "getting ahead."[194] By distinguishing between the two forms of social capital in relation to the accumulation, reciprocity, and the dissemination of benefit to the public, bridging and bonding capital illustrate the different ways in which voluntary associations shape the potential for social capital to pervade philanthropic exchanges within local communities. Depending on the specific form of social capital, the accumulation and collective backing of a group can lead to the uneven accumulation of capital by homogeneous and dominant groups.

Tracing the steady growth of volunteer organizations across the United States throughout the first half of the 20th century, Putnam argues that the increase indicated a proliferation of civic engagement through philanthropy. While Putnam's arguments were initially rebuked by economic scholars in his first attempt to bring the connection of social capital and voluntary to the forefront of American culture, the presentation of his hard data convincingly demonstrates that "civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations."[195] In other words, as private individuals come together to form voluntary associations, their influence on the public good is most evident when the group has an integrated web of accumulated social capital, increasingly accumulated and reciprocated in tight-knit groups. The

194. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 22-23.

195. Putnam, 19.

awareness of social plight in urban centers led to the establishment of these initial groups and growth continued to expand alongside the diversity and growth of the citizenry in both urban and rural settings.

A Shift to Financial Capital

The trend of growth of voluntary associations up until the 1960s illustrated an American commitment to civic engagement, but its tie to social capital would soon be replaced by a new reliance on financial capital. When philanthropy was more strongly tied to social and durable networks like voluntary associations, social capital was central to the incentive for civic engagement and the public good. However, when philanthropy moved away from the intimate, structured, and social in-person groupings with the primary motivation of being community-centric, the number of voluntary associations significantly dropped. This major shift in the structure and motivation of voluntary associations in the mid-20th century was the distinct transition from the function of in-person gathering as validation of membership to the use of financial capital as the form with which to exchange into social capital, to a new sense of individualism.

To uncover how the trend between the rise of the voluntary association and social relations pervaded the rise of capital in Los Angeles, Putnam investigated the relationship of social capital among these group formations. By tracing local group records over three decades, Putnam uncovers a "participation revolution" through formal organizations, arguing that membership in these organizations not only illustrates a rise in social capital locally, as well as regionally and nationally, but simultaneously gauges community involvement.[196] As Putnam

196. Putnam, 49.

shares, "One distinctive feature of a social-capital-creating formal organization is that it includes local groups in which members can meet one another."[197] The composition of voluntary associations in Los Angeles, as well as across the United States, thereby becomes an indicator of the creation of social capital through an emphasis on in-person or social exchanges.

Like de Tocqueville, Putnam shows that American philanthropy had an embedded sense of self-interest within the group. The value of the voluntary association was not just for the group's impact within the public sphere, but distinctly that the "dense social ties facilitate gossip and other valuable ways of cultivating reputation."[198] One way to achieve self-interest within the group could embody accumulating social capital so as to use it to amass other forms of capital. As consumerism became an increasing form of individual expression and indicator of status, social capital no longer remained the primary form of capital to accumulate for the individual within the group. Individualization could now be purchased instead of earned.

As dynamics of the workforce and the nuclear family shifted in the mid-20th century, the availability of one's time to participate in-person decreased. Specifically, as less in-person meetings were taking place, membership in voluntary associations diminished due to the reduced opportunity to accumulate social capital.[199] Looking towards the progression of big philanthropy and the recognition of individuals as philanthropic heroes, the network of the group was no longer needed. Recognition no longer focused on the group but instead on the individual through printed items such as honor rolls. Even as individuals sought to uphold their membership of these

197. Putnam, 51.

198. Putnam, 21.

199. Matthew A. Painter and Pamela Paxton, "Checkbooks in the Heartland: Change over Time in Voluntary Association Membership," *Sociological Forum* 29, no. 2 (2014): 408–428.

voluntary associations to benefit from the opportunity to accumulate social capital, financial capital became the primary contributed form.[200] Instead of contributing time to earn social capital from the network, social capital could now be immediately attributed to the self in exchange for a monetary donation with outward and tangible recognition opportunities.

The professionalization of philanthropy also led to the replacement of social capital by financial or economic capital as a tool of power and influence. By the turn of the 20th century, a myriad of associations existed with the same missions and serving the same causes. Professionalization of the field consisted of organizing processes for fundraising across organizations in the third sector as to avoid chaos and confusion for the donor. Instead, marketing to the masses in the mail, on banners, and largely in print media, individuals responded in a timely manner using financial capital that would be entrusted to the organization to use for the public good.[201] These quick transactions eliminated a previously long and time-consuming effort by the public to influence change. The responsibility for change would be passed onto someone else in a simple donation of financial capital. In the professionalization of philanthropy by reaching the masses, financial capital became the most easily exchanged form of capital for the public good.

While financial capital was able to maintain the existence of voluntary associations for a time, as previously mentioned, "social capital is a more powerful predictor of philanthropy than is financial capital."[202] In other words, the dense networks created by voluntary associations

200. Painter and Paxton, 416.

201. Willford Isbell King, *Trends in Philanthropy* (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1928).

202. Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, 120.

served as a better indicator of how likely an individual would participate in philanthropy through the distribution of financial capital. Nevertheless, without social capital to uphold the value of associations, many of the groups disbanded within the simultaneous shifts of individualized and mass philanthropy. In the end, as financial capital became more embedded in voluntary associations, a steep and steady decline of community and American civic engagement occurred through the second half of the 20th century.

Between the Elite and the Masses

As the formation of participation in voluntary associations shifted, the makeup of the groups also changed. Voluntary associations have always been used as tool by various classes, races, and genders, but the records and significance of various contributions to the social sphere have oftentimes ignored the role of the public assembling for the public good. Diverse, minority, community-centric voluntary associations are often highlighted as bright spots within the discourse of grassroots philanthropy, but the most reputable, respected, and recognized associations remain as those who have spread nationally.[203] Most of these national examples are dominated by white males, perhaps even exclusively, such as Athletic Clubs, Union Leagues, or Masonic Lodges. These private associations can be contributory or disruptive, inclusive, or exclusive; they have the ability to benefit both members and the public, but potentially at the cost of exposing philanthropy as an inherently inegalitarian sector.

The voluntary association was constructed as an early network system to connect like-minded individuals into groups through which status within the larger community could be

203. Theda Skocpol, "America's Voluntary Groups Thrive in a National Network." *The Brookings Review* 15, no. 4 (1997): 16–19. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20068644.

controlled.[204] Prior to a legal status of voluntary associations, the Ancient Greek notion of philanthropy notably incorporated elite clubs of wealthy men.[205] As voluntary associations spread across Europe and later into the United States, McCarthy argues that they were "almost exclusively the province of white male elites."[206] At a time when a classical education was an "indispensable credential of elite status," she illustrates that being involved in a voluntary association allowed men to move into the "public sphere of social service and action" to see and be seen outside of his work and family.[207] Maintaining these exclusive spaces for whiteness also supported the idea of a "possessive investment in whiteness."[208] In other words, white male elites did not simply create groups in order to provide services to the underserved or minority populations. Instead, the emergence of voluntary associations was centered around the ability to "rub together minds as well as elbows" in order to create, accumulate, and sustain social capital while upholding the image of working in the interest of the public good.[209] As such, while these associations formed with the ability to serve the common, they focused on distributing and upholding social benefits to their members.

On the other hand, McCarthy also shares that while early philanthropy was dominated mostly by "white male elites," participation by minority groups and women still existed

---

204. McCarthy. *American Creed,* 13.

205. James F. McGlew, "Politics on the Margins: The Athenian 'Hetaireiai' in 415 B.C." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 48, no. 1 (1999): 1–22.

206. McCarthy, *American Creed,* 13.

207. McCarthy, 17.

208. Lipsitz, *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness.*

209. Gamm and Putnam, "The Growth of Voluntary Associations in America," 511.

throughout the colonial, antebellum, and revolutionary eras.[210] Social workers, who at the time were mostly women, had begun to form voluntary associations for the public good in the early 1800s to counter the increasing social ills produced by modernity. McCarthy highlights that minority associations, especially African American mutual aid societies, were simultaneously and successfully forming as a way of "devising institutional mechanisms for channeling communal rage and despair in public, political ways."[211] For example, the post-civil rights era witnessed the formation of extensive membership in black American life to solidify and protect community affairs as a result from long-time involuntary isolation from mainstream American society.[212] These groups helped build social capital for vast members of the community, attempting to build trust within the community space for the public good, while also removing the historical hegemonic distinction of the practice of philanthropy.

In fact, reports on voluntary associations as late as the 1960s in the United States attempted to make sense of the differentiation of black and white participation.[213] While official records showed that white, elite Americans held more positions in volunteer organizations across the United States, a reanalysis of data showed that these organizations were particularly prominent in black America.[214] As highlighted by Babchuk and Thompson, "despite the fact that

---

210. McCarthy, *American Creed,* 13.

211. McCarthy, 120.

212. Michael D. Woodard, "Voluntary Association Membership among Black Americans: The Post-Civil Rights Era," *The Sociological Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1987): 285–301.

213. Nicholas Babchuk and Ralph V. Thompson, "The Voluntary Associations of Negroes," *American Sociological Review* 27, no. 5 (1962): 647–655.

214. Anthony M. Orum, "A Reappraisal of the Social and Political Participation of Negroes." *American Journal of Sociology*. 72, no. 3 (1966): 47.

they are predominantly lower class, Negroes are more inclined to join associations than are white."[215] This confusion and apparent contradiction between class, gender, and racial makeup of voluntary associations highlights the ways in which these groups were a popular, widespread form of gathering individuals into groups to achieve a greater purpose. While elite associations may have sought social capital for purposes of self-interest and grouped by homogenized thought, many community-centric associations sought to further the trust and well-being of the community by grouping individuals based on region instead of demographics.[216]

Nevertheless, social capital through these associations continued to be accumulated unevenly. The use of volunteer networks enhanced social mobilization, but it was only to the extent possible within the other social limitations on gender and race.[217] For example, many of the dominant, homogenous membership groups still pursued ventures that, "rather than seeking fundamental social or political change, enhanced the status quo."[218] The field of philanthropy was growing as a center for revitalization and public welfare, but associations controlled by the elite upheld their social status by the continued uneven accumulation of capital. Minorities and women pioneered some of the most hands-on philanthropy for the public good, but their recognition remained under-legitimized by the financially and politically engaged associations of the elite males who continued to label them as "Other."[219] The establishment of voluntary

---

215. Babchuk and Thompson, "The Voluntary Associations of Negroes," 7.

216. Gergei M. Farkas and Elisabet Lindberg, "Voluntary Associations' Impact on the Composition of Active Members' Social Networks: Not an Either/Or Matter," *Sociological Forum* 30, no. 4 (2015): 1082–1105.

217. McCarthy, *American Creed,* 25.

218. McCarthy, 12.

219. McCarthy, 4.

associations by social work pioneers took place simultaneously with those of business moguls, but the influence of unevenly accumulated capital from business also upheld dominant social values within philanthropy.

Notably, Putnam believes that social capital contributes to allowing "citizens to resolve collective problems more easily," he agrees that there are also negative consequences to the ties of social capital and voluntary associations: "Norms and networks that serve some groups may obstruct others, particularly if the norms are discriminatory or the networks socially segregated." [220] His study of social capital through the formation and dissolution of these groups in the United States uncovers the various ways that political, civic, religious, and philanthropic participation contributes to the uneven accumulation of social capital within the metropolis and in the process of suburbanization. While social capital helps to build community identity and civic engagement, it can also serve to segregate homogeneous people into disparate associations, through which divided communities are formed and upheld.

Building Community in Los Angeles

Contrary to the common perception that these groups were the direct result of "migrations, urbanization, and industrialization," Putnam shows that the growth of voluntary associations at the turn of the 20th century was much more significant in the West than in the East.[221] In the West, however, the new lifestyle was built on pleasure, leisure, and time, encouraging individuals to participate in the betterment of their communities. [222] In a space such as Los Angeles, which was still seen as a town rather than a city even by the turn of the 20th

220. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 288, 358.

221. Putnam, 514.

222. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 72.

century, and more like a "federation of communities coordinated into a metropolis of sunlight and air" than an industrialized metropolis, the benefits and consequences of voluntary associations are nowhere better witnessed.[223] Ultimately, these groups helped to build community, while also consolidating the landscape "into a sociological mosaic—collectively homogenous, but individually heterogeneous," as the citizenry of Los Angeles sought to build a sense of community through civic engagement.[224]

From Fogelson's viewpoint, the role of the voluntary association directs the movement of individuals into, and out of, the city as newcomers came to fit into the socially stratified and fragmented city. He states: "Membership in these organizations defined the newcomer's place in Los Angeles."[225] In a fragmented city that was "bereft of any unifying civic life," the newcomer needed a method through which to connect with neighbors in order to assimilate and form connections.[226] As a direct result, Fogelson argues that the Los Angeles landscape and its citizenry contributed to the ultimate "quest for community."[227] In other words, the citizenry of Los Angeles came together through the formation of volunteer groups. As Fogelson states: "Notwithstanding the newcomer's best intentions, direct entrance into the community was difficult. Fortunately, the small, compact, homogeneous, and like-minded populace facilitated the formation of voluntary associations that tied him to his fellow citizens and helped him cope

223. Fogelson, 163.

224. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 209.

225. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 187.

226. Fogelson, xvii.

227. Fogelson, 2.

with his problems."[228] As people moved to Los Angeles, the voluntary association became an essential tool to integrating into the community and to define one's position in the socially stratified city by partaking in the accumulation of social capital through group membership.

Similar to Fogelson, McWilliams also determines the role of the voluntary association to be tied to the integration of the newcomer: "In a community made up of overwhelmingly outsiders or newcomers, it had the great merit of bringing people together."[229] Noting the complexity of the landscape and the diversity of its peoples, McWilliams refers to Los Angeles as "a collection of suburbs in search of a city," just as individuals in search of community.[230] McWilliams further finds that "because of the sprawling character of the community itself, the residents of Los Angeles are not integrated to their jobs, their neighborhoods, or their social institutions."[231] To find an alternative means to feel a sense of community with others across the divided city, organized membership was a popular method to bring Angelenos together.

On the other hand, Fogelson also notes that voluntary associations contributed to factions within the larger space of Los Angeles. Over time, these groups "integrated the community less effectively in 1930 than in 1885 because they were less relevant to the newcomers."[232] Fogelson argues that this is because the "neighborhood ties" formed through these earlier social groups across the disjointed communities had already been solidified.[233] In other words, the in-group

---

228. Fogelson, 187.

229. McWilliams, *Southern California*, 296.

230. McWilliams, 235.

231. McWilliams, 238.

232. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 192.

233. Fogelson, 195.

members and the lines of social stratification had already been determined through early accumulation of social capital in relation to other individuals or communities within the region. As voluntary associations became outlets for the creation of a sense of community, they also prevented new members from joining once substantial social capital has been obtained within the group. The communities were comfortable with their levels of trust and sense of identity, solidifying the separation of groups across the vast, horizontal landscape.

Lastly, McWilliams examines the complexities of the way in which social and financial capital affected the way in which Los Angeles grew into a fragmented space. Further supporting the idea that Los Angeles's structure and its voluntary associations were more reflective of the rural character of the rest of the United States, McWilliams illustrates that "the strata of people of means was paradoxically more noticeable in rural than in urban communities."[234] Unlike the traditional centralized metropolis, Los Angeles experienced pockets of wealth found across the Los Angeles landscape as opposed to in downtown. McWilliams attributes much of this dispersion of wealth to the fact that Los Angeles is "an artificial region, a product of forced growth and rapid change."[235] As the influx of immigrants swarmed Los Angeles, the newcomers sought to build a city that they fit into, but also that fit them. When individuals moved to Los Angeles and sought out like-minded people and groups, they came together to build new civic and cultural structures that were more familiar to where they came from instead of where they arrived. In other words, as voluntary associations formed to establish new public cultural institutions, the beginning of the erasure of Los Angeles's history and the presence of its ethnic minorities began.

---

234. McWilliams. *Southern California,* 151.

235. McWilliams, 13.

In the fragmented metropolis, voluntary associations can result in bringing communities together, but they also can lead to the further fragmentation. Only through belonging to a group can one access opportunities to accumulate social capital, through the collective backing of the group and other members' associated capital. While voluntary organizations provided a strategic outlet for gathering newcomers together in the early days of migration to Los Angeles, they also reinforced its division in two ways: by separating like-minded groups into disparate and oftentimes segregated communities, and by facilitating the uneven accumulation of social capital across the city. By weaving the analogous and dissimilar voluntary associations from across the fragmented landscape to form an overarching city, Los Angeles became a complex and intricate fabric demarcated by its unique cultural, geographical, social, and political entities, forming the "fragmented metropolis." Not only is Los Angeles fragmented due to the movement of ethnic and immigrant groups in and out of the center of Los Angeles, but also the formation of voluntary associations that helped to solidify it.

Mass Campaigns

Professionalizing the Campaign

As for-profit businesses began to shape society at-large, an identifiable need for a shift in the philosophy and practice of philanthropy arose to redirect the economic, social, and cultural capital that was being unevenly accumulated by those entitled to those profits. First and foremost, "these large-scale philanthropies of a few rich men came at a time when popular revolt and resentment against the abuses of 'the robber barons' was at its height."[236] Public opinion aligned with that of government, resulting in collaborative work in the interest of the public

236. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 35.

good, creating policies against those who held the majority of the wealth.[237] In other words, the prior voiceless masses became more active through progressive reform policies, and public philanthropy became an active field through which to deliver on promises for the public good.

At the outset of the creation of the mass campaign, organizations produced the notion of the professionalized fundraiser to oversee these intensive campaigns. Centralized organizational practices were needed to administer successful large-scale fundraising drives. Fundraisers began to be paid on a commission basis, earning payment based on the amount of funds that they raised.[238] In this way, the organization was never at risk to pay the individual fundraiser in excess of the total funds collected and the fundraiser was simultaneously motivated to raise as much as possible. Nevertheless, as commission percentages and fees increased for campaign professionals to help with fundraising, especially for large-scale campaigns, commission began to be met with resistance from donors. Donors were reluctant to have their dollars go into overhead costs or fees, where "professionals get a 'rake-off' or ten, twenty, or even fifty percent," rather than supporting the mission of the organization. Restrictions on commissions eventually led to fixed salaries so that, especially in the case of six- or seven-figure gifts, the fundraiser would still only receive their pre-allotted salary.[239] After studies conducted by early 20th-century federations showed the efficiency of the fundraiser through cost-savings, the commission-paid solicitor disappeared fully from the philanthropic scene after World War I.[240]

---

237. Carnegie, "The Gospel of Wealth," 6.

238. Cutlip. *Fundraising in the United States,* 16.

239. Cutlip, 95.

240. "1910 Report."

One of the largest challenges to the growing philanthropic sphere was the overwhelming quantity of appeals. Not only did organized fundraising activities result in charitable organizations raising "the greatest amount of money with the least possible expense and effort," philanthropic institutionalization provided new accountability to donors and the community at large. In fact, the initial call for efficiency was demanded by businessmen.[241] The mass campaign methodology thereby became the "live interest of the whole city rather than upon a fifty-fold pressure upon a few."[242] The elite to whom organizations kept returning for much-needed funding were overburdened by the quantity of asks and recommended that organizations reimagine their strategy to ask the public for help in bettering their own communities. The direct result would be a formalized, inclusive model of philanthropy for the first time.

The intensive campaign eliminated excessive solicitations, coordinated of ideas and information, and reduced general costs associated with fundraising.[243] The institutionalized and professionalized practice of philanthropy aimed for the public to become engaged with supporting the community's most critical needs instead of relying on a few wealthy men to determine and fund their needs. Fundraising methodology thereby no longer necessitated the more traditional outreach based on networks of "personal equation," but instead could focus on marketing and other tactics to engage donors on a mass-scale.[244] With proven efficiency and public engagement through personal and mass appeals, new philanthropic methods were

---

241. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 66, 74.

242. Charles Whiting Williams, "Cleveland's Federated Givers," *Review of Reviews* 48 (1913): 472.

243. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 74.

244. William H. Allen, *Modern Philanthropy: A Study of Efficient Appealing and Giving.* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1912), 312.

designed to generate increased fundraising in a shorter period of time. The intensive campaign was the first reiteration of engaging the public in an organized manner, conducted by "trained campaigners" to reduce a perceived waste of funds through a streamlined and accountable process. [245]

The Ward-Pierce Campaign Model

The "whirlwind campaign" was introduced just prior to the turn of the 20th century as an official form of philanthropy, institutionalizing both fundraising and the fundraiser in a condensed methodology for the first time.[246] Prior to the Industrial Revolution, fundraising had been conducted solely by volunteers. However, William H. Allen, the director of the Bureau of Municipal Research and National Training School for Public Service, argued that "reliance on the haphazard personal equation methods of philanthropy would not serve the requirements of an urbanized, industrialized America."[247] More densely populated areas, more individuals on strict and long labor schedules, and an increased need for funds to counterbalance poverty and urban plight meant that organizations needed methods that would ensure the successful collection of funds to accomplish the programs and services in order to fulfill its mission. As more philanthropic agencies emerged in cities across the United States, a push to coordinate efforts led to the development of Federations, centralizing an agency that would oversee and "ensure the wise expenditure of donated funds."[248] Not only did organizations need to establish economical,

245. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 189.

246. Charles Ward, *The Intensive Fundraising Campaign* (New York, Young Men's Christian Association, 1917).

247. Allen, *Modern Philanthropy,* 312.

248. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 69.

streamlined, and efficient methods to collect and distribute funds, but they would need a designated individual to implement and enact these methods.

The first nationally recognized mass campaign was conducted by Charles Sumner Ward for the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) in 1905. Building upon his previous experimentations with an "intensive, organized plan for a short period"[249] proved to be a replicable fundraising model. From Ward's newly invented methods, American philanthropy experienced a period of growth between the years from 1900 to 1908 known as the "Big Change."[250] First, Ward ensured that he had a "large pace-setting gift" to announce as the campaign opened to inspire others to follow suit.[251] As William Lawrence, a fundraising associate of Ward's, stated: "We must first have some large gifts with which to simulate the imagination of all and to give thrust to later action."[252] Ward also introduced "intensive publicity" methods, including the "campaign clock," to advertise the goal, timeframe, and progress of overall fundraising.[253] Most importantly, large newspaper outlets covered campaign donations. The media serve to move the public to participate in the community effort through a sense of urgency and collective action.

---

249. *Voluntary Giving in a Free Land: A History of Ward, Dreshman, and Reinhardt and its Influence on Fundraising in the United States* New York: Ward, Dreshman, & Reinhardt, Incorporated, 1955), 5.

250. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 61.

251. Cutlip, 85.

252. William Lawrence, *Memories of a Happy Life* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1926), 215-216.

253. Charles Ward, *The Intensive Fundraising Campaign*, 3.

Early attempts at developing the mass campaign model proved both successful and challenging. More money was being raised for the consulted institutions, but the notion of what constituted a "community" came into question. In earlier campaign projects with colleges and universities, the fundraising communities targeted by the campaigns were identified as individuals who were tied to the institution rather than a particular geographical concentration or other externality. Carlton Ketchum, a student at the University of Pittsburg working on the newspaper, suggested that Ward reconsider how community-centric philanthropy could be redefined to be more inclusive while still effective.[254] After collaborating on a project with the YMCA under the leadership of Lyman L. Pierce, Ward and Piece heeded this advice and extended appeals to individuals who also had local and causal relations to the campaign.

Refining the campaign's techniques, Ward and Pierce were able to raise $4 million in a two-week period for the Greater New York YMCA-YWCA in 1913. Notably, Ward had installed campaign clocks on Wall Street and on Metropolitan Tower to record daily fundraising counts.[255] When the campaign had reached its goal, the *New York Tribune* ran a front-page headline stating, "Shower of Gold Rings Money Clock."[256] Describing its success, the article highlights the joy that was felt by the "thousand campaign workers," but also by the community, prompting the Mayor to suggest that he may have to enact his authority to close the saloons if the

254. Letter from Carlton Ketchum, September 6, 1961. in "Material for Article on the History and Trends of Fundraising Campaigns for Colleges and Universities," Ketchum Firm Archives.

255. "$4,000,000 Y.M.C.A. Campaign On To-Day." *New York Times* (New York, NY),. November 10, 1913.

256. "Showed of Gold Rings Money Clock." *New York Tribune* (New York, NY), November 27, 1913.

celebrations became disorderly.[257] These large and boisterous celebrations across the city illustrate the dedication and engagement with which the public at large was entrenched in the campaign and saw the success of reaching the fundraising goal as an achievement of the people, identifying with the philanthropic movement, as well as with the community that participated.

This community-wide celebration was driven by Ward's incorporation of the media into his campaign. He believed that "high-pressure publicity" was integral to the process of a successful campaign.[258] For example, Ward applied his tested campaign strategies by ensuring that *The New York Times* also prominently displayed the names of the large benefactors of the campaign on a daily basis, from beginning to end.[259] This method concretely allowed for philanthropic social capital to pervade the media outlets. As Ward explained, "The job of the publicity men was to make sure that the newspapers were supplied with the day-to-day material necessary to keep a campaign on the front page. Headlines, front-page editorials, and cartoons around the city's team spirit."[260] This spirit created through media introduced social capital into mass philanthropy, where the public still connected with impersonal fundraising and felt part of a community, encouraging a bonding mentality through giving, even if only temporarily.

Labeled the "whirlwind collectors," Ward and Pierce became the image of the model of fundraising through quick, emotional, and passionate philanthropy that brought together

257. "Showed of Gold Rings Money Clock."

258. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 45.

259. "Y.M.C.A." *New York Times* (New York, NY)*,* November 10, 1913.

260. C. Howard Hopkins, *History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America* (New York: Association Press, 1951), 596.

communities by engaging the public in a single cause during a limited timeframe.[261] This model of philanthropy solidified the distinguishing factor of the American model from that of earlier and more traditional European models by reaching fundraising from a combination of "persons of means the often-painful lesson of their obligation to support charitable causes and conditioning the public to the high-pressure fund drive which today is commonplace."[262] His dedication to the value of community engagement, as well as continuing to proclaim the same sentiments of Carnegie of the important role of the elite, in the mission for achieving the public good. In the end, "the modern fundraising campaign, carefully organized, shrewdly promoted, and aimed at broad segments of the citizenry, has made American philanthropy a people's philanthropy."[263] Together, Ward and Pierce's efforts shaped a uniquely American, step-by-step methodology to implement large-scale, organized, short-term campaigns, and also brought the public more fully into the sphere of philanthropy through the invention of the mass campaign.

The Contemporary Campaign

The invention of the mass campaign forced philanthropy to become a more professionalized and inclusive practice, leading to the development of new processes, such as gift vehicle illustrations. The most commonly referenced visualization of a population of prospective constituents is the Giving Pyramid. The giving pyramid illustrates the way in which a complex set of potential donors can be divided into targeted vehicles for giving.[264] This

---

261. *Literary Digest,* December 13, 1913.

262. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 87.

263. Cutlip, 3.

264. "Use the Donor Pyramid to Focus Your Attention in the Right Places." *Capital Campaigns Masters,* Accessed August 21, 2021. https://capitalcampaignmasters.com/use-the-donor-pyramid-to-focus-your-attention-in-the-right-places/

hierarchical visualization of giving vehicles highlights both the quantity of gifts donated by type, but also the perceived value of each type of gift by the organization, with major and planned gifts at the top with annual and sporadic gifts at the bottom. The pyramid thereby solidifies that, while there are fewer major and planned giving donors, these are perceived as more valuable and impactful compared to more readily available community-level annual giving.

Another visual variation of the giving pyramid follows in the Gift Range Chart. This visualization of the prospective public illustrates the number of gifts needed across all types of gifts, including lead, major, special, and general gifts.[265] This differs from the giving pyramid because it can be directly applied to the strategy of fundraising for a campaign. Reflective of the visualization of the giving pyramid in regard to the number of gifts, the gift range chart differs in that it highlights that the quantity of funds reverses the direction of the pyramid. Also known as the 80/20 rule, the gift range chart reflects "where it could be expected that 80 percent of the dollars raised during a campaign will come from just 20 percent of the donors."[266] While dollars raised from the general population has the potential to be larger than those gifts at the top of the chart or pyramid due to the sheer quantity of individuals, typically lead, major, and special gifts account for the majority of all campaign giving.

This visualization of giving vehicles is vital to the ways in which social capital and philanthropy are expressed, especially through the community at-large. In fact, the giving pyramid and gift range chart equally represent the value placed upon giving as it directly relates to social capital. In other words, less common gifts—major and planned—require more

265. Aaron Conley, "Capital Campaigns," in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame (Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016), 248.

266. Conley, 247.

investment by the institution but are reciprocated to the donor with more social capital where the extensive recognition for major and planned gifts bestows upon the donor more social capital to the individual from the organization's social network. In the end, if social capital were to be equally accumulated and distributed across all gift types, there would be no need for hierarchical visualizations of giving. For this reason, social capital becomes the determining factor in mass campaign participation, continuing to elevate the participation of the few over that of the masses.

In other words, the original mass campaign model, as produced by Ward and Pierce, "was to change profoundly the nature of social welfare, health, and educational institutions in the United States by making philanthropy a broad public enterprise, not just a hobby of the very rich."[267] Following these methodologies, the mass campaign democratized philanthropy to include the general public in the very programs and services that would come to shape public and private policy of their own communities. Nevertheless, the social capital of the contemporary mass campaign model returns the exchange of capital to the same elite class of individuals of early fundraising methods. While communities participate in mass campaigns for the public good, the elite continue to benefit most prominently through large-scale recognition opportunities and thereby their newly accumulated social capital.

Moreover, emergency campaigns led to even more rapidly accumulated social capital due to the condensed timeframe of the campaigns. Not only are these intensive campaigns conducive to encouraging people to participate, in crises, campaigns are able to add even more "high-pressure" stakes to the accumulation of social capital.[268] In other words, the development of the mass fundraising campaign—especially in crises—led to the rapid accumulation of social and

267. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 26.

268. Lyman L. Pierce, *How to Raise Money* (New York: Harper, 1932), 295.

cultural capital for participating donors, invested in upholding the cultural infrastructure and social stratification that serves their interests through its reproduction.

In transformation of the mass campaign, which served to open philanthropy to the public and then reimposed limits on who would be recognized and rewarded for their participation, Villanueva reiterates that philanthropy needs to reexamine how its roots and its evolution keep leading to perpetuated inequities. His call for "decolonizing wealth in order to heal"[269] requires a return to community-based philanthropy. The mass campaign as it was designed at the turn of the century provided a unique opportunity to fully integrate the public into the practices that shaped the outcomes of philanthropy, facilitating a direct link between those who can speak on behalf of the needs of the community and those who fund it. Today, the mass campaign allows the people who are affected by the outcomes of philanthropy to determine their priorities and needs, instead of designated by those who possess desirable excess capital.

Campaigning in Post-Modern Los Angeles

The evolution of the campaign and the potential reimagination of the involvement of the citizenry similarly occurs within Los Angeles during the 20th century, although in indirect and circuitous ways. During the mid-century, Chandler led a whirlwind campaign for the Hollywood Bowl, followed by a contemporary campaign with hierarchical recognition structures for the Music Center, and then the Los Angeles Public Library hosted a community-centric approach for the Save the Books campaign in 1986. Each of these campaigns, which will be explored in more detail in Chapter 5, uniquely inform the ways in which philanthropy is adapted and successfully functions within the fragmented metropolis. Nevertheless, Los Angeles's decentralized and

269. Villanueva, *Decolonizing Wealth*, 8.

divided landscape importantly contributes to the application and analysis of philanthropy as it evolves into an exceptional yet replicable model for the metropolis of the future.

Unlike modern, industrialized cities that were built on dense and vertical urban structures, Los Angeles's unique post-modern design forces philanthropy to extensively account for the citizenry as an apparatus for the public good, especially as mass campaigns shift towards engaging the community as a heterogenous collective of subjectivities. Los Angeles' combination of "decentralization and recentralization, the peripheralization of the center and the centralization of the periphery" indicates that the city's growth, just as its forms of philanthropy, did not evolve in a linear manner but rather its polymorphous centers were simultaneously composed by the movement of people and social institutions.[270] An agricultural town that converted into a city of over 1,000,000 citizens by 1930, the city's nonconformity to its predecessors requires urban planners and scholars to investigate characteristics that make the city seemingly illegible compared to other traditional centers. As Los Angeles's downtown was growing outward from the business district and Central Park (now referred to as Pershing Square), institutions were built in the far reaches of the vast and open space: branch libraries were constructed to reach the city's fragmented communities and the Hollywood Bowl was built in the naturally acoustic hills several miles north of the closest real estate development. As cultural institutions were dispersed away from the city center, its population mimicked this decentralizing behavior, and vice versa.

Los Angeles's perception as a decentralized dystopia due to its lack of a single and predetermined center permit a logical synthesis only when interpreted through a lens of a

270. Allen J. Scott and Edward W. Soja, *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 131.

multiplicity of centralized spaces. The redevelopment plan known as the Centers Concept had five basic components, including that major centers have a high intensity of development and activity, low-density "suburbs" comprise mainly of single-family residences, open spaces connecting a network of trails, industrial areas distributed throughout the city, and a transportation system for freeways and transit across the "Regional Core."[271] The Concept was designed to emphasize these assorted centers that already existed across Los Angeles and to build rapid transit systems between them, seeking to "restructure the city in order to eliminate or alleviate current problems and anticipate and deal with future issues before they become serious problems."[272] The Centers Concept attracted the attention of officials and citizens alike because it was the first urban design that took into consideration its post-modern sensibilities, unlike the City Beautiful Movement.[273] Developed during the 1890s, this movement was a reform philosophy of North American architecture and urban planning to introduce an element of beautification in cities, as well as to create moral and civic virtue among urban populations, towards a "harmonious social order."[274] In 1930, the Olmsted-Bartholomew plan for the Los

271. *"*Concept Los Angeles: The Concept for the Los Angeles General Plan." (Los Angeles: Department of City Planning, 1970).

272. *"*Concept Los Angeles," 1.

273. William H. Wilson, *The City Beautiful Movement: Creating the North American Landscape* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994).

274. Daniel M. Bluestone, "Detroit's City Beautiful and the Problem of Commerce," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 47, no. 3 (1988): 245–262.

Angeles region, "Parks, Playgrounds, and Beaches," was developed; however, it was never implemented because of competing public and private interests in the city's development.[275]

Greg Hise and William Deverell's *Eden by Design* highlights the challenges between "private power and public space," where even with a large media presence, the support of the Chamber of Commerce, and the voting public, real estate investors and private organizations ensured that it was "dropped from sight and no action was taken on its proposals."[276] Although masterplans for cultural institutions were developed and implemented over the next several decades, the Olmsted-Bartholomew Plan is one of the most significant forgotten public-private histories of Los Angeles, and the next time a full-scale plan for reimagining the city wouldn't emerge until 1970, with the Centers Concept. The urgency required to mobilize the plan was ignored. Just as philanthropy in Los Angeles had to adapt to its preexisting fragmented physical and social landscapes, these intellectual design plans could not be imposed upon the shifting populations of the city, leaving Los Angeles as a perceptually fragmented, post-modern anomaly.

Moreover, the lack of a unifying identity has not only affected or been affected by the city's design and attempted re-designs, but also by the attempts by the shifting populations, the media, and Hollywood to create a tangible image of the utopic, dreamland city promised to outsiders. Through the creation and recreation of utopias, the city has undergone a "cultural whitewashing" of the city's past social and physical identities.[277] As certain spaces in the city are

---

275. Olmsted Brothers and Harland Bartholomew & Associates, "Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches for the Los Angeles Region," Citizen's Committee on Parks, Playgrounds, and Beaches (1930).

276. Greg Hise and William Deverell, *Eden by Design: The 1930 Olmsted-Bartholomew Plan for the Los Angeles Region* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 55.

277. William Deverell, *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of its Mexican Past* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004), 251.

memorialized, reimagined, or reappropriated, such as Bunker Hill[278] or La Plaza,[279] the diversity that Los Angeles currently postulates as its strength is precisely the image that it endeavored to obliterate during its attempts to create an image for the future of the city, selling cultural capital and "elevating intellectualism to a lifestyle."[280] By moving away from its sunshine and towards its fertile cultural soil, to discredit arguments that Los Angeles has, compared to other major cities, significant "cultural deficiencies," similarly mimicked by its lack of philanthropy.[281] In other words, Los Angeles's mortal quality of its cultures, institutions, and architectures, represented by different period, places, and people, producing a challenging task to immobilize the city and the citizenry for a long-lasting analysis.

Attempts at creating a cohesive community identity by creating utopic portrayals of the city, while simultaneously working to erase the diverse citizenry, highlights Los Angeles' "cultural confusion" throughout its development.[282] Yet, the mass campaign method allows for these shifting populations and, in fact, supports the idea of ongoing change. Los Angeles's distinct role in philanthropy as a post-modern city, especially as it relates to the mass campaign, is due to the shifting perception of the public. It is not just the city's diversity of people and places that allows for the reimagination of the mass campaign, but rather its post-modern identity

278. "Bunker Hill Urban Renewal Project," University of Southern California Archives, 1959.

279. William David Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza: Sacred and Contested Space* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008).

280. Davis, *The City of Quartz,* 17.

281. Margaret Leslie Davis, *The Culture Broker: Franklin D. Murphy and the Transformation of Los Angeles* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007), 36.

282. McWilliams, *Southern California,* 357.

that allows for its citizenry to be identified as an active set of singularities as opposed to the passive and omnipresent, yet cultural dopes.[283] As opposed to the modern metropolis, the perception of the masses within the post-modern metropolis becomes more individualized, where the mass is no longer representative of a singular identity shared by all, but a set of identities that come to form a common. Instead of interpreting the masses as Horkeimer and Adorno who saw them as "deceived," "consumers," and "objects," the formation of the citizenry accounts for the variety built into the Los Angeles public as they relate to their distinct communities, identities, and their active participation in philanthropy.[284] This notable evolution of the masses indicates the need for the mass campaign model to adapt to the public of Los Angeles to best serve its citizenry by rethinking what community means and who is included.

The public's role in the power of philanthropy to enhance the public good through the direct participation of that same public must recognize its place within the imagined community. Benedict Anderson, political scientist and historian, defines the concept of the "imagined community" as a socially constructed community, imagined by the people who perceive themselves as part of that group.[285] The mass campaign provides the framework for philanthropy to communicate the existence of micro-communities within the larger metropolis or region, grouping together individuals who identify with similarly motivated or like-minded people for the common good. In fact, this method most successfully creates an imagined community

---

283. Stuart Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the Popular (1981)," in *Cultural Theory: An Anthology, e*ds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

284. Max Horkeimer and Theodor Adorno, "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception (1944)," in *Cultural Theory: An Anthology,* eds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011).

285. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006), 6-7.

because the donors never meet each other but all participate through the exchange of capital for the same cause. In a voluntary association, the group's members may interact, but the mass campaign assumes the creation of an imaginary community to mobilize philanthropic support. In other words, philanthropy is built on the foundation of the concept of the imagined community.

Los Angeles's multiple centers and its distinct and disparate cultural and community identities allows for the mass campaign to be reimagined as an apparatus for the public good that may be replicated across other major metropoles, especially as the region, nation, and world become more integrated and diverse through population migration. As Donna Bojarsky, founder of the civic initiative, "Future of Cities: Leading in L.A." stated: "We are a trendsetting city, and we look much more like what cities of the future are going to look like. We have the diversity of the economy, the diversity of the people."[286] Los Angeles is currently marked as an exceptional city, and its philanthropic foundations provide critical insight into the potential of the power of the imagined community that may be mobilized through the mass campaign. The future of philanthropy in Los Angeles should be reimagined to revisit the whirlwind campaign as an inclusive methodology for the citizenry in philanthropy, more broadly examining what "community" can entail for a campaign ask, resulting in the public good for Angelenos at large.

Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, philanthropy is constructed of a myriad of layers that inform and influence each other, at times linearly, and at others, simultaneously or retrospectively. By highlighting the transformation and evolution of philanthropy over time through its most identifiable forms of big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns, this chapter

286. Arango and Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart."

illustrates how philanthropy can be used as both an inclusionary and exclusionary tool. Too often, "our national myths often exaggerate the role of individual heroes and understate the importance of the collective effort."[287] While much of the discourse and ideology of philanthropy relies of the critique of big philanthropy both historically and contemporaneously, all forms of philanthropy and the ways in which they inhibit or encourage collective collaboration need to be fully examined to understand the role of philanthropy in serving the public good.

American philanthropy was established within the basis of democracy and the common good, but historical moment and social movements shaped the ways in which people were able or motivated to participate. the Industrial Revolution's shaping of big philanthropy changed the role of excess capital and the influence of the individual upon the public. The voluntary association serves as a unique way for individuals to come together around particular causes and interests to build better communities, but still exists as an exclusionary practice by rewarding only in-group members through an exchange of capital for participation. Lastly, the mass campaign provides a distinct tool to include the public in directing positive outcomes for community organizations and institutions. Nevertheless, the mass campaign has continued to evolve over the last century to become ever-more exclusionary and hierarchical, upholding the social stratification of philanthropy through recognition of individuals instead of the community participants at large. Although philanthropy in the United States was embedded as a democratic way of life, the establishment and dissolution of its forms determine how cities activate the social consciousness of its citizenry for the public good.[288]

---

287. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 24.

288. Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2011).

This chapter also shows how each form of philanthropy can contribute to serving the public good. First, big philanthropy needs to be considered more broadly by examining the variation of individuals who give, individuals who lead, and individuals who facilitate the exchanges for those who have excess capital. Second, while voluntary associations can serve as exclusionary forms of power and influence, they can also bring together like-minded individuals from various communities. In Los Angeles, voluntary associations uniquely assisted in forming strong bonds between neighbors as they moved into the region from various to begin to build a unifying and civic identity. Lastly, mass campaigns can serve to uphold cultural reproduction, but can also provide a voice for the citizenry to actively participate in the public good. While participation in philanthropy requires excess capital and is guided by establishing and upholding the cultural institutions that support current cultural and social values, they also allow the public to have power in coming together to shape the future of the community for all.

Each layer has affected the past, is determining the present, and will influence the future of philanthropy. When these disparate forms come together for the function of serving the public good, unique instances of philanthropy can occur. Part II of this dissertation thereby illustrates case studies of big philanthropy, voluntary associations, and mass campaigns as they uniquely occurred in Los Angeles and how they directly adapted and contributed to the exceptionally fragmented formation of the city over time. Most importantly, in a time propelled by inequities and conversations guided by race, an increasing reliance on our cultural institutions to solve these deep social and cultural issues requires enhanced community engagement through philanthropy to fund these civic activities. Therefore, Part II of dissertation explicitly addresses how each form takes shape within Los Angeles to expand upon the understanding of past philanthropy as a framework through which to reimagine its potential for the future.

PART II

CHAPTER 3

The City of Angels

> Let's face it. Important money is raised by important people asking other important people for important amounts…You need very, very big gifts from very few people.
> – Dorothy Chandler[289]

The practice of philanthropy sets specific standards for modeling hierarchies of philanthropic gift vehicles with gift tables, pyramids, and other strategic asks, yet it can also be reduced to the need for very few, large gifts. Dorothy Chandler affirmed this view in 1964 in the comment quoted above. Instead of identifying fundraising as a highly technical practice, big philanthropy simply describes the cultivation and solicitation of wealthy individuals. Not only is big philanthropy central to the overarching framework of fundraising, but it also highlights a level of importance afforded upon it over the other forms. Big philanthropy is thereby oftentimes identified as the dominant pillar of successful philanthropy, neglecting the possibility for consequential philanthropic influence by groups and the public. For example, when Eli Broad passed in 2021, the media celebrated his wealth and philanthropy across vast regions and sectors, noting that, "He has more pull than the mayor, more art than the Getty, and more money than God. Does Eli Broad own LA?"[290] Within the perception that big philanthropy supports the public good in exceptional ways, this form focuses on just a few key individuals as inimitable players within the philanthropic field.

---

289. "The City: Brightness in the Air," *TIME*, December 18, 1964.

290. Elaine Woo, "Eli Broad, Billionaire Who Poured Wealth into Shaping L.A., dies at 87," *Los Angeles Times,* April 30, 2021.

Los Angeles has a reputation for a lack of philanthropy, both historically and currently. As previously reported, Arango and Nagourney suggest that Los Angeles' lack of civic institutions stems from it being "a relatively young city, filled with recent arrivals who do not have the history of the kind of old-line families who have defined civic foundations in established cities like Boston and Philadelphia."[291] While traditional models of philanthropy on the East Coast were tied to family legacies, many of the families living in Los Angeles tied their wealth and heritage more to where they had previously lived as opposed to Los Angeles, the city to which they had moved.[292] As Fogelson illustrates, Los Angeles lacked any of the big philanthropists like those found in the East: "The majority of its wealthy citizens had come to Southern California to retire and had little in the way of family history to tie them to the region."[293] While these interpretations can be substantiated through recent philanthropy, such as "The 25 Most Philanthropic Billionaires" list by Forbes, perception of the lack of philanthropy in Los Angeles's philanthropy is due to the city's resistance to traditional models.[294] Whereas the East Coast metropolis design requires a centralized structure for its populace, business, and cultural spheres, the new and disruptive model labeled as West Coast philanthropy focuses on technology and new money. West Coast philanthropy is more closely associated with Silicon

---

291. Arango and Nagourney. "A Paper Tears Apart.".

292. Kenneth A. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library: Building an Architectural Icon, 1872-1933* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2016), 22.

293. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930* (Berkeley: University of California, 1967), 68.

294. Angel Au-Yeung, et. al, "America's Top Givers: The 25 Most Philanthropic Billionaires," *Forbes*, Jan 19, 2021, Accessed July 31, 2021. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeswealthteam/2021/01/19/americas-top-givers-the-25-most-philanthropic-billionaires/?sh=60b9e89d1f59

Valley, due to the increase of technology entrepreneurs and new wealth.[295] Neither of these interpretations effectively incorporate a post-modern, decentralized city like Los Angeles.

Contrary to the belief that Los Angeles is devoid of any significant cultural philanthropy, philanthropic "angels" have aptly provided the foundations for the growth of cultural institutions across the city. The term "angels" is being used here to describe the support provided to organizations by an individual donor. Angel investors became a popular term in the 1990s regarding start-ups but has recently been applied to funders and the interaction with philanthropy.[296] Even in the fragmented metropolis, big philanthropy jumpstarted some of Los Angeles's cultural endeavors and to support its most needed institutions, contributing to the long-term cultural growth of the city. Big philanthropy in Los Angeles permeates the social fabric of the urban environment through named plaques, programs, and physical and virtual spaces across nonprofit institutions. These recognition strategies, or, as Carol Duncan refers to them, "donor memorials," act as visible commemorations of the influence of individuals who have made significant contributions to enhancing these institutions, or the causes which match their value systems.[297]

---

295. Alessandra Stanley, "Silicon Valley's New Philanthropy," *New York Times* (New York, NY)*,* October 31, 2015.

296. "Using Venture Philanthropy: Angel Funding for Nonprofits." *University of Notre Dame,* October 13, 2020.

297. Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 72-101.

Even though donors will self-report that they donate because it is a moral obligation and truly selfless act, social pressure accounts for the major of cases of charitable giving.[298] Self-reporting is a form of questionnaire response that relies on the individual to be subjective with regard to their actions, often resulting in inflated moral and ethical views of one's own behavior to align with social desirability in a lab setting.[299] Most importantly, many donors explain their participation in philanthropy through their desire for "enhancing one's social connections."[300] These social connections are directly tied to recognition for participation in philanthropy, from experiencing social pressure as expressed by economists DellaVigna, List, and Malmendier, to psychologist James' finding of individuals donating within the framework of social desirability bias. These quantitative and qualitative studies enhance Bourdieu's theoretical application of the desirability of the accumulation of social capital. Therefore, even with the lack of current scholarship on the explicit link of social capital to the act of donating, many fields of study offer concrete data that recognition serves as one of the leading factors in philanthropic participation due to its direct connection to dense social networks.

Though motivations for big philanthropy are varied, the interpretation of its outcomes remain controversial. Its consequences serve to change the course of scientific research or the plans of arts institutions, but the values and needs of the public are not always reflected in the

298. Stefano DellaVigna, John A. List, and Ulrike Malmendier, "Testing for Altruism and Social Pressure in Charitable Giving," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127, no. 1 (2012): 27-34.

299. Zoe Lee and Lucy Woodliffe, "Donor Misreporting: Conceptualizing Social Desirability Bias in Giving Surveys," *Voluntas* 21, no. 27 (2010): 569-587.

300. Santi, *The Giving Way to Happiness*, 21.

ways in which these outcomes are achieved. As Anand Giridharadas, author of *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World,* states:

> There's no denying that today's elite may be among the more socially concerned elites in history. But it is also, by the cold logic of numbers, among the most predatory in history. By refusing to risk its way of life, by rejecting the idea that the powerful might have to sacrifice for the common good, it clings to a set of social arrangements that allow it to monopolize progress and then give scraps to the forsaken—many of whom wouldn't need the scraps if the society were working right.[301]

Most controversies involving big philanthropy are related to large donations made by wealthy moguls who have amassed wealth through for-profit strategies, surplus labor, and the exploitation of the masses. In return, these same elite reinvest their surplus capital into the community from which it was extracted. This is returned based on the donor's personal values and goals, deemed to be in the interest of the public good. While big philanthropy could positively shape the public good, some of the biggest fortunes ever created in America are being converted into power and influence through philanthropy.[302] This fear of power and influence requires a new awareness of the various strategies enacted by individuals to uncover the role of big philanthropy on the reproduction of social relations and the growth of cultural and civic engagement, especially as it relates to post-modern Los Angeles.

Similarly, David Callahan, author of *The Givers: Wealth, Power, and Philanthropy in a New Gilded* Age, argues that any class of donors who seek to use private wealth to shape public life is disconcerting, "but what's especially troubling at this moment in American life are the divergent trajectories of the wealthy and the general public when it comes to a sense of civic

---

301. Giridharadas, *Winners Take All,* 117.

302. Giridharadas, 7.

efficacy."[303] These perspectives on what constitutes the public good and who gets to decide what that vision encompasses is central to the intertwined theories of social and cultural reproduction: "culture owes its existence to the social conditions of which it is the product and its intelligibility to the coherence and functions of the structure of the signifying relations which constitute it."[304] These reproductive forces are based in the relations of power through the accumulation and distribution of economic capital. In turn, the use of surplus economic capital to participate in philanthropy directly enables individuals to acquire social capital through their benevolence, upholding the perceived naturalization of the way things have always been.[305]

As previously explored, big philanthropy is a field that has garnered vast critiques on its controversial consolidation of funds to manipulate public initiatives. Therefore, to avoid being "quick to pass judgement on [individuals] that do good when they reap financial benefits in doing so," this chapter studies three cases of individuals who have participated in an exemplary method of the exchange of capital through philanthropy in Los Angeles.[306] Each case study examines the ways in which big philanthropy conducted by a distinct individual established and contributed to the growth of Los Angeles's civic institutions. The theoretical and practical tensions in the perception of philanthropy between its role in serving the public good and self-centered motivations provides the framework for these discussions. In the end, these investigations are necessary to uncover the embedded role of big philanthropy in shaping the

303. Callahan, *The Givers,* 59.

304. Bourdieu and Passeron, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1990), 9.

305. Bourdieu and Passeron, 9.

306. Santi, *The Giving Way to Happiness,* xvi.

physical, social, and cultural spheres of Los Angeles without limiting their histories to the superficial manipulations of capital in the betterment of self and ignoring the positive or negative motivations and consequences on the public good.

Unlike the histories of famous individual Los Angeles philanthropists such as J. Paul Getty and Norton Simon, the following case studies specifically address donors who did not distribute their philanthropy primarily through their estates. Many big philanthropists build their legacies through institutions that serve the public after their lifetimes so that they accumulate surplus capital and enjoy the fruits of their labor without discomfort, imbuing what remains after their death to the public in exchange for the promise of an eternal legacy. However, the individuals studied here used their accumulated economic, social, and cultural capital during their lifetimes to immediately activate philanthropy for the public good. Moreover, each of these individual philanthropists implemented distinctive strategies to mobilize their capital and have become recognized as essential philanthropists of their time.

First, Andrew M. Carnegie, while considered a founding father of philanthropy, is little recognized for his work that was particularly informed by, and contributed to, the fragmented communities of Los Angeles. Surprisingly, Dorothy Buffum Chandler, albeit a namesake in Los Angeles, is also understudied for the depth of her contributions to building social capital between physically and socially distinct classes. Lastly, Franklin D. Murphy served most of his time contributing to the growth of philanthropy in Los Angeles from behind the scenes, even as a prominently employed figure in the city. Together, the following case studies are the stories of how big philanthropy in Los Angeles uniquely set the foundation for the growth of cultural institutions in the city, and how individuals carved out philanthropic spaces by enacting various strategies labeled as Pathbreaker, The First Lady of Culture, and Culture Broker, respectively.

Studying these three figures will shift the portrait of Los Angeles as devoid of big philanthropy unconcerned with changing and leaving an imprint on the city. These three individuals demonstrate that big philanthropy has always been central to the development of Los Angeles. It is not a lack of big philanthropy that has contributed to the perception that Los Angeles is absent of civic engagement, but rather its illegible, decentralized, post-modern model of philanthropy that makes it unique.

Andrew W. Carnegie: The Pathbreaker

Carnegie's publication of *The Gospel of Wealth* shaped modern giving by introducing the concept of using big philanthropy to impact the public good during one's lifetime instead of through one's estate, as well as by expanding his generosity beyond his immediate community. A recent exhibition curated by Gino Francesconi at the Rose Museum at Carnegie Hall bestowed the title "Pathbreaker" upon Carnegie for his remarkable shift in the philosophy on philanthropy, allowing for increased access to free, public information through a focus on establishing public libraries.[307] Many of the libraries at the time not only displayed the family name but were specifically "dedicated as memorials to a recently deceased relative."[308] As the tradition of legacy giving continued, individuals with origins on the East Coast subscribed to those ideals, leaving Los Angeles with a significant gap in reinvestment for cultural and civic creation in the local community, both in regard to current and estate giving. By the time of his death, Carnegie

307. "Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy."

308. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 22.

had established 2811 public libraries across the United States, for which he was celebrated during both his life and after his death.[309]

In Los Angeles, Carnegie's contributions to build public libraries was not exceptional, as he had also supplied the needed funds to over 1,000 other towns. Nevertheless, the vast geographic region covered by Los Angeles accounted for one of the most supported cities by Carnegie's library philanthropy with over 6 branch libraries constructed.[310] Most importantly, through his direct refusal to fund the much-desired central library and instead only establishing branch libraries, Carnegie showed that he recognized the city's distinct qualities as a fragmented metropolis.[311] In fact, he not only recognized the decentralized construction of the City, but also further contributed to it by building libraries in disparate communities, serving each one independently. While Carnegie's name is recognizable worldwide for his big philanthropy, his role in shaping civic and cultural development in Los Angeles is understudied and under-credited.

In the early years of developing the public library system in Los Angeles, the city did not have the financial capacity to create branch libraries in their entirety. Moreover, government officials discussed that building a public library system, with a namesake central library, would require a viable donor to construct the system as envisioned.[312] In the last quarter of the 19th

309. "City Library, One of 2811 Memorials to Carnegie, Will Observe Anniversary," *Oklahoma News* (Oklahoma City, OK), October 24, 1935.

310. Annie Murphy, "Helping Everyone to Help Themselves: Andrew Carnegie and Libraries," *Los Angeles Public Library,* January 28, 2020.

311. "Laird of Skibo Won't Yield." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* May 5, 1910.

312. "Wanted: A Public Library Building," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* Jan 14, 1901.

century, individual philanthropy had set the precedent for creating new libraries. By this time "more than two hundred public library buildings…had been erected in the United States with private gifts or bequests financed by local philanthropists."[313] Unfortunately, as previously mentioned, even wealthy citizens in Los Angeles who were "willing, or felt compelled, to give back to the communities" did not keep their amassed wealth within the city's boundaries, but instead contributed philanthropically to the regions from which they originally came.[314] Thereby, the increase in popularity of a library in Los Angeles, paired with an increasing population and lack of funding, meant that current library space was becoming insufficient, with no local philanthropists indicating an intent to provide the funding needed for a library in Los Angeles.

Following boosterism ideologies, city leaders and real estate barons had developed a utopic narrative promising "beautiful weather, cheap land, and plentiful jobs."[315] Encouraging newcomers to move to Los Angeles sought to bring additional wealth to the area to support the city's civic endeavors from within.[316] An exceptional city, the public and politicians alike believed that Angelenos needed to create a new, independent, and exceptional civic identity, but by replicating institutional cultural models. City officials continued to search for a benefactor to fund the creation of a monumental central library. Those who valued the growth of Los Angeles into a modern metropolis also desired to develop dense social networks to enhance philanthropy within the city, so as to avoid requesting funds from individuals outside of it. According to Kevin

313. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 22.

314. Breisch, 22.

315. Hadley Meares, "Sunkist Skies of Glory: How City Leaders and Real Estate Barons Used Sunshine and Oranges to Sell Los Angeles," *Curbed Los Angeles,* May 24, 2018.

316. "Los Angeles! You Need a Library," *Los Angeles Record* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* June 4, 1921.

Starr, the citizenry of turn-of-the-century Los Angeles was dedicated to yet trapped in the invention of the California dream with the disenchantment of a growing urban environment in an increasingly global world. The public library system with a central monument to the City's growth would serve as a symbol to the rest of the United States that Los Angeles had reached a new stage in her maturity as a regional, national, and global player.[317]

Los Angeles's identity as an exceptional, self-sufficient citizenry was under threat given the lack of interest of locals in supporting civic causes. The print media became a centralized tool to press the narrative that local business moguls and oil magnates needed to support the city in which they lived for the public good. In 1900, the *Los Angeles Times* specifically addressed "recently-created oil barons," stating that if no one came forward from within the community, the city might be required to reach out to "Mr. Carnegie to do as much for the City of Angels as he has done for San Diego and a score of other American cities."[318] The social shame of needing the assistance of a non-local philanthropist led to an internal conflict between city councilmen, the media, librarians, and the public about what would serve the public good of the city, with issues of pride seemingly dominating any exploration of the subject:

> It is not certain that Mr. Carnegie would give us this money, and then again, there are some who think we should be too proud to accept it. It certainly does seem as if a rich and rapidly-growing city like Los Angeles should contain enough public-spirited citizens who would be willing to chip in and immortalize themselves by putting up a handsome library building, but so far they have not materialized.[319]

---

317. Kevin Starr, *Material Dreams: Southern California Through the 1920s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 336.

318. "Public Libraries in America," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), June 11, 1900.

319. "The Los Angeles Library," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), February 16, 1902.

A combination of fear of being rejected after so many years of debate and the determination that a local supporter would emerge led government officials to avoid considering an offer from Carnegie for another ten years.[320] The extent of the populace's entrepreneurship and wealth was used as a tool in the media to shame its citizens for failing to come forward with support, resulting in the need to ask outsiders: "It would, however…not be 'dignified' for a wealthy and enterprising city like Los Angeles to go a-begging to an eastern capitalist for a public building."[321] These words sought to enforce a stature to the young and different city. In additional, the tension of financial and social capital between East and West coasts featured a prominent note: "It should not take our enterprising citizens long to find a means of filling the long-felt want without having recourse to the eastern multi-millionaire iron baron."[322] Over the next several years, government officials sent repeated proposals to Carnegie asking for a library building. After multiple requests, "since Andrew Carnegie began the lavish distribution of his immense fortune in library donations, these same boards have hoped that the lightning might strike Los Angeles."[323] Even with wealth within its boundaries, Angelenos could not be convinced to donate.

Together, these published articles illuminate the ways in which Angelenos struggled to define themselves while constantly being defined by others. The people of Los Angeles sought to

320. "City Council Minutes," City Council Minutes Archived Digital Vault, February 14, 1911. http://clkrep.lacity.org/oldcfidocs/

321. "Wanted, a Library Building," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), March 4, 1900.

322. "Wanted, a Library Building."

323. "Will Carnegie Give us a Library?" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 26, 1902.

build social capital and civic institutions through creating new, dense networks by building trust or in-group loyalty that would convince a leading benefactor who lived in the city to finally support it. The lack of existing philanthropy and social capital in the new, growing, and fragmented city was unable to persuade individuals to makes any contributions, even with the promise of a naming opportunity for the central library building. Fogelson's work suggests that social capital in Los Angeles at this time was insufficient to solidify strong enough ties to persuade a local of their connection to the City's populace to provide for the growth of its civic duties. Following a lack of local interest, Carnegie was asked again:

> The Mayor wants Carnegie to give $1 for each person…to build a fine central library building in Central Park…Carnegie prefers to limit his patronage to branch libraries. He not only prefers this, but has indicated that this is what he will do for Los Angeles. But it is the judgment of the Mayor and the Library Board that the branch service on the scale now maintained, even if enriched by Carnegie's generosity, would delay if not defeat the creation of a great central library.[324]

Carnegie continued to claim he was only interested in providing funding for branches so that "other poor boys might receive opportunities similar to those for which we were indebted to the noble man," but Los Angeles maintained its focus on the prospect of a grandiose central library.[325] In response to the mayor's constant adjustments to his philanthropic goals, Carnegie simply replied that he "does not see his way to consider the subject of a Central Library Building."[326] Instead of following the model of the typical industrial city's library system,

---

324. "Laird of Skibo Won't Yield," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 5, 1910.

325. Andrew Carnegie, "The Best Fields for Philanthropy," *North American Review* 149, no. 397 (1889): 688-691.

326. "City Council Minutes," City Council Minutes Archived Digital Vault, February 14, 1911. http://clkrep.lacity.org/oldcfidocs/

Carnegie argued that funding a central library in Los Angeles would be futile in such a large metropolis.[327]

Though the Mayor is recorded in the *New York Times* in 1911 that "the situation is peculiar here," specifically referencing the Los Angeles landscape, he failed to acknowledge the faults of a central library in a decentralized city.[328] The public library as a civic institution was still vital to the growing population of Los Angeles, but its role as a centralized, civic network would seemingly have to adapt to the exceptional needs of the landscape of the community. As a fragmented metropolis, the branches provided unrestricted access through locations built "close to the homes of the working people."[329] As the Mayor gave into his unwavering stance, Carnegie agreed that "he would be glad to…cover the cost of six Library Buildings,"[330] with a private donation of $210,000. Just as Carnegie requested from every city, the City of Los Angeles had to submit a letter of interest to explain the need, as well as to commit to fund 10% of the costs for maintenance of the building and upkeep of the collection.1 After over more a decade since the city first contemplated asking Carnegie at the turn-of-the-century, his offer was accepted. Carnegie and the city proceeded to work together, "with careful consideration of the maintenance of proportionate distances between them, of the meeting of community needs created by the branches previously in existence, and of the extension of library facilities to sections of the city

327. "Accepts Carnegie Offer," *New York Times* (New York, NY), February 12, 1911.

328. ""City Council Minutes," County of Los Angeles Archived Digital Vault, February 14, 1911.

329. "Bertram to Alexander," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1924.

330. "City Council Minutes."

which had not hitherto been supplied."[331] For the first time since the transfer of the Los Angeles Public Library to the City of Los Angeles and the private Los Angeles Library Association was dismantled, a private philanthropic donation had supported the growth of the system for the public good.

Even after the gift was accepted, however, a sense of shame for having to accept funds from individuals who lived outside of Los Angeles continued to pervade local discussion and media coverage. Even in Carnegie's death, Los Angeles struggled to recognize his contributions to the city with the same pride as other cities. Albeit a mention that there would be a centenary "Carnegie Birthday"[332] in the *Herald Express*, that would be celebrated in Los Angeles as well as around the world, only a single photograph appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* of Mrs. Andrew Carnegie, after the week-long celebration had ended, in the section "Behind the Headlines."[333] Councilman McKenzie "…could not see why the city should accept gifts from Carnegie that had a string to them, and he declared that Los Angeles was rich enough to go ahead and build the libraries herself…without putting herself under obligations to the charity of an ostentatiously rich man."[334] Nevertheless, Carnegie provided the foundations for a return to private philanthropy for the public library system, also inspiring several other initiatives for social and cultural growth,

---

331. "Andrew Carnegie Makes Offer for Library Buildings Here." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), February 11, 1911; "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920: How the Library was Established—How it has Grown—What it is Doing To-day for Greater Los Angeles—Why it Should have Central Building," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1920, 5.

332. "Fete Carnegie Birthday; Cite Benefactions in L.A.," *Herald Express* (Los Angeles, CA), November 25, 1935.

333. "Behind the Headlines," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), December 1, 1935.

334. "Carnegie Gifts Find Opposition," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), April 16, 1912.

including the development of Exposition Park.[335] By providing the branches for the system, Los Angeles was able to focus on funding a Central Library through public funding. Serving the entire community of Los Angeles, both in the center of the city and in the growing neighborhoods through its branches, the Los Angeles Public Library grew as a unique combination of public funding and private philanthropy. The lack of local private funding available to support civic causes formalized the need for more dense social networks to link the residents of Los Angeles to an Angeleno identity.[336]

Carnegie's title as Pathbreaker appropriately indicates his lifetime of achievements in shaping lifetime philanthropy through libraries across the English-speaking world, but also for paving the way for public-facing philanthropy across a disjointed Los Angeles. His lifetime giving allowed him to be remembered as a friend "with a fair share of vanity offset by generosity," instead of trying to reestablish his reputation through his legacy giving.[337] The naming of each of Carnegie's branch libraries serves as a memorial to his big philanthropy, although his participation in supporting the growth and expansion is widely unrecognized in Los Angeles due to the void of pride in asking an outsider to support the city's civic growth. Furthermore, Carnegie's investment in the development of civic and culture in Los Angeles spurred a new investment in an Angelenos identity that would contribute to increasing social capital within its communities, leading it trust, civic engagement, and philanthropy to support its future growth. As such, examining Carnegie's philanthropic engagement in the development

335. Suzanne Muchnic, *LACMA So Far: Portrait of a Museum in the Making* (San Marino: Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, 2015), 9.

336. "Los Angeles! You Need a Library."

337. Joseph B. Gilder, "The Carnegie Who His Friends Knew," *The Sun* (London, UK), August 17, 1919.

civic engagement in Los Angeles, as well as his accumulation of social capital through his namesake memorials, unveils a philanthropy designed for both self and other.

Carnegie broke away from his dense network of East Coast social capital that reached far beyond his own community to share in the growth of cultural capital in assorted cities. By extending to other parts of the country, Carnegie did not search to uphold the reproduction of culture within his own city, but to spread cultural capital to the masses across the nation. By establishing libraries in a multitude of cities through philanthropy, Carnegie was able to amass significant social capital from cities across the English-speaking world. Moreover, by giving to the endeavor during his lifetime, he was able to be recognized for his achievements both in life, as well as after death. As a result, Carnegie provided the catalyst for the growth of the largest library system in the United States with six new branches. By thinking beyond the replication of the production of a named central library as in modern, industrial cities, Carnegie broke the traditional pathways created by traditional philanthropy and provided the citizenry of Los Angeles with libraires in each of their distinct communities instead of centrally immortalizing his name.

Dorothy B. Chandler: The First Lady of Culture

By the mid-20th century, the many dreams of a water source, real estate development, and institutionalized growth had materialized, but the Great Depression, World War II, and the lasting effects of fragmentation shook the city's development. Unlike Carnegie's reputation was modeled as business mogul-turned-philanthropist, Chandler's rise took place directly through her philanthropic initiatives. Moreover, as an Angeleno, Chandler simultaneously infiltrated several local non-profit institutions as a volunteer, board member, or fundraiser. Recognized in the community for her civic involvement, successful fundraising efforts, and advocacy for women,

Chandler changed the status quo of philanthropy in Los Angeles by uniquely facilitating the expansion of the city's accessible and sustainable cultural programs. Using the same term referencing First Lady Jacqueline Kennedy in a personal letter, Chandler was named as "The First Lady of Culture" by TIME Magazine, becoming a symbol of success for the power and potential of philanthropy in Los Angeles.[338]

While her family name's leading reputation in Los Angeles would offer significant social capital towards the success of her fundraising efforts, her relatives had earlier acted as a repressive force. Displaying her intellect throughout her childhood, both at school and creatively in music, she was admitted to Stanford, where she met her future husband, Norman Chandler.[339] Neither Norman nor Dorothy ended up graduating from Stanford, as they married and moved to Los Angeles for Norman to take over the leadership of the *Los Angeles Times* from his deceased father. She had only one semester to go for graduation, leaving her without a formal degree.[340] After a decade serving the traditional female role of rearing children and maintaining the home, Chandler experienced "a deepening personal depression," unable to find a role suited to her intellect and talents while remaining a housewife confined to the home.[341]

Chandler's immediate and extended family did not support her ambitions, but as she shared in her oral history, Dr. Jackson, her psychiatrist, encouraged her to "go out into the world

---

338. Letter from Dorothy Chandler to Jacqueline Kennedy, personal correspondence. UCLA Library Special Collections, 1962.

339. Anita Klaz. *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler* (Northridge: California State University, 1981).

340. Klaz, 72.

341. Klaz, 73.

and use her energies in constructive ways."[342] She volunteered at the Los Angeles Children's Hospital, assisted with wartime efforts, actively fought for early air-pollution studies and legislation, and served as a board member to the symphony.[343] Her involvement in the community, especially through the arts, kept her well-connected to the current underpinnings of the development of Los Angeles. More importantly, these relationships, in addition to her connections through her role at the *Los Angeles Times*, came together to make her one of the most well-connected people residing in Los Angeles. By the late 1940's, her accumulated social capital permitted her to pursue leadership opportunities within the vision to develop a civic and cultural center in Los Angeles.

Prior to Chandler's efforts, Angelenos had envisioned a creation of Los Angeles that would match the vision of New York. In the first half of the twentieth century, the citizenry was engaged in the discourse that wealth came from and went back to the East Coast due to the lack of family ties in Los Angeles.[344] Efforts to mimic East Coast culture had shifted the Hollywood Bowl's programming from a community-centric space to one attempted to build a world-class program, focusing less on local talent and culture and aspiring to bring in performances deemed as "high culture" on the East Coast and in Europe.[345] Chandler's experience working with businessmen, women's groups, and politicians, allowed her to socially and politically position herself amongst a growing class of elite in Los Angeles. When news broke that the Hollywood

342. Klaz, 74.

343. Klaz, 74.

344. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis*, 68.

345. F. G. Tollit, "Reactions to Hollywood Bowl's Closing," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 19, 1951.

Bowl's Symphony Under the Stars programming had been cancelled unexpectedly due to a lack of funding, Chandler was called upon to take on the role of chairman of the Emergency Committee of the Hollywood Bowl to save the season.[346] Chandler soon took on the additional roles of the Executive and Reorganization committees, eventually leading the Emergency Fund Committee team and developing what would become known as the "Save the Bowl" campaign.[347]

Following her success in reopening the Bowl within two short weeks through the intensive campaign, Chandler continued to engage in volunteer work, especially within the arts. In fact, she began working with the County in the same decade, continuously pushing for a civic center in downtown. By 1959, she had presented a plan to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors that she would raise $4 million in private funds of the $10 million dollars required to build a new home for the Los Angeles Philharmonic.[348] At this time, the orchestra had a summer home at the Hollywood Bowl but had to share practice and performance spaces with other musical and theatrical groups during the rest of the year.

The Board of Supervisors swiftly approved the proposal to revitalize the dilapidated county-owned land at Bunker Hill through the construction of a music center.[349] Paired with a promise to fundraise a portion of the funds needed to accomplish the construction, the Board

---

346. "Hollywood Bowl Closes for Season," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 15, 1951.

347. Cordell Hicks, "Inspiring Response at Meeting Gives New Hope to Bowl Future." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 6, 1951.

348. Margaret Leslie Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County: Five Decades of Music, Theater, and Dance* (Los Angeles: The Performing Arts Center of Los Angeles County, 2015), 11.

349. Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County*, 11.

encouraged Chandler to include two additional buildings within the vision of the music center to make it an arts complex.[350] This raised the total project cost from $10 million to $25 million, with Chandler now promising to raise $11 million of that total.[351] The strategy of combining private and public funds was novel to Los Angeles at this time and was the single contributing factor that allowed the project to proceed. For years, government officials had pleaded with the community for their support for a Central Library but had to instead rely on the use of bonds and other government funding. Up until the Save the Bowl campaign, the City and County relied on public funding to support the development of cultural life in Los Angeles. The official combination of public and private funding in a capital campaign was invented by Chandler.[352] Her foresight to combine private and public funding to achieve the establishment of a civic center encouraged big philanthropists, the public, and the government to simultaneous support the investment in a new, centralized cultural center in Los Angeles.

This campaign strategy, under the direction of Chandler, changed the way in which philanthropy in Los Angeles would be understood, administered, and accomplished. Previous Music Center initiatives had failed because, as expressed by Traub:

> the 'old money' and 'new money' faction within the city couldn't come together for the common cause of the arts. Dorothy Chandler bridged the gap most famously between Jewish housing developer S. Mark Taper and conservative financier Howard Ahmanson. Chandler saw their rivalry not as an impediment but as an opportunity.[353]

---

350. Deborah Vankin, "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force Behind the Music Center," November 14, 2014. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/la-et-cm-ca-music-center-buff-chandler-20141116-story.html

351. Vankin. "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force."

352. Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County,* 7.

353. Derek Traub, *Past / Forward: The LA Phil at 100* (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Philharmonic, 2018), 141.

Chandler brought a new skillset to fundraising in Los Angeles, focusing on her ability to apply bridging social capital across distinct and disparate social groups. Instead of focusing on in-group loyalty as the tool to motivate donations, Chandler identified the opportunity within Los Angeles's fragmented communities to encourage competition for recognition within the arts sector by using social capital to bring the spaces between new and old money for the same cause. Bridging social capital, defined as an inclusive network that creates links, is specifically beneficial to building new connections across disparate factions.[354] During her work on the Music Center, she uncovered two distinct sources for funding: "The traditional sources of philanthropy were the long-resident families of the region, but few of these people saw the arts as a worthwhile vessel for gifts…The new money was concentrated on the city's Westside, much of it held by European immigrants. They were not among Los Angeles' established families, but they considered the arts fundamental to civilized life."[355] By identifying two disparate segments of the population that could be philanthropic, Chandler uncovered a previously untapped opportunity to bring two dissimilar groups together for a single cause.

For a city growing into an ever more diverse tapestry, in addition to increasing social and political tensions in post-war and Cold War Los Angeles, Chandler remarkably employed her social capital by being a focal point for the city's development and recentralizing the arts through the inclusion of community across social boundaries. For example, "In the course of raising money to build the Music Center she introduced San Marino to Hillcrest. She introduced the motion picture industry to the California Club. She mixed everybody up, work up the drowsing

354. Putnam. *Bowling Alone*, 22-24.

355. Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County,* 14.

and rearranged the seating."[356] The presence of anti-Semitism in the film and television industries had served as a significant barrier to bringing together the capital of these disparate regions and groups in Los Angeles. Through her ability to bridge social capital by collaborating across in- and out-group populations, she was uniquely suited to bring a city of fragmented capital together as a "society power player."[357]

By carefully identifying the best prospects across all of Los Angeles, they would not just be passionate about developing a music culture, but high-capacity, powerful Angelenos that grasped the vitality of the Music Center project. Klaz further credits Chandler with "bringing together the two main centers of power in Los Angeles: (1) the old money and established businesses of downtown, Pasadena and San Marino areas, and (2) the younger, more liberal-mainly Jewish establishment of West Los Angeles."[358] When asked if it was true if she tried to integrate the "old established society of east Los Angeles with the newer more liberal society of west Los Angeles," she simply stated: "Well, I don't think I tried to do it. I did it."[359] Together, these groups held a financial and political power across a span of over 30 miles across Los Angeles County. This served as a financial power that was previously unprecedented in a new, diverse, and dispersed city such as Los Angeles.

Chandler's focus on wealthy individuals had not been used in other community-based projects in Los Angeles before her efforts starting in the 1950s. Within the context of describing

---

356. Joan Didion, "Will Power," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* July 31, 1997.

357. Peter Bart, "Remembering Dorothy Chandler as Los Angeles' Music Center Turns 50," *Variety,* December 10, 2014. https://variety.com/2014/voices/columns/remembering-dorothy-chandler-as-los-angeles-music-center-turns-50-1201375040/

358. Klaz, *An Oral History*, 3.

359. Klaz, 147.

Los Angeles culture, her strategy was interpreted by some as a gimmick designed to increase Chandler's social network.[360] In line with the theories described by Bourdieu on the accumulation of social capital, Chandler's methodology of mingling amongst the wealthy, bridging community boundaries to garner competitive and collaborative support, and publishing these named successes under her leadership did certainly propel her visibility and reputation within Los Angeles and across the nation. Her face on the cover of TIME Magazine in 1964, only seven years after the face of her husband, Norman Chandler, was also displayed on the cover, proves that, regardless of her intent, the outcome certainly reflected these remarks.

Contrary to this negative perception that the objective of her efforts was personal gain, the celebratory TIME Magazine article declares that "Buff's main fund-raising gimmick is no gimmick at all; it is to be intensely personal with the extremely rich."[361] While previous attempts to raise local funds for civic arts had been unsuccessful, the image of the city as "an uncouth poor relation"[362] or "cultural desert"[363] had become prevalent by the 1960s. However, Chandler was able to recognize that individuals would open their pockets to developing a cultural phenomenon of unprecedented proportions for the city that would substantiate its vision of the Los Angeles of the future for generations to come. Therefore, during the years of Chandler's Music Center campaign, "Los Angeles was uniquely ready to spend money on

360. Christopher Rand, *Los Angeles: The Ultimate City* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), 153.

361. "The City: Brightness in the Air," *TIME*, December 18, 1964.

362. "The City."

363. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 5.

culture…spending money on its development is a prideful act."[364] Even the *New York Times* remarked the shift in "new names and new money competing with old families for prominence."[365] These new and old families became competitive with one another for recognition within the arts sector to contribute to the growth and naming of Los Angeles for both current and future visibility.

Uniquely, not only did she have "all the weapons—the Times, the Chandler name, the real power," but she also had the foresight to apply this influence across the disparate communities of the fragmented metropolis for the public good.[366] One of the most innovative uses of her connection to the *Los Angeles Times* was using it as a daily projection of the prior day's donations. The paper already had "its hand in almost every pro-growth endeavor in Los Angeles," and this was no exception.[367] Known for its power as a propaganda machine, Chandler's used her direct ties to the media to stretch her influence across the dispersed city.[368] Her son, Otis Chandler, a publisher for the *Los Angeles Times* during her Music Center campaign, shared: "We'd run an editorial or a cartoon that would be hard on them and [Dorothy] would blow into my office saying, 'What are you trying to do to my music center!?' And I would say, 'We're trying to be a world-class newspaper.'"[369] Even in his attempts to maintain an

---

364. "The City."

365. Carl T. Gossett, Jr. "Recurrent Immigration Waves are Keeping Los Angeles Society in a State of Flux," *New York Times* (New York, NY)*,* October 11, 1963.

366. Gossett.

367. Gossett.

368. Meares. "From its Downtown Fortress, the Los Angeles Times Built LA."

369. Mary McNamara, "Mom is Watching: A Vital Music Center was Dorothy Buffum Chandler's Dream," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), October 19, 2003.

objective perspective on the Music Center and its fundraising, Chandler was still able to persuade her family to publish stories that only indicated positive outlooks on her endeavor. Following in the footsteps of Harrison Gray Otis' media empire, Chandler was "capable of manipulating the entire apparatus of politics and public opinion for [her] own enrichment."[370] Her enrichment, in this case, was the accumulation of capital to successfully raise an unprecedented sum for culture in the city.

Moreover, her success in cultivating individual, wealthy donors later served to enhance the creation of strategic recognition opportunities. The daily publication of donations, with the value of the gift placed alongside the name of the donor, allowed Chandler to use the social persuasion of the entire network of readers, in addition to the readership of the *Herald* that was secretly purchased by Harry Chandler to eliminate the competition.[371] Namely, by introducing vast opportunities for recognition for donations to the project, Chandler was able to motivate numerous donors to participate. Typically, lead gifts serve as the foundation for fundraising campaigns to inspire others give.[372] As shared in the *Los Angeles Times*, "Chandler frequently hit up wealthy friends for steep or multiple donations. She sometimes tore up checks in front of donors' faces and asked for more."[373] Instead of choosing to rely on a single donation from a big philanthropist, Chandler used recognition strategies to encourage the creation of a social network

370. Kevin Starr, *Inventing the Dream: California Through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 228.

371. Meares, "From its Downtown Fortress, the Los Angeles Times Built LA."

372. Conley, "Capital Campaigns," 248-249.

373. Vankin, "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force," l.

of donors. In other words, donors to the Music Center accessed a new, dense network of the highly influential and wealthy individuals of Los Angeles.

While the Ahmanson and Taper names adorn the exteriors of the Theater and Forum buildings, respectively, almost every wall of the interior of the Pavilion is covered in brass names in marble stone. Not only is the lobby adorned with recognizable names of oil tycoons and real estate moguls, as well as enduring family foundations that still continue to contribute to Los Angeles to this day, but each of the floors, rooms, and even the seats, adorn the names of donors.[374] These permanent symbols of recognition persuaded individuals within the vast, fragmented community of Los Angeles to enhance their stature by solidifying their membership in a donor community in one of the most important centers in Los Angeles, both then and now.

As the Center's construction was finalized over the next three years, the generically pre-named Memorial Pavilion was renamed the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion. Ostensibly named in honor of Chandler's success in turning a vision into a reality out of a previous absence of culture in Los Angeles, the Music Center became a catalyst in dismantling the perception that Los Angeles was a "Nowhere City so bereft of culture that its only value is as a base of operations for pilgrims on their way to Disneyland and Forest Lawn" from Eastern periodicals.[375] The success of the Music Center campaign was single-handedly prescribed to Chandler, as displayed on a billboard in 1965 that states, "Los Angeles Thanks You, Mrs. Chandler, For Our New Music Center."[376] She was clearly the center of the success of this effort yet she was still humbled by

374. Welton Becket and Associates, "Fact Sheet: The Music Center," Los Angeles, California, October 25, 1960, 3.

375. Jack Smith, "L.A. Culture Runneth Over," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), March 27, 1977.

376. Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County,* 32.

this honorable naming.[377] While the Pavilion carried her named as honoree for her time and commitment to the cause, the other Music Center buildings marked a transitional moment of naming as a direct result of various levels of donating based on the value of each gift.

In addition to the main pavilion boasting the honor of her name, her legacy survives in the establishment of the Blue Ribbon committee. Blue Ribbon committees are common across organizations, often established surrounding governmental and political policy issues. Made of volunteers, Blue Ribbon committees are typically created in order to have a nonpartisan, unbiased opinion to bring to an organization as a decision-making body. Those who are appointed to a Blue Ribbon committee are usually chosen for their expertise in a given area. Chandler conceived of a Blue Ribbon committee for the Music Center as an exclusive group of elite women of Los Angeles.[378] Establishing the group in 1968, four years after the Music Center opened, she saw an opportunity to enhance the power of women in the field of the arts. Several volunteer women's groups already supported similar causes, and even one women's group, the Women's Affairs Committee, worked just with the symphony.[379] But as recorded in Chandler's oral history, she "wanted to have a new, new idea and bring together all kinds of women in the community from various backgrounds, social and business wise."[380] Participation in this exclusive group, capped at a membership of 500, required an invitation from a current member

377. Rosemary R. Goodale, "In the Matter of Naming of Music Center Buildings," State of California, County of Los Angeles, December 28, 1965. UCLA Library Archives.

378. "Blue Ribbon Committee," The Music Center. www.musiccenter.org/support/ways-to-give/the-blue-ribbon/

379. John Orlando Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story* (Hollywood: Hollywood Bowl Association, 1962).

380. Klaz, *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler*, 143.

or Dorothy Chandler herself, being vetted by three officers on the committee, as well as a donation of $1,000 annually. Together, these women served as an advisory group, as well as a distinct fundraising entity of the organization. Not only was Chandler able to bring attention to the distinct role of women within the space of public cultural institutions when the Music Center opened in 1964, but it also defined a new center—a new Bunker Hill—and became the symbol of a new Los Angeles.

As much as Carnegie was a pathbreaker, Chandler was a visionary. Chandler made it to the front cover of TIME magazine in 1964, her reputation gained through saving the Hollywood Bowl and the unprecedented success of the Music Center campaign. By the time Chandler had become a leader in the arts, she used her fame to persuade the disparate communities of Los Angeles to come together, causing the "cultural desert to bloom."[381] Notably, not only had she successfully completed a $10 million fundraising campaign goal—and raised almost twice as much—to build a state-of-the-art Music Center, but Chandler also revitalized the rundown Bunker Hill.[382] In other words, Chandler's individual leadership saved and established two iconic cultural centers in Los Angeles in the most successful philanthropic campaign in 20th century Los Angeles.

In the fundraising campaigns that followed in Los Angeles, fundraisers repeated many of the strategies Chandler had used in the Save the Bowl and Music Center campaigns. Organizers for the Save the Books campaign referred to Chandler as the "Grande Dame" of Los Angeles based on her role in the Music Center endeavor, attempting to replicate the strategy of having an

---

381. "Publisher's Wife Helping Cultural Desert to Bloom," *South Mississippi Sun* Biloxi, MS), December 23, 1974.

382. Vankin, "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force."

influential name spearheading the Save the Books campaign.[383] More importantly, the social connections that she had made over time not only directly contributed to her success in this endeavor but also created a way for philanthropy to continue to spread behind the scenes. Since the opening of the Music Center, cultural institutions across Los Angeles have mimicked the recognition walls, naming opportunities, exclusive fundraising groups, community appeals, and most importantly, the model of the singular face of the cultural campaign, as well as philanthropist leaders to inspire other significant donors and the community at-large. While not all strategies are transferable across organizations due to their capacity or bandwidth, organizational history, or individual connections within the community, Chandler's strategies established a new philanthropic legacy upon which the city could build, increasing both philanthropic success across the city.

Through saving and creating cultural centers, Chandler not only carved out a path for herself, but also for Los Angeles by bringing together big philanthropy, community-driven efforts, and a funding partnership with the government. A testament to Chandler's vision and relentless pursuit of a performing arts center that would yield new access to the general public through a combination of public and private philanthropy, The Music Center was seen as the "cultural hub of Los Angeles as an all-inclusive place to connect and unite through the arts."[384] As historian David Halberstam states, "'If you're charting the coming of a big, sleepy, conservative community into the modern, affluent, increasingly sophisticated metropolis that

383. "Save the Books," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Room Collection, 1986, 2.

384. "The History of the Music Center," *The Music Center,* Accessed January 31, 2020, https://www.musiccenter.org/visit/about/history/

exists today, she may be the single most important player."[385] Upon her death in 1997, even the *New York Times* published an article in her remembrance, specifically celebrating her fundraising campaign efforts for the Music Center.[386] Chandler defined a new cultural image for Los Angeles to show its citizens, as well as to put on a display for the world, while shaping the future of philanthropic strategies in Los Angeles.

Franklin D. Murphy: The Culture Broker

Franklin D. Murphy remains one of Los Angeles's least recognized philanthropists because he facilitated the growth of Los Angeles cultural and educational institutions from behind-the-scenes. Yet, like Carnegie, he had a profound impact throughout the city, moving across disparate parts, and funding disparate endeavors, to uplift the culture in the City of Los Angeles as a whole. Working within the upper echelons of wealth, instead of creating his own vision of the city, Murphy focused his philanthropic efforts as "The Culture Broker." Margaret Leslie Davis, professor and author, applies the term "The Culture Broker" to Murphy's influence in cultural and philanthropic Los Angeles, describing his role as "utilizing his relationships with the founders and scions of some of America's greatest fortunes – Ahmanson, Rockefeller, Ford, Mellon, and Annenberg – to direct the largess of the wealthy into the cultural institutions of his choosing."[387] The importance of Murphy's legacy remains not in his role as a direct "big philanthropist" or even as a politician, but as a leader in philanthropy who facilitated the expansion of big philanthropy across Los Angeles by moving around the funds of other big

385. David Halberstam, *The Powers that Be* (Urbana: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), 268.

386. Rick Lyman, "Dorothy Chandler: Arts Patron in Los Angeles," *New York Times* (New York, NY), July 8, 1997.

387. Davis, "The Culture Broker," https://margaretlesliedavis.com/the-culture-broker/

philanthropists on their behalf. Essentially, Murphy's role was to convince those who possessed excess financial capital to support the growth of Los Angeles, and to see the growth of culture in the city as part of their own legacies.

Namely, he did not conduct fundraising like Chandler, nor did he give away his money like Carnegie, but he made sure to work at cultural institutions that included leaders of a certain political and social class as to secure the capital necessary to make an impact, using the tools of big philanthropy, but from within. As Murphy stated: "It is my firm conviction that we can easily differentiate the *great* cities of the world from those that are merely *large* by noting the kinds and quality of institutions the people provide to serve their educational and cultural needs."[388] Unlike Carnegie who used philanthropy to establish an immortal legacy, Murphy's role in big philanthropy was to facilitate the legacies of others. Murphy was uniquely able to infiltrate the highest ranks of social class within the city, to engage in new networks across Los Angeles within the cultural sphere.

While Murphy did not directly build his own power of legacy after death, he ensured his continued value in high-net-worth social circles by facilitating the promulgation of the legacies of others. As Davis describes, Murphy found "the promotion of culture as the means to position himself among the rich and powerful."[389] In this way, Murphy's position as a culture broker in Los Angeles established the foundations of culture in the emerging metropolis and enabling the preservation of legacies of big philanthropists for both those who came before him and those who would come after. Murphy's work thereby relied on bridging social capital, bringing

388. Franklin D. Murphy, "My UCLA Chancellorship: An Utterly Candid View," interview by James V. Mink (Oral History Collection, University Library Special Collections, 1976), 10.

389. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* xiv.

together various entities within the community, by moving between them to create and maintain support for the overall vision of growth for a cultural Los Angeles. His extensive and durable networks across philanthropists in the sciences, arts, education, and healthcare promoted him to a position where big philanthropists sought his opinions, skills, and suggestions on how to distribute their financial capital in the best interest of the citizenry, as well as for their legacies.

Murphy initially worked alongside other prominent cultural and civic leaders, including Dorothy Chandler and Ed Carter. Individuals such as these who served as UC regents also appeared as leaders in many cultural institutions in the 1960s, working to promote the cultural capital of Los Angeles without acting as outright big philanthropists. Davis argues that Murphy existed within a Los Angeles that was embarking upon a "cultural coming of age."[390] In his move from Kansas, Murphy established roots in Los Angeles as Chancellor of UCLA and became a central figure in the UC network, as well as with other civic leaders, government officials, and business moguls of Los Angeles. Upon his arrival, he learned that these cultural and civic leaders, specifically the UC regents, maintained much of the local administrative authority.[391] By partnering with individual and institutional allies, learning who controlled the campus he agreed to lead, Murphy was able to facilitate the city's cultural growth by moving funds from one hand to the next. During his tenure at UCLA, Murphy's leadership was marked by many achievements: notably, his practical and ideological vision for an independent identity to launch Los Angeles as a recognizable cultural destination.

---

390. Davis, xv.

391. Eddie R. Cole, "Segregation Is Immoral: Race, University Systems, and Bureaucratic Resistance." *The Campus Color Line: College Presidents and the Struggle for Black Freedom* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020), 119–155.

One of the first initiatives undertaken by Murphy upon arriving in Los Angeles and beginning his position at UCLA was to rebrand the university. Universities have commonly been used to develop cities, but UCLA's history of continuously moving further outside of the developing city to "secure a site greater in area and more remote from the congestion of the city" challenged the relationship of the university to Los Angeles.[392] Murphy thereby identified three strategic needs to make the university central to the growth of the city: in addition to a request to have equal funding to Berkeley, Murphy decided that the university must "obtain a unique identity" and be "tied more closely to the city of Los Angeles."[393] The initial notion of the university was as an "extension program."[394] Murphy specifically requested that the then title of it as a "Southern Branch" to Berkeley be replaced with "Los Angeles Branch."[395] The renaming of the branch to include Los Angeles it is naming directly connected the university to the city, solidifying the role of Los Angeles as a prominent leader within the expanding university system, removing the opportunity for the city's identity to be erased from the overall development of the system. As Murphy himself stated, "The dynamics of the times, the forceful personalities involved, and the roadblocks barreled through to create a cultural infrastructure,

392. James R. Martin, *The University of California (in Los Angeles): A Resume of the Selection and Acquisition of the Westwood Site* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1925), 72.

393. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 44.

394. Edward A. Dickson, *University of California at Los Angeles: Its Origin and Formative Years* (Los Angeles: Friends of the UCLA Library, 1955), 7.

395. Dickson, 46.

constituted 'the great untold story of Los Angeles.'"[396] He identified Los Angeles as a "mosaic city," one that was distinct and diverse from others in California and in the United States.[397] His recognition of the exceptional fragmentation of Los Angeles fostered the need for dedicated attention to crafting a unifying identity with a university dedicated within its boundaries.

During his career at UCLA, he impressed upon the regents, as well as the boosters of the university and other culture brokers of Los Angeles, that he was central to the potential cultural growth of Los Angeles. Moreover, his wife's connection to Dorothy Chandler facilitated a closer connection to the ultimate power within the city early on.[398] These early social networks that he became privy to through his role enabled him to quickly rebuild the status that he had created for himself in Kansas, all to "be welcomed into the more open and fluid society of Los Angeles."[399] This fluidity is again reflective of the exceptionalism of philanthropy and its related social capital in Los Angeles. Unlike in New York City, where one must be born into social capital through family legacy and reputation, in Los Angeles, Murphy was able to "move steadily into positions of power that would have been denied to him in the East.[400] In Los Angeles, he could earn his way in.

---

396. Murphy to Otis Chandler, Papers of Franklin D. Murphy, Box 28, Folder 2, Department of Special Collections, University Library, University of California, Los Angeles, March 21, 1983.

397. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 389.

398. Davis, 52.

399. Davis, 17.

400. John Hohns, "Power Brokers! Pinpointing the Most Powerful Californians and What They Do," *PSA Magazine,* December 1975, 46.

These more fluid social networks not only allowed him to gain the trust and respect of big philanthropists, but to also obtain powerful positions within the private foundations and companies led by these same individuals. As a result, even after his time at UCLA, Murphy later became a founder and the Director of the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, among other board member positions of high-profile philanthropic organizations including the Ahmanson Foundation, the J. Paul Getty Trust, and even as the CEO of the Times Mirror.[401] Furthermore, he also overlapped these terms with positions across the country, such as the Ford Motor Company, Hallmark, Bank of America, and the National Gallery of Art.[402] Not only did he cover a wide breath of institutions and sectors, the multiple sources that list his extensive roles all indicate that he made an indelible impact in each of the organizations for which he worked.

Importantly, his role at the J. Paul Getty Trust fully conveys the difference between the big philanthropists who gave their individual wealth away to Murphy's role to ensure its vision for generations to come. While Getty's name is synonymous with art in Los Angeles, Murphy served as the prominent force behind the success of Getty's legacy in directing the advocacy of access to the arts for the public. Beginning as the exploration of culture through the wealth of an individual for his own benefit and transforming into multiple spaces that display some of the greatest collections of art and an exquisite display of architecture, J. Paul Getty's impact on the City of Los Angeles traces the impact of the changing values of Enlightenment, civil society, and philanthropy throughout the twentieth century to today. Without J. Paul Getty's estate and his vision for the arts, the Getty as it stands today would not have been possible. Nevertheless, Getty

401. "Franklin Murphy Dies," *New York Times* (New York, NY), June 17, 1994. www.nytimes.com/1994/06/17/obituaries/franklin-d-murphy-78-dies-leader-in-arts-and-publishing.html.

402. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 373.

had proclaimed in his estate plans that we would leave the decision of how to dispose of his wealth up to the Trustees.[403] Based on the trust and social capital that Murphy had accumulated up to this point, the Trustees, in turn, looked to him to make the final decision.[404] The J. Paul Getty Foundation was set up as an institution that supported its own programming and needs as opposed to the more common, grant-making foundation. In order to dispose of the minimum 5% required by law, Murphy conceived of The Getty Center. This colossal project would not only provide an outlet for current spending but would also be the central space through which to provide continued annual support, funding programs at the Museum with its 5%.

While Getty's big philanthropy enabled the creation of a foundation built upon excess capital to distribute to the public good, if Murphy hadn't taken his vision and turned it into a reality after his passing, it also wouldn't exist as it does today. As Davis writes, Murphy "may have done more to shape the cosmopolitan, cultural image of Los Angeles than any other person of his generation."[405] On the other hand, without the big philanthropy of individuals such as J. Paul Getty, the Center could have never been imagined, let alone funded. In understanding that individuals are behind the missions, strategies, and applications of our most prominent and vital cultural institutions, and directly influence the culture of the community, can we trust philanthropy to serve as a democratic practice and to implement change for the public good?

As shifts took place in philanthropy and the way in which institutions related to the individual, the donors' role in the creation of cultural capital also continued to grow. While

403. "Trust Indenture," *The J. Paul Getty Trust,* 2006. http://www.getty.edu/about/governance/pdfs/indenture.pdf

404. Murphy, "My UCLA Chancellorship," 31.

405. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 319.

recognized just before his death for having "fashioned an awesome record as a cultural catalyst in the building of museums, libraries, collections and scholarship," today his name is rarely remembered in the context of Los Angeles's cultural growth.[406] In other words, his role as the behind-the-scenes mark-maker on cultural Los Angeles continues to live behind-the-scenes today. Those who played their parts as big philanthropists explicitly in the eyes of the public continue to be remembered for their impact. While the recognition differs greatly, the impact of Murphy's contributions may even exceed those of the donors themselves.

In addition to his multiple roles in non-profit and for-profit corporations across the Los Angeles landscape, he also later served to help with specific and iconic fundraising campaigns, including Chandler's Music Center campaign. He also assisted with the Save the Books campaign after he had retired, serving on the campaign's Blue Ribbon committee. The gift records prove that his social capital remained intact: he made only three phone calls for fundraising, and all three resulted in donations. Moreover, those three calls raised more funds than the rest of the Blue Ribbon committee members combined.[407]

Murphy's thirty years as a dominant figure in Los Angeles, "elevating the city into an arts capital," provided him with honorable recognition.[408] His well-maintained relationships throughout his lifetime in Los Angeles also rewarded him with an 18-month long birthday celebration. Davis states that it was of Murphy's opinion "that he had been given enough

406. William Wilson, "A Birthday Present for a Cultural Catalyst," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), October 16, 1992.

407. "Solicitation Response Status," *Blue Ribbon Committee*, Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1987.

408. Davis, "The Culture Broker," https://margaretlesliedavis.com/the-culture-broker/

plaques."[409] So, as reported in the *Los Angeles Times,* Murphy was instead presented with multiple lectures, exhibition, and programs at museums across Los Angeles that catered specifically to his interests and passions.[410] The fact that some of the most prominent museums in Los Angeles, including the Getty, the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, and the Huntington, to name a few, put their other exhibitions and the presentation of other collections aside to celebrate one man indicates the extent to which his social capital influenced the cultural landscape of Los Angeles throughout his lifetime.

His name now labels a sculptural garden that he founded on the UCLA campus, is credited with the founding of the Fowler Museum, and resides over the admissions and administration building.[411] Nevertheless, the many organizations he worked for, the many places he raised money for, do not have outright and prominent recognition for him since he was simply the facilitator and not the traditional version of a big philanthropist. In other words, his role as a culture broker, as opposed to directly participating in the growth of cultural Los Angeles as a big philanthropist, diminished the legacy of his name. As time passes, the legacy of his embeddedness as a culture broker also fades.

There are two important components of Murphy's story. First, he was able to direct multiple visions into one that represented the City of Los Angeles as a whole. Second, he was able to do so without being as noticed as the man with the name on the outside of the building. In other words, as big philanthropy continues to proliferate in Los Angeles and the names on the

409. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 373

410. Wilson, "A Birthday Present."

411. "Past Leaders: Franklin Murphy, 1960-1968," University of California, Los Angeles. Accessed December 1, 2019. http://www.pastleaders.ucla.edu/murphy.html

buildings continue to get bigger, who are the current culture brokers and how much cultural funding do they control? Retrospectively, the history of Murphy's influence on the cultural development emerges as a unique and positive tale. Perhaps the power of big philanthropy that acts from behind the scenes was a unique set of circumstances in which one man had incredible influence. Nevertheless, the evaluation and analysis of big philanthropy's role as a technology of power within the constant development and redevelopment of the city's cultural vision needs to be conducted overtly as well as covertly. Only with an understanding of the various means through which big philanthropy can occur can scholarship such as this uncover the role of social capital amongst philanthropy, especially in a seemingly fragmented metropolis.

Conclusion

Contrary to common public perception, Los Angeles has long been a center for individual philanthropic achievements through its cultural institutions. Even in the fragmented metropolis, big philanthropy jumpstarted some of Los Angeles's cultural endeavors and to support its most needed institutions, contributing to the long-term cultural growth of the city. While potentially overlooked as the leaders of big philanthropy in Los Angeles, Carnegie, Chandler, and Murphy left an indelible mark on the city. They brought together, and also contributed to, the fragmented and dynamic social capital of the city. Between the creation of branches that stemmed out to the disparate communities from the center of the city, the creation of a recentralized and accessible music center that pulled together support from individuals from all around greater Los Angeles, and the distribution of grants in and around Los Angeles while promoting the city's exceptionalism, all three directly shaped the development of culture in Los Angeles through big philanthropy. The legacies of their achievements have withstood the test of time in different ways, but all also received named recognition and social capital during their lifetimes. In the end,

each individual offered a significant contribution that created a new pathway for philanthropy in a city that was seen as a philanthropic desert.

As we uncover the philanthropic histories of Los Angeles's most iconic cultural institutions, the role of individual leaders and their relationship to social capital becomes clearer. These stories are vital to understanding the role of philanthropy in Los Angeles because excess capital is key to participating in philanthropy. Philanthropy also allows for the accumulation of further capital, particularly social capital. Moreover, as participation in philanthropy is restricted to those who have access to social, economic, or cultural capital, the sector continues to uphold relations of power and cultural reproduction. In other words, social, economic, and cultural stratification will continue to be reproduced by the emphasis on the distribution of capital to the visions of those who are able to influence public policy through wealth. Big philanthropy is a powerful tool for shaping any city. In a fragmented city like Los Angeles, however, it has the potential to either uphold or dismantle these traditional structures: the exclusivity of bonding social capital can further disassociate its communities, or its already disjointed structure can help to dissipate its power for lack of a centralized system. As such, the study of philanthropy in Los Angeles requires a more in-depth look at how some of the most iconic cultural institutions were formed, by whom, and in what times, to indicate the role of philanthropy as it relates to the accumulation of social capital.

Following Norman Chandler's TIME Magazine cover in 1957, which had already declared that philanthropy in Los Angeles is unique because "Los Angeles is a place for the kind of people who are willing to try something new. It's a place for people who want to build a new world," Dorothy Chandler confirmed those theories by putting them into practice to show the

changing landscape of cities such as Los Angeles within the context of "The New World."[412] Those who participate in philanthropy for public causes must already have social and cultural capital, upholding the imbalance. Participation is thereby limited to those who have the influence to shape civic values and public opinion, facilitating cultural reproduction. The desire for legacy, along with a desire to envision a new cultural identity for the city, seem to have distinctly met at the same time in history. When "growth-giddy Los Angeles was poised to push toward maturity with its greatest boosters guiding its civic plans," the individuals with the power to make an impact embedded themselves within the future of Los Angeles.[413] In a balance between a "golden" and a "gilded" age of philanthropy, these stories of big philanthropists are vital to understanding the role of philanthropy in building social and cultural capital for an Angeleno citizenry, especially as Los Angeles continues to be dismissed as representing a meaningful cultural presence.[414]

Big philanthropy is not a neutral phenomenon. The continued uneven accumulation of economic capital, paired with the socially desirable qualities of philanthropy, ensures a disparity between the influence of individual and mass participation in philanthropy. The question on how big philanthropy is shaping the future of culture in the city will continue as long as the effects of the exchange of significant wealth within the public sphere—even only their legacies—remain. Studying the historic role of philanthropy by individuals in shaping Los Angeles's cultural institutions helps to critique its potential contemporary role as a social technology of power by upholding current values in perpetuity. As a result, mitigating the uneven accumulation of capital

412. "Cities: The New World," *TIME*, July 15, 1957.

413. Davis, *The Culture Broker,* 66.

414. Arango and Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart."

leads to an understanding of the indispensable and increasingly necessary role of the larger collective in contributing to the public good through philanthropy, while still recognizing the necessity of big philanthropy in the origins of these central public institutions.

While individual philanthropy supports cultural institutions in unique ways, voluntary associations, or formal groups of individuals, founded some of Los Angeles's earliest cultural achievements. These social—and later financial—groups helped to institute some of the city's premiere and longest-standing public organizations. As individuals and their legacies begin to take on a form that is typically more symbolic of institutions, understanding the relations of power becomes increasingly difficult. As these exchanges of power become more elusive,[415] analyzing the structures that impact the ways in which individuals are controlled in their cultural and philanthropic participation will become even more necessary to ensure that the public good remains at the forefront of the mission and application of our third sector institutions. As the following chapter investigates, the formation of voluntary associations became a successful way in which to apply and accumulate social capital with greater influence by combining cumulative capital of individual group members. As such, while big philanthropists act individually, what is at stake when groups of like-minded individuals form around specific initiatives? The next chapter examines the establishment of the Los Angeles Public Library and the Hollywood Bowl to uncover the role of voluntary associations and social capital in various attempts to lay the foundation for long-lasting public cultural institutions in a diverse, post-modern city.

415. Frumkin, *On Being Nonprofit,* 3.

CHAPTER 4

Philanthropy Rising

> Notwithstanding the newcomer's best intentions, direct entrance into the community was difficult. Fortunately, the small, compact, homogeneous, and like-minded populace facilitated the formation of voluntary associations that tied him to his fellow citizens.
>
> – Robert M. Fogelson[416]

Voluntary associations served a prominent role in determining the relations of the populace for both the new and existing citizenry. In fact, membership in voluntary associations was instrumental for newcomers in Los Angeles to determine their social position within the newly forming city. Following Fogelson's theory of the "quest for community" within the fragmented metropolis, Angelenos used these groups to link to one another through shared interest and ability by operating within the theories of bridging and bonding social capital.[417] As previously discussed, these methods of inclusion and exclusion, respectively, offer opportunities for individuals to gather as formal entities with the mission of achieving a common objective. Throughout the early development of Los Angeles, those who immersed themselves in community-building through group membership guided the growth of civic and cultural institutions, as well as determined the mechanisms for the exchange of capital between the public and the elite within the emerging city.

Studying the voluntary associations that led to the establishment of the Los Angeles Public Library illustrates how these groups garnered community support to accumulate capital through the creation of a dense network, both as individuals and for the public good. The Los Angeles Public Library was created after three separate attempts: first, by *Los Amigos del País* in

---

416. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis*, 187.

417. Fogelson, 2.

1844, then by the Library Association in 1859, and finally, the Los Angeles Library Association in 1872. Each of the attempts took place in a newly shaped Los Angeles, from the Mexican Era to the Transitional Era, and then in the beginning of a period marked by industrial expansion and growth. Throughout each of these timeframes, Los Angeles was becoming an increasingly diversified metropolis. This also allowed for new philanthropic strategies, such as private-public partnerships, to be applied in the establishment of a library. On one hand, the formation of voluntary associations was essential to the establishment of a centralized library system for the public good. On the other, voluntary associations led to the uneven accumulation of social capital, shifting and solidifying social relations among the citizenry.

The development of the Hollywood Bowl serves as an additional illustration of the establishment of an iconic cultural endeavor through the creation of voluntary groups. The formation and dissolution of three separate voluntary association attempts formed the foundations of what the Hollywood Bowl is today. However, these groups were created and dissolved by their members within a much more condensed timeframe than the Los Angeles Public Library. Specifically, all three associations were established and reorganized within a 5-year period, between 1919 and 1924.[418] This directly indicates the drive by the founders in their search for the rapid accumulation of social capital through the establishment of a prominent cultural organization. Instead of these volunteer groups disbanding due to the lack of social capital to sustain them as in the case of the library, members simply renamed the organizations to restructure the allocation of social capital. In other words, by readjusting the leadership positions and adding and removing people from the association, social capital was as quickly accumulated as it was taken away. Nevertheless, these private associations, their changing names, limited

418. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 3.

philanthropic resources, and the overlap and removal of members, were essential to the creation of additional public cultural spaces, especially in a growing and increasingly diverse city. The case study of the Hollywood Bowl and the role of its volunteer organizations thereby informs us to the extent of the complexities of philanthropy in early Los Angeles as it relates to social capital, simultaneously uncovering the increasingly embedded role of the public in providing social capital as supporters and users of civic institutions during the first half of the 20th century.

In this chapter, I uncover how a myriad of voluntary entities led to the founding of the Los Angeles Public Library and the Hollywood Bowl to illustrate the ways in which they were fundamental to the establishment of the relations of capital in early cultural institutions in Los Angeles. I first explore the ways in which voluntary associations were integral to the early attempts at forming a library and performance center in Los Angeles. I then investigate the consequences of the shift from social capital to financial capital on participation in these voluntary groups and the resulting dynamics of community building. Lastly, I examine the social relations between the elite and the public within the shift from the volunteer groups into organized institutions and how they encouraged or discouraged participation for an in- and out-group citizenry. While the evolution of the library's establishment evolves over the course of a century and the Hollywood Bowl over just a thirty-year timeframe, the themes of community-building and capital exchange emanate throughout.

This chapter serves to illustrate the importance of understanding the evolution of voluntary associations as it relates to the accumulation of social capital in the early cultural development of Los Angeles. While these associations were vital to the growth of early philanthropy across the United States, they were also particularly instrumental in determining the

groupings of like-minded individuals to form de facto, place-specific communities.[419] Without these organized groupings, many lasting civic social and cultural organizations would not have been established. Yet, these groups also provided members with advantages that did not necessarily benefit the community at large. Voluntary associations in Los Angeles helped to build community, while also consolidating the citizenry "into a sociological mosaic—collectively homogenous, but individually heterogeneous."[420] Ultimately, the citizenry determines through their usership if these efforts by local leaders to establish civic institutions will be sustainable.

From *Gente de Razon* to Representatives of the Old Regime

Contrary to common perception that voluntary associations were the direct result of "urbanization and industrialization," much of the data about their establishment between 1840 and 1940 shows that much of their growth took place in rural areas as opposed to densely populated and industrial cities.[421] In fact, the growth of voluntary associations at the turn of the 20th century was much more prominent in the West than in the East. In the eastern industrial centers such as New York City, industrialization and the resulting misgivings of urban life did not directly preclude participation in civic engagement, but rather restricted the ability of individuals to have time to engage in in-person activities.[422] In the West, however, the newly designed lifestyle was built on pleasure, leisure, and time, encouraging individuals to participate

419. McCarthy, *American Creed*, 13.

420. Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, 209.

421. Gamm and Putnam, "The Growth of Voluntary Associations," 550.

422. Gamm and Putnam, 544.

in the betterment of their communities.[423] Even more so, Los Angeles was little more than a rural town prior to the turn of the century, and thereby mimicked this trend.

Political scientists Gamm and Putnam demonstrate how these communities activate the social consciousness of its citizenry for the public good by establishing voluntary associations. As shifting relations "disrupted patterns of work, leisure, churchgoing, and family roles," groups of individuals who similarly identified began forming entities to "respond to the erosion of traditional community interactions."[424] Gamm and Putnam thereby understand the relations between the establishment of these social groups and their economic and demographic structures to align with Marx's interpretation of social consciousness, determined by their social being.[425] Whereby Los Angeles now exists as a post-modern metropolis, its early rural community-setting and migration patterns precluded its exceptional link to the formation of voluntary associations for civic engagement.

The rise of the voluntary association is connected to the rise of a sense of awareness to a sense of responsibility; from a social consciousness to a social conscience, encouraging civic participation alongside the activation of social capital amongst members. The rise of social consciousness pervaded the adolescent pueblo of Los Angeles. By this time in the eastern United States, associations served as the catalyst for the formation of public libraries.[426] The first attempt at establishing a library in Los Angeles similarly used the form of a voluntary

---

423. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 72.

424. Gamm and Putnam. "The Growth of Voluntary Associations*,* 530.

425. Karl Marx, "Preface," *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.*

426. Jesse H. Shera, *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England 1629-1855* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952).

association through which to come together in the central plaza for the public good. This early effort was named *Los Amigos del País* (translated as *The Friends of the Country*) in 1844, prior to California entering the Union.[427] Politically, socially, and economically active members of society gathered to form the association

During this period, prominent members of the community were referred to as leaders of the "*gente de razon*," meaning "people of reason."[428] In 1844, Los Angeles only had a population of 2,497, and of those, 1,847 were demarcated as the *gente de razon.*[429] As historian Gloria Miranda illustrates, this specific categorization as "non-Indians" was used in order to self-identify as the descendants from a privileged ancestry to support the social stratification of the Spanish population in California, which remained active during the Mexican period.[430] These projections of superiority of the dominant population were labels to uphold invented social relations. This cultural appellation not only distinguished between privileged and Other, but also defined both who had access to social capital within the community and with whom it would or would not be shared.

Not only were the individuals involved in founding *Los Amigos del País* vital to the relations of a library, but the central location of the library at the Plaza was also fundamental to its role. The space in which the first library was held was referred to as a "social gathering place," further indicating the relationship between the role of the association, the library as a

---

427. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library*, 9.

428. Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza*, 50.

429. "Historical Resident Population: Spanish and Mexican Period, 1781 to 1846," Los Angeles Almanac, Accessed February 15, 2020, www.laalmanac.com/population/po01.php.

430. Gloria E. Miranda. "Racial and Cultural Dimensions of 'Gente de Razón' Status in Spanish and Mexican California," *Southern California Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1988): 266.

public space, and the social relationships that would be built and maintained for the accumulation of social capital.[431] As Estrada shows, because the citizenry perceived the *gente de razon* as "the most prosperous, influential residents of the pueblo," they centralized their influence in the Plaza by living around the edges of the center, a space defined by "decided preference and social prestige."[432] The library not only provided a place in which to empower *ciudadanos* through an exchange of newly created capital, but its location in the center of the Plaza solidified its role in concentrating its influence within social relations.

Author and historian William David Estrada argues in his book, *The Los Angeles Plaza: Sacred and Contested Space,* that the people living in the pueblo began to see themselves as "*ciudadanos*," or citizens.[433] As opposed to "subjects" from the old Indian and Spanish colonial regimes, the *gente de razon* saw themselves as active participants in the development of this new Mexican-Era Los Angeles and focused on the importance of cultural separation and advancement. Their status as citizens afforded upon them the opportunity to participate in the exchange of social capital, which could be further used to separate themselves from the Other. By advancing socially within a stratified society, non-Indian individuals moved away from the pervading stereotypes of drunkenness and violence. This contested reorganization of the

431. Glenna Dunning, "A Wanderer and Homeless Waif," in *Feels Like Home,* eds. Sheryn Morris, Christina Rice, James Sherman (Los Angeles: Photo Friends of the Los Angeles Public Library, 2018), 11.

432. Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza*, 50.

433. Estrada, 50.

population and its resulting disorder led to the desire for increased social stability through authority and control.[434]

The change in cultural and social power structures and the growth of the population who viewed themselves as an active citizenry enabled the creation of a library. Estrada states that this shift from Spanish colonial to Mexican rule allowed for particular "innovations in popular culture and ideology."[435] The ability to read denoted a differentiation of class and the creation of a library functioned as a key component in spreading Enlightenment ideals. A summarized history of "How the library was Established" argues that at this time "there was a steady growing realization of the need of books in the life of the community."[436] In an increasingly populated, diverse, and divided city, bringing the people residing within Los Angeles together through a single civic institution would ensure the values of enlightenment reached its populace.

Intertwined with the idea of "enlightening the masses," cultural institutions were being established in more major metropolitan areas to serve the purpose of rendering the masses docile and obedient through participation.[437] British sociologist Tony Bennett proposes that "forms and institutions of high culture might be enlisted for this governmental task in being assigned the purpose of civilizing the population as a whole."[438] In an increasingly populated, diverse, and fragmented city, bringing the people of Los Angeles together through a single civic institution

---

434. George Harwood Phillips, "Indians in Los Angeles, 1781-1875: Economic Integration, Social Disintegration," *Pacific Historical Review* 49, no. 3 (1980): 427–451.

435. Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza*, 50.

436. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 2.

437. Horkeimer and Adorno, "The Culture Industry."

438. Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics* (London: Routledge, 1995), 19.

would allow for the government to ensure the values of enlightenment were reaching its extensive populace.

Carol Duncan, a Marxist-feminist scholar, argues that controlling a citizenry would be "to control the representation of a community and its highest values and truths. It is also the power to define the relative standing of individuals within that community."[439] The library as an educational and cultural space for the citizenry thereby becomes a place in which new relations of production are formed, truths are displayed for the masses, and the public learns how to perform and reform within the space. A consequence of the power of social capital as it relates to reading in the life of the intellect is its resulting tie to the discourse on class distinction. While this uneven accumulation of capital would be generated as early as the first attempt, the effects on social relations at the library more fully transcended its second and third attempts, respectively.

Even with increased engagement by the *ciudadanos* to form the *Los Amigos del País* association, the library was dissolved within a year.[440] The perpetual restructuring of the populations—both culturally and physically—failed to produce the participation needed to sustain the civic and cultural organization in an increasingly disrupted Los Angeles. The creation and dissolution of the 1844 voluntary association foreshadowed the ways in a diverse and subjected populace was embedded in the city's development and restricted the ability to garner widespread support of the citizenry. The role of the library as a tool for social stratification through the accumulation of social capital would continue to be entangled in its two subsequent

439. Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 8.

440. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 9.

attempts to reform voluntary associations in 1859 and 1872, reflecting both a shift in the relations of the exchange of capital.

Following the tumultuous years of the Mexican American War, the second attempt to establish a library in Los Angeles was not made for another fifteen years, in 1859. While this attempt also ultimately failed, it occurred in a Los Angeles in which the dominant class and culture had again shifted. This time, the group was called the Library Association.[441] Having previously moved from Spanish to Mexican rule, the Hispanic-American Transition Period was again defined by social upheaval.[442] More Anglo-American wealth and cultural values moved into the area throughout the decade due to immigration from eastern and midwestern states. While Guillow argues that the Americans, unlike the Spanish, did not enforce assimilation by criminalizing customary practices and allowing for inclusion in democratic elections, a resounding fear of the Other remained.[443] These cultural clashes devolved into a riot in the central Plaza in 1856. The return of the formation of a voluntary association to create new social bonds, especially for the purposes of a centrally binding civic institution in 1859 by newcomers clarifies the role of social capital within the organization of the citizenry.

In addition to the early civic vision of the *ciudadanos,* Carey McWilliams, author of *Southern California: An Island on the Land,* argues that the newcomers provided a new opportunity for cultural production: “many of these early settlers were people of enterprise,

441. “Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920.”

442. Lawrence E. Guillow, “Pandemonium in the Plaza: The First Los Angeles Riot, July 22, 1856,” *Southern California Quarterly* 77, no. 3 (1995): 183.

443. Guillow, “Pandemonium in the Plaza,” 183-184.

talent, intellect, and culture. They had civic vision."[444] While the newcomers brought with them a cultural entrepreneurial drive, the local Mexican culture established at the Plaza continued to appear in direct opposition to these new Anglo-American ideals. Therefore, the drive to redefine civic participation returned as central to the city's development, but this time in transition to a newly established Anglo-American power elite within the increasingly sprawling city.

Unlike the development of the structure of the pueblo under the Spanish system, where the residences of the power-elite clustered around the Plaza in the center of town, Estrada argues that by the mid-19th century Anglo elites began to choose to "dwell beyond the core of the city."[445] Even though the Los Angeles Almanac recorded twenty-six Americans living in Los Angeles in 1844, it also documented that the majority of the Anglo population were living outside of the Plaza at this time.[446] Current residents of the pueblo perceived the Anglo newcomers' cultural to be in direct opposition to theirs. Therefore, instead of remaining central, the Anglo population moved outward into separate communities, "for indeed, the Plaza's function as the center of civic and religious life was foreign to the Anglo city."[447] This cultural separation encouraged a fragmentation between cultures and communities, and thereby the social and financial support that would be needed to sustain the library project.

Just as in the first library attempt, the individuals involved in 1859 were again a group of leading citizens, specifically noted as the "well-known citizens" of Los Angeles.[448] As recorded

444. McWilliams. *Southern California*, 151.

445. Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza,* 26.

446. "Historical Resident Population: Spanish and Mexican Period, 1781 to 1846."

447. Estrada, *The Los Angeles Plaza,* 26.

448. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 2.

in "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," the leading citizens acknowledged for their involvement in the library included Myer J. Newmark, William H. Workman, and Samuel Foy. While each of these men were defined as leaders, they came from a variety of business, religious, and cultural backgrounds. A Jewish attorney, a midwestern rancher and soon-to-be politician, and Free Mason rancher-turned-businessman, respectively, they all possessed significant social capital to add to the collective group. In Harris Newmark's recounting of the establishment of the library, he also further includes "Felix Bachman, H. S. Allanson, and others," as well as John Temple, who served as the library President. As a result of their engagement in business, as well as in the Library Association, many of these men would also later become involved with the city government.[449]

For years, an assumption regarding the involvement in voluntary associations as a means to achieve social mobility pervaded both theoretical and scientific writings. Bourdieu's theories on the accumulation of capital explicitly describes the distinction between inheriting and earning capital. An individual may be predisposed to possessing capital through family inheritance, both in objective and embodied states, or can gain capital through self-improvement with credentials such as educational status or cultural exposure.[450] This theory of capital accumulation focuses on the individual, but in a group, the dense network of Bourdieu's theory becomes central to the voluntary association, with the collective backing of the whole. Capital and social mobility, therefore, are intricately connected with regard to networking opportunities and access to cultural affairs.

449. Harris Newmark, *Sixty Years in California, 1853-1913* (Location 4156--kindle).

450. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 244.

On the other hand, sociologists continue to search for evidence that voluntary associations specifically affect vertical social mobility. An early study on this phenomenon, was published by Louis Wirth in 1938 showing that voluntary associations were integral to the "way of life" in urban areas, accounting for the displacement of personal relations.[451] The propensity of the success of any voluntary association, however, was in the ability to move away from the needs of the individual towards the "needs of the average person."[452] The ability of "operate as leveling influences," instead of explicitly attempting to accumulate social capital for oneself would in turn produce more social capital, but not necessarily more social mobility.[453] The relations procured from the success within a role in the voluntary association, however, may lead to new opportunities for further accumulation.

Even later studies, when social mobility garnered special attention in the social sciences during the 1970s, were unable to determine any direct correlations between social mobility and voluntary associations in either a dissociative or socialization hypothesis. Alfred Mirande, professor of sociology, illustrates that social mobility negatively affected personal relationships but was positively correlated to participation in voluntary associations.[454] In other words, those who were already socially mobile tended to participate in groups as opposed to remaining stable with static and more intimate relationships. Within the exceptionalism of the growing city, its increasingly immigrating population, its sprawling character, and mission to redefine its identity,

---

451. Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 1 (1938): 1–24..

452. Wirth, 18.

453. Wirth, 18.

454. Alfred M. Mirande, "Social Mobility and Participation: The Dissociative and Socialization Hypotheses," *The Sociological Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (1973): 19–31.

those who were already mobile enough to move or travel to Los Angeles immersed and reinvented themselves within the formative social groups to guide the path of the city's future, as well as stake their role within its history.

When the third attempt of establishing a library resulted in the reformation of the Los Angeles Library Association in 1872, yet another new Los Angeles had emerged. Just as the shift between earlier social, political, and economic structures between dominant and subjective cultures, the increasingly dominant presence of Anglo-Americans in Los Angeles revitalized the opportunity for the creation of new social bonds embedded within a drive to whitewash the past and look towards creating a "city of the future."[455] In his book *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of its Mexican Past,* William Deverell traces the development of Los Angeles from a pueblo into a major metropolis by examining the "ideas whites, particularly elite, city-building whites, held about Mexicans."[456] By looking at these ideas that the elite class held about the vision for the city's future and the development of its civic institutions, he uncovers that the library was explicitly fashioned not by adapting to the needs of its populace, but to have the citizenry adapt to the cultural values of the dominant elite.

LALA was formally established with the backing of notably influential and wealthy individuals, including John G. Downey, T.W. Temple, and Ygnacio Sepulveda.[457] While some of these individuals were also part of the 1859 attempt, the noteworthiness of the fact that "over 200 civically engaged businessmen" were in attendance to determine if, how, and when this library movement would embark, shows the incredible momentum that this attempt had over earlier

455. Deverell, *Whitewashed Adobe*, 2.

456. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 7.

457. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 2.

ones.[458] Specifically, the 1872 founding of LALA illustrates that "its elite male founders envisioned that their organization would act as a potent symbol of their rapidly growing influence" in the city.[459] The momentum gained by each group over the previous attempt shows the increasing appeal and power of social capital to transform the relations of the community around a new civic and cultural institution. As such, each of the members' collective access to social capital exponentially increased over earlier attempts. The power of the collective backing of social capital within a dominant group transforms the relations of the community, especially social relations as they relate the cultural values in relation to the Other.

Notably, the Spanish participation in the endeavor was made evident: "At this meeting, when the Los Angeles Library Association was formed, sixty-six vice-presidents, whose names—including many Spanish representatives of the old regime—are part of the history of Southern California."[460] The participation of both Spanish and Anglo citizens in the third attempt indicates the elite leaders of the city coming together to pool their social capital to affect change to shift Los Angeles into their vision of the future. Nevertheless, the specific notation of "old regime" indicates the changing perspective of who was part of the future of Los Angeles, compared to those who are defined as being part of the past. This confirms that the role of Spanish citizens was becoming part of the erasure of a history of a changing Los Angeles as the social capital of the Anglo demographic as the dominant cultural group continued to grow.

---

458. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 5.

459. Jerry Cao, *Los Angeles Public Library* (Los Angeles: University of California, 1977), 69.

460. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 2.

Further, in the library's first decade of existence through the Los Angeles Library Association and as part of the municipal system, "[the main library] owned only one book in Spanish—a Spanish/English-Spanish dictionary—a circumstance that changed very little during subsequent decades."[461] Even though Mexicans were still prominent in Los Angeles, the books and materials donated reflected the values of the donors, not the values of the users. California historian Kevin Starr argues that books that would have donated from privately held collections were driven by "an effort to bring the world into Southern California, to seek out the symbols and artifacts of older civilizations so as to possess and re-express them locally."[462] These texts would not have reflected any form of local culture but would have been held by an elite class who valued Western and colonial cultures. As such, the materials donated to LALA to begin building its collection would have actively served to whitewash the Adobe values of Los Angeles and replace them with an elitist, European-facing value system of culture and education, further building upon the donated materials of the previous, Anglo-centric attempt.

Although Guillow argued that the Americans did not use a process of forced assimilation after the Mexican-American war, the Americanization of the public was made urgent and with a sense of pride by the 1870s: "From the Fiction Department are issued the magazines provided for home circulation and here also is to be found the collection of foreign literature…freely available for home reading and study and forming a nucleus for extension work in Americanization."[463] Stated in early library documents, and continuing into at least the 1920s, the focus on using the library as a tool to promote the Anglo-American image as another form of whitewashing took

---

461. Cao, 287.

462. Starr, *Material Dreams*, 334.

463. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 8.

place in and around Los Angeles at this time.[464] The process of Americanization through the use of texts, as well as the removal of un-American materials, Mexican and Spanish culture could be effectively whitewashed. By removing the language and culture of the Other, teaching the people how to be more "American," the embedded power of the library in civilizing the masses becomes explicit and reproduces socially stratified civic relations in the fragmented metropolis.

Throughout the various attempts, the city and its people continued their quest for community. As the first civic institution located downtown, its maneuvering and adaption to the shifting demographics and changing center of the city would indicate the library's resilience and determination for and by its community. As the city continued to grow, a permanent home for the library would become one of its greatest challenges in an ever shifting and disintegrating city. Moreover, as the library became an official part of the City of Los Angeles's growth plan, specifically the City Beautiful plan, it would come to define the library as a central and iconic civic structure to the identity of the city and its people.[465] In turn, the library's leadership, accessibility, and funding sources would all be forced to adapt to the ever-changing social relations of the library to the people.

The Rise of the Creative Class

The first attempt to establish the Hollywood Bowl using a voluntary association also serves as an early example of the formation of groups within the context the development of a social consciousness in Los Angeles. As journalist Hadley Meares shares, an interest in the establishment of more art-centric performances centers emerged at the turn of the 20th century:

---

464. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 2.

465. Charles Mulford Robinson, "Los Angeles, California: The City Beautiful," *Bureau of Governmental Research* (1907), 16.

> In early 1900s America, many artistically inclined progressive elites supported the pageantry movement, which sought to bring affordable history, dance, and music to the public in an effort to foster civic pride, teach moral lessons, and elevate public discourse. A rustic outdoor setting was considered ideal for these lofty goals. For cultural boosters, California, with its open blue skies, verdure covered canyons and ample cheap acreage, was indeed the promised land.[466]

In 1914, C. E. Toberman, a prominent land developer, hosted a vision to create a monument to music for Angelenos. *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* a history of the making of the iconic institution, describes how Toberman "had dreams of a great theatrical project in these hills rivalling Oberammergau," looking to Western European culture for inspiration.[467] A direct reflection of this sentiment arose in Los Angeles as the role of voluntary associations grew within expanding communities towards the creation of an outdoor musical theater.

The timeliness of Toberman's concept among other parallel efforts, as well as the uniqueness of the space of the outwardly expanding terrain of Los Angeles, meant that the establishment of the Hollywood Bowl faced few challenges outside of the competition for power through the accumulation of social capital. Many prominent society members were simultaneously developing similar ideas to seize an opportunity to lead his or her dream forward as the ultimate production of culture in the growing city. Author and historian Suzanne Muchnic states in her research about the development of culture and museums in Los Angeles at the turn of the century that, "It was time to provide the citizenry with the refinements and cultural amenities that distinguished older, more sophisticated urban centers."[468] Newcomers and leading citizens were engaging in an active search for ways to introduce a new means of capital

---

466. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

467. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 6.

468. Suzanne Muchnic, *LACMA So Far: Portrait of a Museum in the Making* (San Marino: The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, 2019), 10.

production for social and cultural gain to compete with other cities such as Chicago and New York.

While Toberman was scoping out land for this new cultural vision, a woman named Christine Whtherill Stevenson was also busy preparing for a similar display of culture, having already featured performances of "Julius Caesar" with over 5,000 actors in a natural amphitheater located in Griffith Park as early as 1916. After its success, "Stevenson sought to build a permanent amphitheater to produce her huge spectacles."[469] In 1918, Dr. T. Perceval Gerson, a physician, and Dr. H. Gale Atwater, a dentist, called a meeting to "form a community park and art center of a civic nature."[470] Separately, these disjointed but prominent and dedicated individuals showed a commitment to building what would become the Hollywood Bowl, searching for a new cultural endeavor for the city's populace in order to contradict any negative perceptions of Los Angeles as a "cultural desert"[471] and reimagine the future of the city.

In each of these separate efforts, these individuals were declared to be "ahead of [their] time."[472] Each attempted to fill the need for a cultural endeavor for the city and its populace, in addition to the opportunity to accumulate social capital, as had been witnessed through other contributory endeavors, including the Los Angeles Public Library. Richard Florida, author of *The Rise of the Creative Class,* illustrates how social capital pervades areas which have weak social bonds: "Weak ties are critical to the creative environment of a city of region because hey

469. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

470. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 5.

471. "Wise Fools," *The Daily Palo Alto* (Palo Alto, CA), April 24, 1923.

472. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 6.

allow for rapid entry of new people and rapid absorption of new ideas."[473] The demographically disperse and physically disjointed landscape of Los Angeles created the disconnections between one another and their communities, promoting the resulting influx of creativity and vision for idealism. Together, these passionate citizens became part of a durable network that would come to be known as the Theater Arts Alliance. The Alliance was officially incorporated in 1919, with Stevenson and Dr. Gerson elected as president as vice president, respectively.

The Alliance was unique for the reason that it gathered like-minded, yet socially disparate, individuals into one group. As highlighted by music professor Catherine Parsons Smith, the group consisted of a diverse team of leading visionaries, including "proponents of theater and champions of music, real estate developers and promotes of public parks, theosophists and agnostics."[474] By coming together to form the Alliance, they all shared in the collective backing of the group's social capital, with the urge to refine "the anti-intellectual, culturally unfocused Los Angeles."[475] With the addition of Hollywood elites to the Alliance, the location in the hills set just above Hollywood made the available land more suitable. The combined participation of the Hollywood elite, real estate developers, local business owners, and prominent women engaged in community affairs assured a social backing of the project across various segments of the population.

---

473. Richard Florida, *The Ride of the Creative Class* (New York: Basic Books, 2012), 285.

474. Catherine Parsons Smith, "Founding the Hollywood Bowl," University of Illinois Press, *American Music* 11, no 2 (1993): 208.

475. Dorothy Lamb Crawford, *Evenings On and Off the Roof: Pioneering Concerts in Los Angeles 1939-1971* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995), 13.

As witnessed by the early trial of the first attempt to establish the Los Angeles Public Library, a stable location and substantial financial support would be fundamental to the success and sustainability of the Bowl. Instead of focusing on the city center like the library in the plaza, Muchnic argues that cultural endeavors such as museums and universities—and by this time, branch libraries—were vacating the city for its outskirts, where the power elite clustered throughout the turn of the 20th century. By the beginning of the 1900s, the center of Los Angeles had come to be defined as an epicenter for uncivilized pastimes, including gambling, alcohol, and prostitution.[476] Unlike the Chamber of Commerce's vision of a library for Los Angeles as a symbol of growth of the city, the idea for a dedicated outdoor musical performance space was directly connected to the negative externalities of that growth. These instances signified the growing emphasis on moving both culture and capital outside of the city center to adapt to its decentralization.

The attempts to secure land for the endeavor required the capability of the leaders to be entrusted to parcels of land on which to establish the cultural center prior to engaging the civic efforts of the public. While Toberman had helped to secure three options on parcels totaling 60 acres, finding a space that was accessible, had natural acoustics, and was available for lease, "differences arose over use of the property…The Alliance was a house divided."[477] These differences of opinion led directly to the dissolution of the Alliance in 1920. Ultimately, the competitive nature of materializing the dream of Southern California in a period fixated on boosterism uncovered deep individual differences in what Los Angeles was to become: an

476. Muchnic, *LACMA So Far,* 8-9.

477. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 6.

emphasis on community bonding through religious performances or through a new focus on secular cultural programming.[478]

Kevin Starr's book, *Material Dreams: Southern California Through the 1920s,* theorizes that developing ideologies for the creation of a new Los Angeles was prevalent, planning and implementing them was often strenuous and poorly executed. Tracing how numerous individuals—tourists and newcomers alike—prophesized that their viewpoints and wealth alone could propel Los Angeles to be a cutting-edge city, Starr shows that the early 20th century indulged in the heroism of specific individuals as opposed to groups. From railroader to landowners, and bankers to publishers, each party saw that they could shape the future of the city in favor of their capitalist direction. The willingness of some of these individuals to form voluntary groups "as a means of reassociating and stabilizing themselves amidst the dislocations of their new circumstances" propelled endeavors that would not only serve profit-seekers, but also combine a more diverse set of needs of the larger population.[479] An association formed on the basis of like-minded yet of disparate talents is closer to representing the citizenry from which it was formed, but the individualistic goals of its members do not always align. The need for singular prestige—or making a name for oneself—thereby becomes a barrier to moving these projects from ideas to actions.

Under the auspice of secularization, the leaders reorganized into newly formed as the Community Park and Art Association within the same year. John C. Scott, Jr., American sociologist, argues that one of the deciding factors in the successful formation of voluntary

478. Starr, *Material Dreams,* 167.

479. Starr, 132.

associations appeared as a result of the separation of civic interests and religious institutions.[480] Those who followed this line of thinking remained in the new Association, including Toberman, due to his role in attaining the property. On the other hand, several new names appeared to replace the old, including additional new women in leadership positions: "Mrs. Blanchard was elected first president of the Association, Mr. Toberman, vice president, and a young and dynamic piano teacher, Artie Mason Carter, secretary."[481] According to Scott, the presence of women in leadership positions was also telltale of the use of private groups to articulate the vision of people whose race and gender were otherwise sequestered.[482] Notably, while the Community Park and Art Association still embraced their collective social capital, an even more comprehensive addition of social capital was introduced by Carter with her backing of the community at-large. In 1924, she became the first president of yet another newly reorganized and renamed private association for the Bowl, the Hollywood Bowl Association.[483]

For a few years, the attendance of a variety of the community was a positive aspect, producing a performance space that all Angelenos could participate in. As such, through her varied approaches in fundraising, reorganizing, remodeling, and campaigning, Carter had shaped the Hollywood Bowl into a uniquely designed cultural space for the community based on the collective backing of social capital from the citizenry. Starr argues again that, under Carter's leadership, the Bowl played an integral role:

---

480. John C. Scott, Jr. "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations," *American Sociological Review* 22, no. 3 (1957): 315.

481. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 6.

482. Scott, "Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations," 315.

483. Caroline Estes Smith, *The Philharmonic Orchestra of Los Angeles: The First Decade, 1919-1929* (Los Angeles: United Printing Company, 1930), 100.

> As an institution, the Hollywood Bowl underscored the popular, pageant-esque music was taking in Los Angeles…in the creation of community feeling and identity. In a city and region of people from elsewhere, with few highly developed civic institutions, music and music-related pageantry…provided an important bond among people struggling to reassert themselves in new surroundings.[484]

After gaining the full support of the community, however, leadership changes began to take place as other leaders and members of the Association searched for more exclusive social capital to be attributed and shared by the organization. Like the library, the Hollywood Bowl became implicated with individuals "denoting their positions in society"[485] through the associated activities embedded within the institutions. The added emphasis on the masses as a part of and benefitting from the effort removed the exclusivity of accumulated social capital and self-interest of involvement of the members in the Association.

Louis Adamic, a Slovene-American author mostly known for advocating for ethnic diversity in the United States, was writing essays about Los Angeles, its institutions, and its peoples. In an essay entitled, "The Bright Side of Los Angeles," Adamic complains of ever-present Folks:

> No matter where one goes and what one does, one cannot get away from The Folks in Los Angeles. They are everywhere and their influence is felt in well-night every phase of city life. They are simple, credulous souls; their bodies are afflicted with all sorts of arches and pains, real and imaginary; they are unimaginative and their cultural horizons are sadly limited.[486]

The Folks, or the common, as they arrived from different parts of the nation began to overwhelm not just the general population of Los Angeles, which by 1926 had become

---

484. Starr, *Material Dreams,* 166.

485. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 2.

486. Louis Adamic, "The Bright Side of Los Angeles," *Facts You Should Know About California,* ed. E. Haldeman-Julius. Little Blue Book, no. 752 (1927): 9-10.

predominantly white, but also overwhelm the few cultural institutions that existed. Carter's tiered system of pricing—anywhere from 10 cents to 50 cents—allowed varying segments of the populace to attend. No longer was the Hollywood Bowl a private affair; rather, it provided a unique opportunity for most of the population to mingle and bond as part of the growth of Los Angeles. The Association, which had originally formed to organize disparate individuals in their quest to build a new community, moved from a group to an institution: the aesthetic disposition of the music, displayed in a particular space, transformed it into an institution.[487] This granted access to its services and programs to the public and away from the bond of its members, moving the performances away from the status of a created work to subject to preferences in taste.

Within two years, Carter resigned by March in 1926 due to "constant antagonism to her ideas" from the board and other committee members.[488] The president role went to Mr. Toberman, who held the position for the next 17 years. He was then elected President Emeritus "in recognition of his many years supporting the institution financially and with wise counsel."[489] Ticket prices increased and more elitist performances from Western Europe were scheduled, ensuring a return to the exclusivity desired by the Bowl's unremitting leadership.

As a result of the created capital within these dense networks, voluntary associations led to its uneven accumulation for association leadership and members compared to that shared by the public. Because private associations can be public- or member-serving, many associations formed primarily based on the benefits attributed to its members. Even though these organizations create "social capital by forging communities of like-minded peers and

487. Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 22.

488. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

489. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 7.

strengthening the bonds of civic engagement," Kathleen McCarthy, author and professor of classics, argues that these homogeneous groups, often predetermined by location, class, race, or cause, frequently uphold social stratification and cultural reproduction.[490] The ability of private groups to simultaneously include and exclude certain segments of the population guarantees an uneven accumulation of capital across a diverse citizenry. As a philanthropic entity, voluntary associations can benefit both members and the public, but potentially at the cost of exposing philanthropy as an inherently inegalitarian sector, especially when its intrinsic value of social capital is replaced by financial capital.

A Reliance on Economic Capital

While social capital and social mobility may not be measurable for direct correlation in social scientific studies, economic capital and social mobility are more easily definable within the realm of charitable giving. Because economic participation in philanthropy requires surplus economic capital, it relates directly to income. History professor William H. Sewell measured donations across the 20th century and showed that middle class households accounted for almost half of charitable giving in the United States, along with participation in associations.[491] Beginning in the 1970s, however, local associations, including fraternal, nationality, and ethnic organizations, saw a decline in participation as it related to economic capital. The only type of organizations that witnessed growth during this time were national organizations which relied mostly on economic capital because of geographic distance from its supporters.[492] Social

490. McCarthy, *American Creed,* 5.

491. William H. Sewell, "Social Mobility and Social Participation," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 435 (1978): 239.

492. Sewell, 239.

mobility as interconnected with economic capital was thereby tied to middle-class households and above, as well as beyond geographic limitations of the local community.

When the middle class first evolved, it was centered on economic ability: "the opportunity to use a skill or an idea to make money and improve one's life."[493] Zoltan Acs, author of *Why Philanthropy Matters,* describes how middle-class engagement with philanthropy became driven by economic capital instead of time as social mobility became more closely tied to income and the ability it afforded to move within both place and association. The elite also embraced the promise of excess capital as a way for the middle-class to move from one class to the next through education and work.[494] The interconnectedness of social and economic capital, with the removal of time and leisure because it was now spent at school or work, promoted the reliance on economic capital to support local and national causes, instead of holding together community bonds.

As previously explored, Putnam's research also traces a steady decline of voluntary associations resulting from the shift from social capital to financial capital across the United States during the mid-20th century.[495] Yet, these shifts took place in Los Angeles much earlier. By the second attempt to form a library by the Library Association in 1859, association and participation was already being defined by subscription and membership dues. Similar to many other library models seen across the United States at this time, an initial fee of $5 was required to

493. Zoltan J. Acs, *Why Philanthropy Matters: How the Wealthy Give, and What It Means for Our Economic Well-Being* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 218.

494. Acs, *Why Philanthropy Matters,* 127.

495. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 123-124.

join the association, with $1 monthly dues for continued access the library's resources.[496] A lifetime membership was also available at $50.[497] Not yet operating under the concept of extraneous private philanthropy from its citizens, the maintenance and usage of the library was fixated on these fees. Most importantly, this was a payment that the majority of Angelenos could not afford.[498] As a result, the need for financial capital to participate in this private organization consolidated the capital of the elite while excluding those who did not possess excess capital.

When financial capital was not available in the form of cash, later participatory asks also included material donations. For example, at the initial meeting held by the Library Association, the citizenry was asked to participate by providing books and periodicals to build a collection. As a result, more interest in the library's success continued to unfold: a defining moment in this library attempt was "an immediate and important acquisition" of a collection of books from former Mayor of Los Angeles, Henry Mallus' private collection.[499] Association members appointed a specific committee to solicit memberships, gifts, and subscriptions from the community at large to encourage more financial support.[500] In fact, for the six months between the initial meeting and when the doors opened on September 24, accumulating participation from all classes was a priority.

With the additional role of individuals to participate in the association through philanthropic means, the community received a more overt call-to-action for monetary support,

---

496. Newmark, *Sixty Years in California,* 4156 (kindle)

497. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 9.

498. Newmark, *Sixty Years in California,* 4156 (kindle)

499. Newmark, 4156.

500. Dunning, "A Wanderer and Homeless Waif," 12.

with a new opportunity to accumulate social capital. For the official launch of the Association, a formal meeting was called through a public announcement that ran in the *Los Angeles Star*: "All who are disposed to aid in establishing a library and reading-room in the city are requested to meet at Wells, Fargo and Company's Express Office, on Monday evening, April 4, 1859, at 7 o'clock."[501] The announcement, put in the paper two days prior to the meeting, aimed to encourage a wider participation of the public in the endeavor, one that the *Star* confidently declared was "to prove successful."[502] The mention of success served to encourage philanthropic support as people tend to support organizations that show promise and have trustworthy leadership.[503]

The publication also sought to further incorporate the population at-large, extending the durable network afforded to the library through its leading members.[504] As social capital became concentrated within the voluntary association, the leaders were able to gain an increasingly uneven advantage in accumulating social capital, but it also continued to draw in more members. As Bourdieu explains, "The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize."[505] Moreover, the leaders of the voluntary association had the ability of "committing the social capital of the whole group."[506]

---

501. *Los Angeles Star*, April 2, 1859.

502. *Los Angeles Star*, April 2, 1859.

503. Eugene R. Temple, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame, *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising* (Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016), 227.

504. Bourdieu, *Distinction*, 21.

505. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 249.

506. Bourdieu, 251.

The larger the network, the larger quantity of cumulative social capital available to an individual to possess and apply. In other words, a leader or representative of LALA individual wields the power of the sum of the collective social capital to influence decision-making and policies outside of the group. Even while the institution provided a public benefit as more of the citizenry was invited to participate, leaders and members continued to unevenly accumulate social capital.

In follow-up articles in the *Los Angeles Star,* the Library Association hoped that "citizens of all classes [would] rally to its support."[507] In this way, the voluntary association continued to amass social capital for the collective while functioning based on a financial foundation for a more sustainable operation. As opposed to encouraging access through material donations or time, participation required financial contributions as in the example of the initial voluntary association, when the doors to the library opened on September 15, 1859, the *Los Angeles Star* declared that the "terms of subscription are within reach of all."[508] This declaration served as an inclusionary note that the library was an organization devoted to the public good, but it, in fact, continued to exclude those without the necessary economic capital required.

The requirement for financial capital to gain access to the association's services solidified the exclusionary nature of the group. Amy Gutmann, author and president of the University of Pennsylvania, argues that creating an ideal voluntary association in actual contexts is complicated due to their potential to exclude participants. While de Tocqueville's praise of the American voluntary association centered on its democratic principles, Gutmann argues that the ability to associate with an intention of discrimination prevents democracy from taking place: "People who want to join voluntary groups but are prevented by doing so by prejudice…do not

507. *Los Angeles Star*, September 24, 1859.

508. *Los Angeles Star*, September 24, 1859.

enjoy equal freedom of association."[509] Although not an explicit form of racial, gender, or ethnic discrimination, the financial basis of the Library Association created a new form of exclusion for those who did not possess surplus economic capital. The interconnection between social and economic mobility hence became more prevalent in the movement away from accumulating social capital from volunteering instead of donating.

The Library Association was unable sustain its services with the requirement of financial capital through which to participate. When volunteer time and social capital were integral to the group's success, in addition to new material donations, the public engaged civically with the initiative. However, the move to a financial capital-centric model limited access to the citizenry that the group was attempting to engage. This paradox of the shift from a social capital-centric establishment to a financially based one fostered the reliance on financial capital as a means for disbanding the Association within two years of its establishment. The physical, religious, and cultural separation between communities also meant that the city's early civic organizations became disintegrated, including their financial support.

Through the uneven accumulation of capital through the Association, the newcomers' "conception of the good life so shaped the landscape, community, and government of Los Angeles as to leave an indelible imprint on the character of their adopted metropolis" by the systematic creation of decentralized fragmentation waned.[510] The group dissolved due to its inability to concretize the central civic duty of the institution beyond its core leadership and membership, making it inaccessible to the public. Nevertheless, the growing group of leaders

509. Amy Gutmann, "The Value of Voluntary Groups," *Identity in Democracy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 87.

510. Fogelson, *The Fragmented Metropolis,* 84.

involved in the Library Association over *Los Amigos del País*, in addition to specific leaders' names being recorded for the first time, indicates that the Library Association had indeed provided more social capital for its leaders than in the first attempt. This recognition enticed some of its members to return to its efforts in 1872, under the name of the Los Angeles Library Association, remaining an exclusively male affair.

In the case of the Hollywood Bowl, however, financial capital played a significantly different role during its transition between an inclusive and exclusive space. The Alliance encountered issues similar to those of the early attempts by the associations for the Los Angeles Public Library, including securing a location, as well as financial funding. Instead of letting funding issues tear apart the prospect of succeeding and disbanding the group, Association members were personally dedicated to keeping the Hollywood Bowl initiative funded, regardless of the cost.[511] Without an external philanthropic strategy in place, leadership members of the Alliance fronted personal funds, took out loans, and paid off debts to continue to manage the prospects for the Bowl to exist. Namely, donated funds and loans came from Stevenson, president of the Alliance, and her friend, Mrs. Chauncey Clark.[512] While the Library was first free for use and later became reliant on membership dues, the Hollywood Bowl relied on funding only from its leadership to carry the sustainability of the Bowl to the free programming and services for the public.

When Artie Mason Carter, a piano teacher, was newly appointed to a leadership position, community members supported her as a representative of the community at large. Instead of

---

511. Hollywood Bowl Association, *A Brief History: Symphonies Under the Stars,* Board of Directors, 1926.

512. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

relying on financial support strictly from leadership, Carter enlisted the help of the citizenry, as well as the government and local businessmen, to financially guide its social relations. As Jones's *Hollywood Bowl* reported: "I voted for your sewers when you wanted them; now you vote for my symphonies!"[513] Her ability to maneuver the politics within the volunteer group, Los Angeles government officials, and members from the public to build a financial base for the Bowl to make it accessible to the public showed the reliance of the Bowl's success on financial capital in its early days.

Carter's requests to the community to raise the funds to pay for the musicians to perform on a regular basis were always urgent: "she tore into the effort with the zeal and passion of a crusade. Her unbounded enthusiasm and idealism attracted many loyal followers."[514] Driven by belief that the Bowl represented an integral value system of Angelenos as a whole, she aligned her fundraising efforts with that of the community spirit. As such, she endeavored to bring the Bowl to the people and the people to the Bowl through philanthropy by moving beyond the Association members and attendees at performances:

> Pasteboard Penny Banks were distributed to stores, banks and offices along Hollywood Boulevard. A society circus was held in the Bowl with motion picture stars as patrons and patronesses. The indomitable Mrs. Carter rang doorbells cajoled and wheedled for money in large sums and small. She rallied eager workers to the cause. When interest lagged, she even sold her one and only diamond ring to bolster the funds in the cause to which she was dedicated. She had courage and daring. Financial needs were met in many ways.[515]

Carter's foresight to emphasize community outreach made her fundraising efforts to support the Bowl more personable and accessible than simply asking within the Association's

---

513. Isabel Morse Jones, *Hollywood Bowl* (Los Angeles: Hollywood Bowl Association, 1920), 58.

514. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 9.

515. Northcutt, 9-10.

members or for membership dues: “We raised the first thousands by popular subscription. Then see how interested they all were in the Bowl because it was their own! In no other way than by sharing the responsibility can we make music the veritable possession of the people.”[516] By making the Bowl a democratic, popular, and inclusive space for musical performance, individuals could identify their contribution to its establishment. Notably, “the penny boxes caught on. Tourists here for the summer carried the little yellow boxes home with them and wrote for more. The Boy Scouts of France sent $100. Help came from many unexpected sources.”[517] The penny boxes alone raised over $6,000.

By including fundraising through penny boxes and a Hollywood Bowl dinner, Carter combined the public with asks to the elite. The Hollywood Bowl dinner event raised over $8,900 in less than twenty minutes from three-hundred people.[518] She also asked prominent members of the music community to become the founding members of the Alliance by pledging $1,000 each.[519] Carter’s early fundraising efforts encouraged a sense of community spirit was reinforced and progressed the Bowl’s reputation, both in Los Angeles and beyond. She “traveled around the country, granting interviews, raising money, giving lectures, and promoting Los Angeles and the Bowl,” a recruitment tool to help spread a new image of culture and progress of this new city in the west.[520] At the same time, with funding provided by the County, construction began with a

516. Jones, *Hollywood Bowl,* 37.

517. Jones, 10.

518. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 10.

519. Jones, *Hollywood Bowl,* 13.

520. Catherine Parsons Smith, *Making Music in Los Angeles: Transforming the Popular* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 149.

$100,000 improvement project, transforming the Bowl from "a weed-filled dell into a sleek modern amphitheater."[521] The proliferation of making the Bowl's establishment a community-wide effort, combined with a public-private philanthropic partnership in enhancing the Bowl for the public good, concretized its role as an iconic civic institution.

As Carter successfully facilitated the support of the citizenry to finance the Bowl's programming, the incorporation of the public's interests and preferences for performances was not embraced by those seeking further capital accumulation from the Bowl's reputation beyond the local populace. After two years of making the association a successful endeavor based within the realms of collective financial capital, Carter was removed from the association through a mix of misogyny and power on behalf of the *Los Angeles Times,* replacing inclusion of the public in the free summer series known as the "Symphonies Under the Stars" with specific exclusionary methods, including higher pricing tactics.[522] Upon Carter's departure, the Association lost not only the financial support of the public, but also the collective social capital from Carter's supporters and followers. Notably, Aline Barnsdall, an ally of Carter, withdrew her five-figure donation and removed her name from the list of founders.[523]

Leading up to the summer of 1951, the Hollywood Bowl, "Southern California's cultural center," was reputed as "internationally famous as the site of some of the world's finest musical productions."[524] The marketing around the summer series was overwhelmingly full of pride and

---

521. Smith, "Founding the Hollywood Bowl," 217.

522. Smith, *Making Music in Los Angeles,* 211.

523. Norman M. and Dorothy K. Karasick, *The Oilman's Daughter: A Biography of Aline Barnsdall* (Encino: Carleston Publishing, 1993), 91.

524. "Hollywood Bowl Pamphlet," *LA Philharmonic Scrapbook,* Los Angeles Hollywood Bowl Special Collections, 1951.

anticipation of greatness for the City of Los Angeles. As celebrated in one of its published summer schedule pamphlets: "Nowhere will you find so many great artists, so many famous productions, so much high-level entertainment, and all in one season."[525] While its communications sold its cultural prominence to citizens in Los Angeles and beyond, it was also a symbol for the progress of Los Angeles in relation to the rest of growing urban centers across the United States.

The public could not immediately trace the effects of this shift, but the Bowl's reliance on both financial and social capital provided by the masses to support the endeavors of the elite was not replaceable solely by its founding members and voluntary leadership. As dynamics of the workforce and the nuclear family shifted in the mid-twentieth century, so, too, did the availability of one's time to participate in-person.[526] Even as individuals sought to uphold the membership of these voluntary associations to benefit from the opportunity to accumulate social capital, as well as participate in the attendance to the Bowl's performances, the Bowl's early reliance on financial capital and the pricing out of the public. The Hollywood Bowl, for which Carter had raised significant funding, would soon need to be saved through a new form philanthropy—the mass campaign—in 1951.

In the end, financial capital maintained the existence of voluntary associations for a time, but as previously mentioned, "social capital is a more powerful predictor of philanthropy than is financial capital."[527] The dense networks created by voluntary associations served as a better

---

525. "Hollywood Bowl Pamphlet."

526. Gamm and Putnam, "The Growth of Voluntary Associations," 544.

527. Putnam, *Bowling Alone,* 120.

indicator of how likely an individual would participate in philanthropy through the distribution of financial capital. Without the social capital upholding the foundation of these integral associations, the evidence of both the various Library and Hollywood Bowl associations disbanding within the shifts from social capital to financial capital illustrates that the inequities of accumulation were only perpetuated for the purposes of social stratification. The revitalization of the importance of building community through more equal accumulation and distributions of capital would become vital for the success of these endeavors.

Embracing Community Support

Throughout the attempts made to sustainably establish a library in Los Angeles in 1844 and 1859, several critical factors were necessary to gain substantial social capital. The library needed to incorporate a growing and diverse population as both members and users, adjusting financial strategies away from fixed membership dues and fees towards a more inclusive philanthropy, as well as adapt to the physical and social transitional nature of the city. Whereas earlier attempts to sustain a voluntary association for the library signified an inversion of cooperation on behalf of the citizenry, the third and final attempt that led to the ownership of the entity by the municipality unveiled the radical possibilities of inclusionary practices through social capital for the public good.

Noting the community support of the Los Angeles Library Association since its official formation in 1872, and the potential of the library to be a key civic institution to the city, the Los Angeles City Council sought to formally take control of it as a city-run institution. LALA had effectively experimented with the library as a social program and influencing both public opinion and policy to encourage the city to use this endeavor as its instance of contributory philanthropy. As a result, the city desired to bring the library under the control of the government, making it a

public resource as opposed to a private one as opposed to its current members-only, exclusive approach. When the city officially annexed LALA only two years later, in 1874, it became the first public library system in Los Angeles, and was officially re-named the "Los Angeles Public Library."[528]

During the 20th century, public libraries joined public schools as the only tax-supported intuitions in the United States dedicated to the civilizing function of knowledge and learning for the masses.[529] The library as an institution became a space through which cultural hierarchies were put on display. The patrons were to absorb the collections as deemed appropriate by the librarians, but the demand for popular periodicals, fiction, and non-fiction materials soon led to a shift within the library's structure itself: separating civilizing and entertainment collections from one another. History professor Abigail Van Slyck illustrates how this was also met with the distancing of race, gender, and age within the library space. Reading rooms were created by the social elite who "tended to claim the pursuit of culture as an upper-class activity and to see even publicly supported libraries as essentially elite institutions that could be opened to the public only with the benefit of fatherly wisdom and foresight."[530] Even as library entities became publicly owned institutions, their transition from private associations carried forward enlightenment and civilizing ideals within the hierarchy of social relations.

Putnam's theories on social capital garner a significant basis for the understanding of the individual accumulation of social capital within formal associations, but he fails to recognize the

528. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 4.

529. Sidney H. Ditzion, *Arsenal of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Library Movement from 1850 to 1900* (American Library Association, 1947), 9.

530. Abigail A. Van Slyck, "The Lady and the Library Loafer: Gender and Public Space in Victorian America," *Winterthur Portfolio* 31, no. 4 (1996), 228.

relationship of social capital to institutions. In the shift from the library from an association to an institution, the relation between its exclusive membership and the inclusive public significantly shifts. As Bob Edwards and Michael Foley review, Putnam's selective attention to the individual-level analysis ignores the "institutionalized monitoring, insurance, and regulation themselves help to build cooperation, and yes, even social capital."[531] The municipal control over the entity replaces the bonding formulation of the financial-centric membership for access to books and literature. Instead, this new instrument for bridging social capital enhances the well-being of the public at large by becoming a free entity through which reading is a service provided to the masses at no cost.

The library officially became free to the public in 1891 and championed a slogan of "free for all," shifting away from membership fees which had served as an exclusionary practice using financial capital to support its early growth.[532] Whilst the library space and its resources were now accessible to the public, the process of checking out books was still restricted. Only citizens who owned property were able to physically remove books from the library building with the agreement to return them at a later date. Over the next several decades, the rules about who really constituted "all" became increasingly inclusive, open to those who did not own property, including men, women, and children.[533]

The alterations of the library's accessibility forced the community to adjust to a more inclusionary model, much like the library itself to the changing landscape of Los Angeles:

---

531. Bob Edwards and Michael W. Foley, "Much Ado About Social Capital," *Contemporary Sociology* 30, 3 (2001): 227-230.

532. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 15.

533. "Library Rules Modified," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 4, 1913.

> As many library historians have observed, women as well as men became increasingly inclined to use reading as a way of denoting their positions in society. Literature and libraries were thus imbued with a central role in the intellectual, political, and economic life of American communities; public libraries, in particular, helped to define civic identity.[534]

Throughout the attempts at establishing a library, the dominant group, represented by those who were also consequently in charge of the associations, influenced the ways in which materials were made accessible, and thereby how the citizens were trained into the city's new civic identity. But as the association became an institution, the usership changed. Not only was there momentum achieved through the gain of social capital through the voluntary association attempts at establishing a library, but each attempt also highlights the ways in which social capital allowed for the tensions between cultural and ethnic groups to emerge into institutionalized culture. Social capital therefore not only influenced the ways in which the library was established, but also the ways in which it was used.

The expanded use and access to the resources also transformed the institutional relations into an increasingly divided citizenry, focusing on differences between race, class, and gender within its walls. Significantly, the struggle of catering to women and children while also to the lower classes became a point of contention:

> …a 'lady'—we use the word advisedly—who once stood squeamishly on the threshold of the reading room of the Los Angeles public library and said, pointing, disdainfully at the poorly dressed occupants: 'Why do they let those persons in? They're dirty. The room smells. They soil the magazines and papers. It's a disgrace. What decent person wants to mingle with such trash?[535]

To which the newspaper editor comments:

> If the public reading rooms "smells", "lady", it's an argument not for 'exclusion of the lower classes,' but for a big, generous-spaced, well-ventilated reading room—perhaps

534. Breisch, *The Los Angeles Central Library,* 2.

535. "Los Angeles! You Need a Library!"

with a bath-room attached! It's an argument for a new library building and the adoption of the $2,500,000 library bonds.[536]

While the library was established "in the best spirit of social service," the library became a central hub for the discourse on class and gender relations within the community.[537] As more and more users came to the library for its resources, not everyone showed their appreciation in this expanding audience. Following the theories of history professor Alexis McCrossen, the library's connection to a source of leisure disrupted its totalitarian authority upon civilizing the population into incorporating entertainment ideals of the public.[538] These shifts forced public libraries to determine their role in culture while remaining relevant to an increasingly diverse population. The desire to uphold the hierarchy of Culture while providing resources to the masses required the library as an institution to both spatially and temporally define the abstract concept of the public through their policies related to access.[539]

The prior focus of the association's social capital on the individual—or micro—level helps to illustrate the strain between the shift from the exclusivity of the users to being open to the public. As illustrated by Dutch professor and economist Sjoerd Beugelsdijk, micro levels of trust created by social capital is the most widely studied area but limits an understanding beyond how individuals interact with groups through relations of trust. Alternatively, macro social

536. "Los Angeles! You Need a Library!"

537. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 7.

538. Alexis McCrossen, "'One Cathedral More' or 'Mere Lounging Places for Bummers'? The Cultural Politics of Leisure and the Public Library in Gilded Age America." *Libraries & Culture* 41, no. 2 (2006): 170.

539. McCrossen, 180.

capital relates to the function of entire systems, specifically bureaucratic.[540] The way in which the library operates for the community instead of for individuals or exclusionary groups shapes the way in which the elite and the common must adapt to being in alignment in the same social system and physical space.

Without a single centralized location, much of the Los Angeles Public Library's original expansion took place through the implementation of reading rooms, book depositories, and delivery stations to reach a larger community. Adapting to Los Angeles's unique "sprawling, rambling, disjointed" layout, branch libraries were a viable option through which book collections could be accessed by its dispersed public.[541] Communities funded the branch libraries themselves through private donations, in addition to the provision of a building. After a year of probation, the city assessed the services of the library and then determined as to whether it would become part of the Los Angeles Public Library system. If deemed satisfactory, the city government would then take over the library building and collection, continuing to fund it in its entirety.[542] The promise of city-supported funds to provide services to communities across growing Los Angeles inspired neighborhoods to come together around libraries to expand civic engagement. By 1910, the city had established twelve branches and fourteen deposit stations, and more than a handful of reading rooms.[543]

---

540. Sjoerd Beugelsdijk, "A Multilevel Approach to Social Capital," *International Studies of Management & Organization* 39, no. 2 (2009): 67-70.

541. Robinson, "Los Angeles, California: The City Beautiful," 16.

542. "Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920," 11.

543. "Historical Notes," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1992.

Because the citizenry's inclination to use the library had adapted to the shifting relations of the voluntary associations throughout the second half of the 19th century, library leaders, members, and users viewed the purpose of the library in competing and often contrasting ways. The library's new inclusive paradigm of free access to all led to its overt overcrowding, both with books and people. The librarians complained that the "lack of space and air conditioning made for difficult working conditions," leading to a one-day "sickout."[544] Moreover, the lack of social prestige had been eliminated when the Los Angeles Library Association disbanded, which ended the private stream of funding for the library. The library erupted into literal flames in 1986 after decades of social and philanthropic neglect. As a result, the library needed to be revitalized by private philanthropic sources through the Save the Books mass campaign, reigniting both the social reality and imaginary to engage the citizenry in civics for the public good.

The Hollywood Bowl similarly experienced social and financial peril in 1951, but under circumstances in opposition to those of the library. As previously mentioned, the Hollywood Bowl's early days were inspired by the incorporation of the masses and minorities, and even attributed to the extensive involvement of women in leadership roles. In an article entitled, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles the Athens of America," author Hadley Mears points to this unique participation of women in creating a cultural space in Los Angeles. Hadley argues that the Hollywood Bowl is "entrenched in our community's cultural fabric, thanks in large part to remarkable women (and a couple of Griffith men) who worked tirelessly to bring outdoor pomp and pageantry permanently to the masses."[545] On the other hand, some histories of the Bowl

544. "Tom Bradley Wing: History and Design." Los Angeles Public Library. Accessed January 29, 2020. https://www.lapl.org/branches/central-library/art-architecture/tom-bradley-wing

545. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

simply disregard the inclusion of women for much of its history in the predominantly male elite space of philanthropy and culture.[546] Notably, women at the Bowl accumulated substantial social capital early in its history, even throughout the rapid associational changes.

While the Hollywood Bowl began as a free and open space and later moved to ticketing—the opposite of the library's tactics—its incorporation of the public was often viewed as a similar space for respite for the citizenry. As Northcutt states, "Hollywood Bowl is a meeting place for men and women of all races and creeds – searching for wholesome pleasure, spiritual blessings, education, enlightenment, amusement, diversified entertainment, and seeking surcease from the cares and agitations of the day."[547] As in news articles published in the *Los Angeles Times* about the various races and creeds visiting the Library, the Hollywood Bowl was accessed by a wide breadth of Angelenos.

The Bowl not only provided access to the public, it also specifically hosted performances that embraced the cultural diversity of the city. Spanish-speaking performances were common, as well as German-language events.[548] As the Anglo-American population continued to grow in the region, however, many of the other venues in Los Angeles catered exclusively to English-speaking audiences, enhancing the need for the Bowl to continue to uphold a diverse audience by representing its dedicated audience. The Bowl organizers discussed increasing ticket prices to reflect the models taken by other musical performance centers, such as in San Francisco, to mimic other local theaters and to elevate its programming. At this time, however, even the *Los*

546. John Orlando Northcutt, *Magic Valley: The Story of the Hollywood Bowl,* Fashion Press, Inc. 1976.

547. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 3.

548. John Koegel, "Canciones del Pais: Mexican Musical Life in California After the Gold Rush," *California History* 78, no 3. (1999): 160-87, 215-19.

Angeles Times argued that "These high prices result in exclusiveness, shutting out that large class in the community who are able to pay only a fair price for being entertained, but whose combined contributions would make a much better showing than the larger sums paid by the wealthy."[549] The *Los Angeles Times* would later change their stance on this.

As previously examined, Carter's leadership extended beyond her role as secretary, and later as president, not only including organizing community sings but also halting construction in nearby areas and managing to permanently secure the land, all within two years of the first summer concert.[550] Her focus on community philanthropy even further enhanced the efforts to secure the Hollywood Bowl's role in civic and cultural engagement in Los Angeles. For example, Carter's efforts spurred a new attention for the Bowl and at an on-stage plea at the end of the 1923 season, asking attendees to pay off the remaining debt, raising a total of $9,000 that night. She ended the evening with a ceremonious burning of the actual mortgage document on stage in front of the audience.[551] While the board of directors of the Association were supportive of her successes and ideas to secure the Bowl for the community, "there were large blocks of skepticism and gave doubt that such a far-fetched scheme could work out."[552] While she was an integral part of the leadership team, and certainly contributed to the collective social capital of the Association, many of the other leaders saw her enthusiasm for community involvement as a

549. "The Prices Too High," *Los Angeles Times.* May 19, 1887.

550. Meares, "The Women Who Made Los Angeles."

551. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story,* 12.

552. John Jenken and Michael Buckland, *The Hollywood Bowl: Tales of Summer Nights* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), 52.

potential threat to their rapid accumulation of capital within the Association in comparison to the community at-large.

Due to Carter's unique approach to engaging the community through segmenting the elite groups and the masses, her fundraising for the Bowl "proved to be a lively Adventure in Neighborliness."[553] As Bourdieu argues, one influence of social capital is upon transforming neighborhood relations.[554] The incorporation of the community into the group's methods for the rapid accumulation of social capital allows for transforming the community while also benefiting from it. Moreover, in this way, social capital was being unevenly accumulated by the Association, while also bringing the fragmented communities of Los Angeles together.

Carter, referred to as the "Mother of Symphonies Under the Stars," amongst other nicknames including "the Bowl lady," and "soul of the Bowl," continued to add programming for the community, contributing to the Bowl's as an integral cultural institution within Los Angeles' growing reputation as the "Athens of America."[555] In 1924, the Bowl's land deed was issued to the County, making "all Los Angeles County residents joint owners of the Bowl. No Roman amphitheater of the famous days was more democratic than this."[556] Angelenos now had a larger sense of community across Los Angeles, as well as actively participating in the cultural growth of the city. In this moment, the Hollywood Bowl moved beyond the exclusivity of the elites and members of the Association, allowing citizens to benefit from the accumulation of the

553. Jenken and Buckland, 10.

554. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 249.

555. David Fine, *Imagining Los Angeles: A City in Fiction* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2000), 123.

556. Caroline Cube, "Hollywood Bowlsheviks," University of California, Los Angeles: Library Special Collections, December 1, 2015.

capital for the community at large. Compared to the endeavor of establishing the library, which began as an elite endeavor and remained exclusive with restrictions for visitors and borrowers for decades after it was founded, the Hollywood Bowl began by being focused on the gathering of everyone in the community, and gradually became more expensive and exclusive.

After Carter's departure however, the Bowl's leadership insisted on raising ticket prices and shifting the goals of its performances away from the community and towards high culture. Increasing national tensions on issues of immigration and anti-Semitism played out in the decisions around what to play at the Bowl. A perception of the growing cultural distance between the classical and the popular was reflected in a the racially shifting audiences who were participating in both music-making and attending musical performances across the city.[557] Europe's ultramodern music and the development of commercial popular music meant that an emerging class of wage earners had both leisure time and discretionary money to spend. This population of Los Angeles demanded more engagement with the popular, yet the subscribers rejected these, complaining that programs were "too popular and too light."[558]

In the years leading up to the Bowl's closure, the media, including the *Los Angeles Times,* discussed the need for diversification of both the performances and audiences. Many of the recent seasons saw a decline in attendance by the public and the community had suggested aligning the performances to public preference: "The demands of the public's musical tastes have widened until the Bowl cannot sustain itself on strictly symphonic programs…As a result, the Hollywood Bowl Association has set itself to develop program that will appeal to the entire

557. *Los Angeles County Culture and the Community* (Los Angeles: Civic Bureau of Music and Art of Los Angeles, 1927), 7.

558. Gene Sherman, "Even a Briton Conceded Long Ago that the Bowl was Something Heroic," *Los Angeles Times,* July 25, 1951.

public…keeping in mind that the Hollywood Bowl is owned by all the people of Los Angeles County."[559] Moreover, the Bowl could become a center for social and cultural capital to be made accessible to many Angelenos at an affordable price.[560] By returning to a focus on the public as opposed to the elite, the Bowl's capital misfortunes were spared and its reputation renewed.

Ultimately, the Hollywood Bowl's establishment and early days were not focused the elite and the production of exclusive cultural capital. Instead, the Bowl's early success was driven by affordability, access, and performances for the public. The Bowl's embeddedness within the community was predominantly due to the inclusion of women in leadership, in particular, Mrs. Carter. By involving the citizenry in the successful philanthropy of the project, she also allowed for the shared experience of accumulating social capital for participants across the city, not just limited to members of the Alliance. Unsurprisingly, after several years of trending towards more exclusive and elite performances in order to recuperate the exclusive accumulation of both social and cultural capital, the Bowl lost its collective backing from the citizenry, forging one of Los Angeles's largest cultural financial descents. The story of saving the institution that followed these crises changed the course of philanthropy in Los Angeles as an inclusive emergency practice.

Conclusion

Exploring the role of voluntary associations as the founding groups of two of Los Angeles's most prominent civic and cultural institutions uncovers the embedded social and

559. Cordell Hicks, "Hollywood Bowl Interest Grows as Opening Near: Women's Groups Taking Lead to Assure Season's Success," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 1, 1951.

560. Albert Goldberg, "The Sounding Board: Hollywood at the Crossroads," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), September 11, 1949.

cultural formations of capital as they continue to inform the ways in which philanthropy is conducted today. For the Library, the progression of accumulating social capital through the creation of private organizations in culturally transitional eras indicates the adaptation of acquiring membership and funding to sustain the association. While the library initially provided exclusive access based on financial capital in a centralized location, it later became free and open to the public. The Central Library became so popular and accessible that the elite relinquished their support of the endeavor. The building itself became overcrowded and overpopulated with books, without any financial backing to solve the issues, eventually leading to the arson attempts that closed the building for six years. As inclusive access abounded, the once social capital-rich institution lost the backing of its exclusive private associational durable network, leading to its ultimate deterioration decades later.

Similarly, the Bowl began with voluntary associations that provided its leadership with opportunities to unevenly acquire social capital. On the other hand, individuals involved in the community through music and the arts held significant leadership roles and enhanced the availability of social and cultural capital to the community at-large. Shared as a cultural resource with the citizenry, the various formations of groups tied to the Hollywood Bowl incorporated community-based philanthropy into its efforts and emphasized the ownership of the site by the citizenry. Nevertheless, Bowl leadership continuously revamped its volunteer groups, withdrawing its commitment to affordable and accessible programming over time, instead focusing on elitist performances. The capital accumulated by the members of the association in control of the programming of the Bowl's season was significantly greater than those of who attended, rendering the performances inadmissible to the public due to both cost and interest. This thereby led to such a lack of sales that the Hollywood Bowl was forced to cancel its

programming only two weeks into the 1951 season. The once social capital-rich institution through the collective backing of the community lost its support due to an increasingly elitist and exclusive approach, leading to its ultimate lack of attendance and underfunding.

Albeit formed through democratic principles, voluntary associations simultaneously led to the uneven accumulation of social capital exclusively for association members. Questions of race, gender, ethnicity, and religion contributed to the underlying tensions around their formation and the inclusion or exclusion of specific segments of the population. Because voluntary associations can be public- or member-serving, many have been formed primarily based on the benefits attributed to the members from being involved with the group. The accumulation of social capital becomes embedded within the voluntary organization as a philanthropic entity. As Payton and Moody explain, "philanthropy's impact on society is only because of voluntary associations."[561] These groups seek to ensure the betterment of society through philanthropy to establish new and lasting cultural institutions. They also provide individual members with cumulative capital, benefiting from the in-group network. The uneven accumulation of capital produced through the formation of and participation in these groups allows members to gain an uneven advantage, especially in as disconnected a city as Los Angeles. Without the assembled action of individuals who come together in search of community and the public good, with the added benefit of self-interested capital gains, the gaps left behind by government policies and programs would be ignored.

At times, the voluntary organizations consolidated disparate individuals in search for community through civic and cultural institutions, providing the citizenry at-large with increased opportunities to accumulate social and cultural capital; at others, they solidified the already-

561. Payton and Moody, *Understanding Philanthropy*, 28.

fragmented communities and augmented social stratification through leadership networks and exclusive memberships. They reinforced the fragmentation of the metropolis in two ways: by separating like-minded groups into disparate and oftentimes segregated communities, and by facilitating the uneven accumulation of social capital across the city. By weaving together the private organizations across the disjointed landscape to form an overarching city, Los Angeles became a complex yet intricate fabric demarcated by its unique cultural, geographical, social, and political entities, forming its rhetorical identity as the "fragmented metropolis." Not only is Los Angeles a sprawling city due to the movement of ethnic and immigrant groups in and out of the center of Los Angeles, but also by the formation of voluntary associations that helped to solidify it.

Most importantly, the case studies illustrate that these institutions momentarily failed during a fluctuation of capital in the inclusion and exclusion of the public. To save both institutions from their respective crises, intensive private funding through mass campaigns was urgently necessary, reinstating the opportunity for rapid social capital accumulation from individuals who were able to participate through the new philanthropic call-to-action. Individually named recognition for efforts and financial contributions maintains its relevance in mass campaigns as in voluntary associations. However, when the citizenry actively participates in these intensive campaigns, how is capital accumulated and distributed, and how is this participation memorialized? The following chapter illustrates that when these two institutions fell into crisis, their philanthropic campaigns were fully inclusive of the citizenry and ignited new opportunities for the accumulation of social capital, for both leading members of society and the public at large.

CHAPTER 5

Campaigning the Citizenry

> The modern fundraising campaign, carefully organized, shrewdly promoted, and aimed at broad segments of the citizenry, has made American philanthropy a people's philanthropy. – Scott Cutlip[562]

The citizenry of Los Angeles represents a distinct constituency of individuals who constitute a collective and integrated whole. Its social diversity supplements the complexity of the city's disparate physical landscape yet contributes to an exceptional tapestry of the common. As offered by Hardt and Negri, the multitude signifies an "active social subject whose constitution and action is based on…what it has in common."[563] The exchange of capital within the relations of production of the multitude forces a reinvestigation of the locus of surplus value. With an increasing focus on immaterial production of the multitude, the analysis must adapt to include an understanding of the exchange of capital: "Money, of course, is not only a general equivalent that facilitates exchange but also the ultimate representation of the common."[564] With the multitude possessing "the real wealth," it will inevitably be included in the exchange of capital, but for the purposes of exploitation or neighborliness?[565]

The rhetoric of the overlapping spatial and temporal fragments of Los Angeles and its populace, as I have outlined so far, directly upholds the misnomer that philanthropy is absent. On the contrary, its forms of philanthropy are deeply embedded within its varied communities,

---

562. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 3.

563. Hardt and Negri, *The Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), 100.

564. Hardt and Negri, 151.

565. Hardt and Negri, 149.

although is more difficult to perceive and comprehend due to the city's decentralized nature. During the 20th century, the whirlwind campaign, which focuses on incorporating the public—of which individuals may donate any dollar amount—served as a most suitable framework for philanthropy in Los Angeles. Unlike the other forms, such as big philanthropy that relied upon "appeals in person…affecting one's invitations to dinner and to other social functions"[566] embedded within the exclusive social capital of the elite, or voluntary associations that create formal groupings of similar individuals focusing on individualized social capital, mass campaigns allowed for the engagement of the community within the practice of philanthropy to elevate social capital for Angelenos as a whole.

The campaign framework developed at the turn of the 19th century established an inclusive philanthropy by the citizenry for the public good for the first time. The mass campaign was developed as a strategy to refocus philanthropy as being for the people by the people. This model would come to shift the potential of philanthropy. As Cutlip describes, "The campaign method of money raising was to change profoundly the nature of social welfare, health, and educational institutions in the United States by making philanthropy a broad public enterprise, not just a hobby of the very rich."[567] The mass campaign democratized philanthropy to include the citizenry in the programs and services that would come to shape public and private policy of their own communities. For this reason, I argue that the creation of communal trust, a durable network, and a method of identity formation, is the determining factor in mass campaign participation and its resulting success as a philanthropic model, especially in Los Angeles.

---

566. Allen, *Modern Philanthropy*, 312.

567. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 26.

To explicitly examine the vital connections between social capital and mass campaigns, this chapter illuminates three case studies that serve as key examples of campaign models in Los Angeles across the second half of the 20th century. The first of these campaigns, the Save the Bowl campaign, was an emergency fundraiser to reopen the Hollywood Bowl after its financial failure in 1951. This campaign's methodology replicated the traditional mass campaign as developed by Ward and Pierce, exacerbating the influence of news media in Los Angeles. The Living Memorial to Peace campaign for the Music Center in the 1960s was also led by Dorothy Chandler, who altered the traditional campaign model to focus on an extended timeframe, bridging and bonding capital, and permanent and prominent displays of recognition. Although the third significant campaign in Los Angeles—the Save the Books campaign—did not take place until 1986, its tactics mimicked the functional elements of the Save the Bowl whirlwind campaign. This time, however, it focused on the public instead of individual philanthropists. Even with comparatively little support from elite individuals and large corporations, the Save the Bowl campaign successfully exceeded its fundraising goals by engaging with the multitude, connecting with disparate communities, and segmenting its messaging and needs across the mosaic city. By studying the genealogy of the Save the Bowl and Save the Books fundraising campaigns, as well as A Living Memorial to Peace, this chapter explores the methodology of enacting the use of the multitude to effectively generate social and cultural capital through mass campaigns to support the public good.

Over the span of three decades, each of these campaigns took place in a fragmented and growing metropolis, with Los Angeles's cultural image being continuously defined and redefined. The study of mass philanthropy is integral to understanding the exchange of capital across the city because, not only does the perception that philanthropy in Los Angeles is lacking

continue to pervade media and academic literature, but also that the city lacks civic and cultural institutions that provide the populace with a common and centralized identity. To dispel these perpetuated myths, this chapter uncovers the iconography, segmented framework, and recognition strategies of each campaign as they align with the ways in which mass philanthropy saved and established some of Los Angeles's most iconic civic and cultural institutions.

Formulating the Campaign

Within days of the summer season being cancelled at the Hollywood Bowl in 1951, newspapers across the nation first highlighted the closure as a tragedy and a shock for Angelenos.[568] From Pittsfield, Massachusetts, to Portsmouth, Ohio, and even Leavenworth, Kansas, the news of the closure of the Hollywood Bowl invigorated the criticism of Los Angeles's lack of culture with headlines such as "Glittering Coast Tough on Culture."[569] However, these early pronouncements of surprise were swiftly followed by the indication of a variety of errors made, directly contributing the Bowl's steady financial decline. While the Bowl's founding was a manifestation of idealism to provide a great "cultural asset" and prestige to the community, its idealism was also included as a factor in its downfall, including that "commercialism took its place alongside idealism in the operation of the Bowl."[570] The need to serve a vast and diverse public with a desire to have high marketability was met with disinterest by all targeted audiences.

---

568. "Hollywood Bowl Closes for Season," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 15, 1951.

569. "Glittering Coast Tough on Culture," *Leavenworth Times* (Leavenworth, KS), July 18, 1951.

570. "Rescue Hollywood Bowl!" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 17, 1951.

Publicly published commentary about the "lessening of interest" by the Angeleno populace over the years rarely appeared, except for by *Los Angeles Times'* music critic, Albert Goldberg, starting in 1949.[571] As he readdressed in a piece following the Bowl's closure: "The hope of recent seasons that the Bowl could be all things to all people has not been realized…The lovers of serios music resented the proximity of the other kind and, justly or not, felt that the standards had been lowered."[572] The Bowl was unable to sustain a programmatic structure that would appeal to a broad base of constituents, managing prices afforded to the general public while producing performances targeting the elite music enthusiasts.

Further captured by an op-ed dedicated to the Hollywood Bowl closure, residents exclaimed that "if the directors are going to toady to the arty Hollywood cult they have no right to expect financial support from the rest of us."[573] The disconnect between the vision of the Bowl's programming committee from the desires of the public reveal the central intersection of the breakdown of the exchange of social, cultural, and economic capital between the masses and the elite within the institutional sphere. So, while the mixed reactions to the closure provide an unclear illustration of whether the shuttering of the Bowl truly came as a surprise, one thing is certain: the general public's interest and attendance had greatly declined. Their much-needed financial support had been undervalued and resulted in an indebted institution to its peoples.

To upend the Bowl's financial decline, the Emergency Fund team launched efforts to fundraise within the first week of the closure while the attention of the community was captured.

---

571. Albert Goldberg, "The Sounding Board: Hollywood Bowl at the Crossroads."

572. Albert Goldberg, "The Sounding Board: Hollywood Bowl Strikes Out," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 22, 1951.

573. F. G. Tollit, "Reactions to the Hollywood Bowl's Closing." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 19, 1951.

The threat of losing the season, or potentially event of the Bowl's performances forever, was enough to shake the cultural foundation of Los Angeles. Through a well-planned execution of large and small fundraising efforts under the umbrella of "Save the Bowl," the first Los Angeles whirlwind campaign was applied to the Hollywood Bowl's funding crisis. As such, the cancellation of the Symphony Under the Stars one week into the 1951 season spawned one of the most revered 20th century philanthropists in Los Angeles, Dorothy Buffum Chandler.

Chandler was not immediately placed at the helm as chairman, but quickly grew into the role as a leader in enthusiasm and devotion to the revival of the Bowl for the citizens of Los Angeles. Dedicating herself completely to "bring order out of chaos" even as a new member to the Board, she was elected as chairman of the committee.[574] With the establishment of the Emergency Committee, Chandler built the language around the Bowl to "rescue" or to "save" it. Within a week, the "Save Hollywood Bowl" title was used in newspapers as more funds continued to come in, even after it reopened for honorary performances.[575] The language was not always consistent across papers—or even across articles in the same paper—but its meaning and delivery remained the same. As opposed to the encoded message and symbolism of the experience of attending the Hollywood Bowl, the appeal to fundraise to save the Bowl was explicitly made without layered symbolism outside of what the Bowl means to the community.

In a direct adaptation of the Ward-Pierce campaign model, Chandler not only published the list of names daily, but placed them alongside the amount that was donated, in addition to the total received: "There was an understanding that generous philanthropy was met with positive

574. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 18.

575. "Save Hollywood Bowl!" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 4, 1951.

coverage and appearances in the Society pages, which she controlled."[576] This way, an additional social pressure would be added to the value of the gift in relation to the peer group. As participation numbers began to rise, donation amounts also began to rise, as suggested by related studies.[577] In the case of the Save the Bowl campaign, the *Los Angeles Times* launched its media-centric fundraising efforts with a gift of $500 at the same time they made the announcement that they would be accepting contributions on behalf of the Bowl.

With a stated fundraising goal of $100,000, the Executive Reorganization Committee asked the public for "contributions of $1 to $100 – or more – from a public shocked at the prospect of losing its cultural cynosure."[578] In the first days of fundraising, more than half of the daily reports were of donations of $5 or less, with few anonymous donations at $100. Within a week, multiple named donations worth $100 or more arrived as group donations, including from women's clubs, student clubs, and even international music groups, were sending in collective donations to support the Hollywood Bowl. As reported in the *Los Angeles Times,* by the 16th day into the Save the Bowl campaign, "public contributions reached $51,167.04, topping the halfway mark in the widespread drive to preserved one of Southern California's greatest cultural

---

576. Derek Traub, *Past / Forward: The LA Phil at 100* (Los Angeles Philharmonic, 2018), 142.

577. Research conducted by Berg et al. (1995), Cason and Mui (1998), Frey and Meier (2004), Alpizar et al. (2008), Krupka and Webber (2009), and Croson and Shang (2009) generally conclude that the providing "social information" to potential donors increases their generosity. Social information includes data such as the history of donations to the organization or cause, the total amount of donations, the list of the names of donors, and the largest donation amount all directly and positively correlate to increased participation and giving amounts. Therefore, as more and more people donate, more social information is captured and able to be disseminated, leading to an increased number of people who are connected through their network to the cause through their network and knowledgeable about the ask.

578. "Bowl Fund Drive Gets Under Way," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* July 31, 1951.

institutions."[579] While the campaign outlasted its original two-week emergency timeframe centered around the Ward-Pierce accelerated model, it exceeded its full fundraising goal prior to the end of the summer, and garnering the ability to reestablish its programming as funds came in and with the addition of honorary performances.

With the success of the Save the Bowl whirlwind campaign under the leadership of Chandler, the next part of her new vision was to understand the needs of the city and its populace. Following other models in cities with multi-building centers, including the Lincoln Center in New York City, Chandler devised a unique plan to boost the cultural image of Los Angeles against the pessimism and discouragement of others, especially New Yorkers. As a fragmented metropolis, the city required a space in which to bring its disparate parts together, both figuratively and literally. Finding a space on which to create The Music Center that would not only be a perfect spot for this conglomeration of the arts, but also fulfill the purpose the new center that the city needed through developing a new culture industry: a new cultural center through which culture could be produced and available to be consumed by the masses. The Music Center idea was supported by real estate developers and Los Angeles boosters to redevelop downtown, as well as to create a civic identity around the arts, through cultural consumption in a central space.[580]

To launch the Music Center's plan for construction, Chandler headed a fundraising campaign entitled, "A Living Memorial to Peace." As Chairman of the Fund Committee, she

---

579. "Gift to Bowl Top Halfway Mark in Drive," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 1951.

580. Margaret Leslie Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County: Five Decades of Music, Theater, and Dance* (Los Angeles: The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, 2015), viii.

"assumed responsibility for raising eleven million dollars from the public for the 24-million-dollar Music Center of Los Angeles which began construction in the spring of 1962."[581] The Music Center campaign, defined largely as a community-centric achievement combined with big philanthropy of an elite few, was a turn away from the old, community-spirited gathering of small funds to establish big ideas, towards focusing on the few big asks with the supplementary support of the public. By carefully identifying the best prospects across all of Los Angeles, these would not just be individuals passionate about developing a music culture, but high-capacity, powerful Los Angeles citizens that grasped the vitality of the Music Center project. As Chandler's roles within higher education, the press, politics, and music in Los Angeles expanded, she was able to identify new key populations moving into Los Angeles that would ensure the success of another fundraising campaign for music in the city.

Following the examples set from the Save the Bowl and the Living Memorial to Peace campaigns, the largest disaster-related library campaign to-date in the United States was named the Save the Books campaign. This campaign took place from 1986 to 1988, led by two librarians, Sheila Nash and Judy Ostrander. Unlike in the Save the Bowl campaign, Save the Books lacked a formal "Grande Dame."[582]As such, ARCO CEO, Lodwrick M. Cook, alongside former Mayor of Los Angeles, Thomas Bradley, stepped in as the face for the campaign, and to therefore make the ask. Guided by their vision, the Save the Books campaign raised over $10 million through direct mail appeals, telethons, billboards, radio advertising, commercials, and special events. Its success astounded the leaders of the campaign, City officials, and citizens alike. Conducted as a "two-pronged campaign," the first approach was to target major donors to

581. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 21.

582. "Save the Books: The Campaign," Private Collection of Judy Ostrander, 2.

develop a robust leadership team that would help to garner additional support from an extended population of the public, including corporations and celebrities.[583] The second approach encompassed public appeals to target the Los Angeles community at-large.

As soon as the arson attempt was recorded in the news, the citizenry was enveloped in this secondary prong, and by the conclusion of the campaign, turned out to be the central focus of the two. Even though the Save the Books campaign raised significant support from other corporation and foundations in the Los Angeles area, more than 30 percent of the funds came from individuals.[584] Known as the "80/20 rule," 80% of the funds raised is typically raised from only 20 percent of the donors, while the other 80 percent only generate 20 percent of the total funds.[585] While this does not meet or replace the major funding needed in order to hit a goal as large as $10 million, donations from corporations and foundations usually account for over 80 percent of total funds raised in campaigns such as these. In other words, the 30 percent mark for community involvement was record-breaking for a philanthropic movement in Los Angeles.

Not only was the committee asked to cultivate gifts from leading individuals in the community, but they were also to focus on making asks to industry leaders. In order to complete the gift scale strategies for major gifts, while only one more $1 million gift was needed, forty more were needed at the $25,000 level, to raise a total of $8.5 million from these individual and industry asks. Industries were chosen based on the types of books that were lost in the arson fires. Notably, the committee targeted the aerospace and film and music industries. With most of the collections lost from these areas, it was important to appeal for help to collect and share

583. "Save the Books: The Campaign," 1.

584. "Major Gifts Report," Private Collection of Judy Ostrander, 1987.

585. Temple, Seiler, and Burlingame, *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, 247.

information from these industries with the public for interest and understanding. With such a large aerospace industry in Los Angeles, many important companies such as Lockheed, TRW, and McDonnell Douglas contributed with major gifts to the campaign.[586] Again, this type of support communicated to the public that there was a wide breadth of support of the public library from a diverse Angeleno audience.

In the arts, while some large corporations such as Disney declined to donate, other associations and individuals filled these gaps such as the J. Paul Getty Trust, Weingart Foundation, National Endowment for the Arts, and Dr. and Mrs. Armand Hammer.[587] For the Library, these individuals, families, and industry foundations that were able to contribute to the Save the Books campaign within that first year proved that Los Angeles had indeed changed. This was the first time that the community had responded to the Los Angeles Public Library in such a manner of outpouring philanthropy, where businesses, community, students, and librarians alike were able to come together to reach the $10 million fundraising total. Contrary to the Library's problems in its early days of scraping for membership dues, to including over 200 of the leading businessmen, and then even having to ask the east coast benefactor, Carnegie, for library support to build its branches for lack of a local philanthropist, this campaign was finally able to rally Angelenos from all parts of the city, with the widest variety of interests, to support the library as a civic and cultural institution.

586. "Final Report," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1987.

587. "Final Report."

Moreover, the Save the Books campaign was also recorded as a "unique and atypical effort" for several reasons.[588] First, "The Central Library fire has been a major news story, extending over months."[589] As with any campaign, a trigger event develops the momentum needed for donations to start coming in. On the other hand, maintaining that momentum often proves to be difficult. At the outset, unlike both the Save the Bowl and Music Center campaigns, the Save the Books campaign had no official end-date. Since there was already extensive media coverage due to the unexpected and devastated nature of the event, news outlets covered the story of the fire without any additional cost to the library. In short, the public was already highly aware of the arson and the following call-to-action of volunteerism and philanthropy came at no surprise. In fact, many people were more than willing to come forward on their own.

Second, "ARCO underwrote all costs, so that all donations and proceeds from events went 100% to the STB fund."[590] Often, a sponsoring company will lend in-kind support to non-profit efforts, but this typically includes a small spectrum of what is needed. For example, a place of business may lend office space, while another business lends materials, and even an additional sponsor is required for printing costs and material production. In the case of Save the Books, ARCO was the only sponsor that underwrote the costs of the campaign, supplying the necessary space for office workers, event support, printing materials, and more.

Third, "In addition to the four librarians who worked full-time on the campaign May, 1986 and November, 1986 to the present, dozens of Central Library staff members helped to

588. Leslie Nordby, Virginia Walter, and Barbara Clark, "Development Committee Report," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, February 8, 1988.

589. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

590. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

address and stuff envelopes, sell merchandize, and participate in the Speakers' Bureau on Library time."[591] Not only were members of the library staff dedicated to leading the Save the Books campaign in a full-time capacity, but there were countless others who promoted the cause their attendance at events around the city, by volunteering their time to help remove the books and the charred remains from the building, as well as to help continue service to the greatest extent possible in the branch locations.

Lastly, unlike many campaigns for other cultural and educational causes at the time, "a deep emotional appeal was generated by the imagery and the notion of burning books."[592] By using newspaper ads, billboards, commercials, and call-to-action mailers and donation appeals that referenced the "400,000 burn victims," the campaign garnered attention from a wide spectrum of the population. [593] Expanding upon this iconography and embellishing the reach of its marketing imagery became the essential component of the campaign's success in messaging to the multitude. As will be explored in the following section, these images determined the trajectory of the campaign, and alongside the models put forth by the other campaigns, the definition of the fundraising needs directly informed the collective structures and segments.

Identifying the Iconography

As previously noted, the Save the Bowl campaign was the first of its kind in Los Angeles, but closely replicated the Ward-Pierce model as was created for community engagement in the modern metropolis. Within its short timeframe, the campaign invoked language of the

591. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

592. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

593. "400,000 Burn Victims Need Your Help," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

Hollywood Bowl being lost. These early messages that inspired music and culture prospects across Los Angeles later became paired with an inspirational drive to make an impact by supporting the fund to bring the Bowl back for the community at-large. This "fight to save the bowl"[594] was the motivational piece that would successfully encourage the public to give in both large and small amounts to be part of the Angeleno community—to be one in the many of the imagined community of donors that would save one of the few cultural symbols of Los Angeles' progress.

This imagined community is based on a collective identity, using the "language of the population," and reinforces the relationship between the in-crowd and the "Other."[595] Through the breadth of the dissemination of the message of the Save the Bowl campaign across the city, the media encouraged Angelenos to donate anything they could to be part of the community of this effort. Alongside the daily honor roll, the print media played an integral role in relaying the language of the Save the Bowl fundraising effort, without producing any marketing or imagery outside of the call-to-action. Nevertheless, the formulation of the campaign informed both the campaign for the Music Center and for the Los Angeles Public Library by creating the foundations of communication tactics.

Notably, the success of the Save the Bowl campaign stimulated Los Angeles in many ways, while also proving that a sense of change—a new image of culture in Los Angeles—was created and seen by Angelenos across the entire city. As stated in a Times Mirror piece, "The remarkable comeback made by Hollywood Bowl since its rebirth in 1951 has stimulated

---

594. Virgil Pinkley, "Editorials," *Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), July 25, 1951.

595. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2006), 78.

community-wide interest in all the arts."[596] More importantly, this increased interest was not only expressed verbally, or in attendance, but in philanthropy: "The result was that when we set about to reopen the Bowl, people gave generously of their time, their enthusiasm, and their much-needed financial support. It started a trend that has continued every year since. That is why each year since then has been a better year at the Bowl."[597] Not only was the Bowl now a site dedicated to propelling the future image of Los Angeles, but it also served as a site of importance even to Los Angeles' history:

> Historically, no more fitting spot could have been selected in Southern California for the presentation of a great pageant-spectacle commemorating the 100th anniversary of Statehood. Hollywood Bowl, the modern cultural center, is situated just over the hill from Ranch Cahuenga, where was signed the famous Treaty of Cahuenga ended the Mexican War in California.[598]

Until a new center of Los Angeles could be defined, the legacy of its story, "Crusade—Survival—Victory," would continue to live on for decades to come but would soon be overshadowed by an even bigger physical prospect: The Music Center as the "Living Memorial to Peace."[599]

The Music Center, a $33.5 million, three-theatre complex, was dedicated as "A Living Memorial to Peace," on December 6, 1964. With its official opening in 1964, The Music Center "ushered in a new era of artistic and civic pride and, in the process, solidified Los Angeles as a

596. "Bowl Comeback Stimulates Art Interest—Mrs. Chandler," *Times Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), July 1951.

597. "Bowl Comeback Stimulates Art Interest."

598. "The California Story," *Hollywood Bowl Association*, Huntington Archives, 1950.

599. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 22.

major cultural force not only nationally, but also globally."[600] Not only was its symbolism to the role of Los Angeles important, but the encoded messages of the building's architecture were also vital to its representation to Angelenos. As Welton Becket, the architect of the Pavilion, stated: "We wanted the building to give the patron a feeling of elegance and beauty befitting the rich cultural adventures to be experienced within. Yet we wanted it to be contemporary and understated so that it would not overpower people."[601] The round exterior of the building was created distinctly so that "the building would be seen from all sides. We did not wish to turn our back on any part of the city."[602] These structures as just as important as each element of the Central Library. As the Library building was constructed and decoded as a temple, this Pavilion was meant to represent equitability. In the sense of the missions of each institution, the library's mission of access was illustrated through its entrances, while the Music Center's Pavilion structure communicates access through its round shape to face each direction of the city. That the Central Library and the Pavilion were built forty years apart and took opposite shapes and lines to communicate the same symbols to the city is indicative of the changing, yet foundational elements, of Los Angeles, its people, and its desire to work towards the public good.

Contrary to the Save the Bowl campaign, Save the Books campaign applied the book as the object that was the victim as opposed to the building. In the case of the Save the Bowl campaign, the philanthropic efforts were designed to save the programming efforts which had been cancelled due to a lack of funding. Tied to the images of the library burning, the campaign's design to replace the books moved the images away from the building and towards a

600. "The History of the Music Center."

601. Davis, *The Music Center of Los Angeles County*, 23.

602. Davis, 23.

focus on the books themselves. As much as the Central Library served as an icon to Los Angeles, years of dilapidated use of the building had led to a lack of interest in the building itself in the eyes of the public. Yet, the public still valued the resources that the library provided to the public, still bringing "the world to Southern California."[603] In this unique public-private partnership at the Los Angeles Public Library, books not only became the symbol of the campaign, but remained central to its mission of raising private funds to replace the collection.

According to Stuart Hall, messages are "encoded" into various forms of media which develop the system of coded messages that would, in turn, be understood or "decoded" by the viewer.[604] In the case of philanthropy, as the prospect views the donation appeal, he or she can choose to accept or reject the encoded messages. Unlike many campaigns for other cultural and educational causes at the time, "a deep emotional appeal was generated by the imagery and the notion of burning books."[605] In one ad, the background image portrayed an old hardcover of the *Pictorial History of the World*, with the edges of its pages blackened and warping as flames rise from its cover. The images of fire were not only designed to be eye-catching, but to directly connect people to the trauma of the Central Library burning and its relevance to knowledge of the world. As reminders of the building on fire, but with a focus on books, the audience, through accepting the encoded messages, would be motivated to donate to the cause.

Kevin Starr, author and former State Librarian, illustrates how early book collectors and their subsequent book collections became an integral part of the development of Southern

---

603. Starr, *Material Dreams*, 334.

604. Stuart Hall, "Encoding, Decoding," in *The Cultural Studies Reader,* eds. Simon During (New York: Routledge, 1993), 90-103.

605. Nordby, Walter, and Clark. "Development Committee Report."

California. As collecting grew as a form of cultural capital, the creation of "a book culture…had become a regional badge of identity."[606] By the 1920s, it had "come time to institutionalize this accumulation of literary and artistic treasures" and most of the collections were given to local libraries.[607] Based on the values of collectors and their desire to collect materials from around the globe, local libraries became designated spaces for preserving knowledge from various cultures. As such, the loss of so many books symbolized a loss of the knowledge of these world cultures, which could be encapsulated by the single image of the *Pictorial History of the World*.

In contrast to other media theories that disempower audiences, Hall also proposed that audience members can play an active role in decoding messages. In one of the printed appeals that drove the beginning of the campaign, the ad led with the message, "400,000 BURN VICTIMS NEED YOUR HELP."[608] To give context to the number of books lost in the arson attempt, the 400,000 books burned in 1986 was the same amount that existed in the entire Los Angeles Public Library collection in 1921.[609] While this retrospective comparison between articles places relevancy on the impact that the arson had in 1986, the Save the Books campaign had to draw on an even deeper, more immediate understanding, by not only using the number of books lost, but by envisioning the books themselves as the victims. As such, in philanthropy appeals, the imagery and the message must connect with the prospect to convey a particular message, to make the call-to-action effective, and to result in a donation.

---

606. Starr, *Material Dreams*, 342.

607. Starr, 336.

608. "400,000 Burn Victims Need Your Help."

609. "400,000 Library Books in L.A. Never Have Had Other Than Rented Home," *Los Angeles Express* (Los Angeles, CA), May 25, 1921.

In addition to the *Pictorial History of the World,* a copy of Don Quixote was later used in visual appeals for donations, which had been lost in the fire. This time, the book is not engulfed in flames, but instead is the charred remains of the book open to where its title page is legible amongst the black debris of burned pages. The 100-year old edition of Don Quixote is paired in the ad with a call-to-action that asks the reader to "help make certain our City has one of the finest public libraries in the world...again!"[610] By referencing the larger scope of the collections of the Los Angeles Public Library and its role in serving Los Angeles and beyond, the use of Don Quixote as a symbol of a lost prize possession is encoded for the viewer, placed in only specific segmented appeals as opposed to for the general public. Notably, the image was placed in ads in the *Beverly Hills Weekly*. The text-heavy appeal emphasizes the high standards and reputation of the library, as opposed to its loss or by using literary puns as seen in many of the other appeals to the citizenry.

One tactic that Cook had attempted to promote in direct line with the traditional model of mass campaign fundraising was the "thermometer." As previously mentioned, the "campaign clock" or "thermometer" was used as a visual engagement to entice the citizenry to donate and to see the collective impact that their donations made towards the fundraising goal which originated from the Ward-Pierce campaign model. Cook, "with booster-like zeal…had wanted to cover the smoke smudges and paint a bright thermometer" on the west façade of the library.[611] Instead of concern that the campaign fundraising being "out of sight would mean out of mind," the concern

610. "Beverly Hills," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

611. Patt Morrison and Cathleen Decker, "One Year Later: Wounds of the Library Fire Slow to Heal," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* April 28, 1987.

was instead that if the remains of the smoke would inhibit the public from remembering that the library had caught on fire.[612]

An additional messaging tactic that proves successful is embracing tradition, history, and customs.[613] To apply this to the campaign, a televised fundraising appeal coordinated by ARCO included messaging specific to American values at-large, as well as civic heritage:

> Free people must have the opportunity to seek knowledge, and to use that knowledge to shape their lives and their society. In the spirit of that American tradition, a major fundraising campaign has been established to restore the Library's collection to its former position as a national resource. We call this campaign Save the Books…With your help, we can restore an important part of our civic heritage and preserve a well spring of knowledge that will enrich the lives of generations to come.[614]

This ten-minute public service appeal by ARCO helped to raise additional funds by reminding the public at home about the importance of support to their local library system, not only to their community, but to the survival and sustainability of civilization. In fact, during the news coverage of the days immediately following the arson attempt, citizens remarked at the library burning being an attack on civilization itself.[615] As such, the Save the Books application of this larger threat added an additional layer to the urgency and necessity of donations to the library.

Further, more than simply using the images of books as burn victims and the individual call-to-action to participate as a member of society, the tactic of book burning as an actual attack on our community and what we stand for as a society was also used in the segmented appeals.

---

612. Morrison and Decker, "One Year Later."

613. James, *Inside the Mind of the Bequest Donor*, 154.

614. "Save the Books," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, Accessed March 17, 2019, https://www.lapl.org/collections-resources/blogs/lapl/save-books

615. Morrison and Decker, "One Year Later."

For example, Cook developed more personalized letters by the fall of the first year of the campaign to better address the urgency of the need to major donors across the city. In one of these letters, addressed to Abraham Spiegel, a Holocaust survivor who immigrated to Los Angeles and became a prominent real estate developer, Cook states the following:

> Book burnings aim at the hearts of a free society. So when an obviously deranged person set fire to the L.A. Central Library last April he was attacking all of us. And all of us who care about the freedom of ideas to circulate openly in a society are joining together to help restore the famous Central Library collection.[616]

In this letter, the victimization moves away from the books and to the people and community of Los Angeles, as well as democracy at-large. The loss that "we" as a community experienced was something that we could all share in. Even if we hadn't used the library, knowing that our community had been attacked—that a symbol of our civic society had been subject to an act of violence (these days we would inevitably call it terrorism)—would pull us together in spirit in a primary sense, with the secondary effect as the drive to give back to the community, to ourselves as individuals, and, in turn, to the institution.

The immediate and destructive fear of book burnings as a threat not only plays on the fears of what happened in Los Angeles, but other examples of the loss of freedom and democracy in other places around the world. From many literary tales portraying a dystopic world without reading such as Fahrenheit 451, to relatively recent world events as Nazi book-burnings during the second World War, the visual symbols used for this campaign were meant to connect with a diverse set of individuals through a variety of images of local and world history. In fact, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum reached out in a letter to the Los Angeles Public Library to specifically ask how they produced the image of the books burning and if they

---

616. Lod Cook letter to Abraham Spiegel, Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, November 20, 1986.

could use the same artist because of how well they believed their community would connect to it as a symbol.[617] Together, these combined image and text appeals that played on the rituals of both the library and of society successfully garnered the public support needed in order to fulfill fundraising from the general public for Save the Books, adding almost an additional $200,000 through just direct mail appeals.[618] This variety of print and visual appeals illustrates the Save the Books' outreach to every Angeleno, segmenting messaging, imagery, and ask amounts, hoping to connect to its fragmented communities.

Originally designed as an emergency campaign in line with the Ward-Pierce model, it more closely followed the reshaping of the philanthropic campaign of A Living Memorial to Peace. Chandler's further adaptation of the Ward-Pierce model by extending the community campaign beyond the condensed timeframe of two weeks up to two years from the Save the Bowl to the Music Center campaign permitted the Save the Books campaign to pivot from an emergency design to a longer term, strategic, comprehensive campaign. Ending up lasting for more than two years, the role of the community at-large in reaching the ambitious $10 million illustrated that the extended timeline proved successful. As Lon Bruns, former executive director of the Southern California Association for Philanthropy, stated:

> When you compare it to a major university or hospital campaign, $10 million is not that large, but the library doesn't have the historical relationships… It doesn't have built-in linkages like alumni. It's basically a public institution that has been supported by tax dollars and now has to go to the private sector because of an extraordinary need.[619]

617. "Correspondence," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

618. "Major Gifts Report," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1987.

619. Mike Wyma, "Central Library Wages a Battle for Recovery," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), November 20, 1986.

Contrary to Burns' assumptions about the recent history of the library, this public institution was built on private donations, transitioned into a public-private partnership, and was only later supported through tax and bond measures when the City insisted on building a grandiose monument as a Central Library that no individual big philanthropist wanted to fund for the fragmented metropolis. Due to this, while the branch libraries have been supported by private donations since their beginnings, only the Central Library has relied critically on public funding.

Formulating a Segmented Framework

Not only did Chandler successfully identify a variety of new audiences that would engage in this pro-social behavior to allow the Save the Bowl campaign to succeed, but she also enacted a relationship-based strategy to maintain enthusiasm for the Bowl across the breadth of the community. By enlisting the help of conductors and musicians to play with the Los Angeles symphony at the bowl for no fee, she was able to create a continued interest and passion at the site of the heartbreak, tying the community and donors directly to the emotion of missing the Bowl and longing again for the once-beloved cultural space of Los Angeles. In order to successfully tap into those musician relationships, however, she specifically asked renowned Conductor Alfred Wallenstein to make the appeal to headline musicians with which he already had strong relationships, instead of trying to build those relationships from scratch on her own.[620] Musicians, both local and national, responded to Wallenstein's request for honorary performances, leading to a Tribute concert with four prominent conductors and one hundred musicians to focus attention "on the Crusade to Save the Hollywood Bowl."[621] With

620. "The City: Brightness in the Air," 4.

621. "Tribute to Bowl Slated Tomorrow," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 1951.

performances sold out for four nights in a row, the public's attention had been successfully turned back to the stage through both financial support and public participation.

Relying on these strategically designed appeals, action was able to be taken immediately, relieving the Hollywood Bowl of its destructive financial woes within two weeks. With an outpouring of support in attendance at the Bowl for its fundraiser concerts and "enough pledges to make up a whole season," the Bowl was able to reopen with an amount of excitement that matched its earlier marketing pieces. [622] While the controversial blame put on the general public for the 1951 Hollywood Bowl Symphony Under the Stars season was cancelled, the success of its reopening was, in turn, credited back to them: "the Bowl has been saved as one of our finer cultural institutions, a credit to the community and a continuing delight to individuals."[623] As one cartoon so adequately illustrated the Bowl's return, the image shows a strong arm labelled "Civic Pride" rising out of the clouds of "Disaster" and "Threat", holding the "Revitalized Hollywood Bowl." While "it took the shock of threatened discontinuance of the Bowl season to rally music lovers all over Southern California," this sense of renewal is one that would proliferate for years to come in Los Angeles as the City and its people looked to the future in anticipation of what other great public support might exist to continue to grow and expand culture for its community and beyond.[624]

The success of the Save the Bowl campaign was not purely based on the amount raised or the swift reopening of the Bowl within under two weeks, but instead based on the impressive reach of the campaign and its incorporation of the community in new ways. As Chandler stated:

---

622. "The City: Brightness in the Air."

623. Pinkley, "Editorials."

624. Pinkley.

> I think the whole change in the cultural picture of Los Angeles came in 1951, when the Bowl closed down. That was a real shock to Los Angeles. The Bowl had always been something taken for granted, and here it was broke, and the season was online five days old. The orchestra was out of work. That was the turning point. We had hit rock bottom. The only place to go was up. Everyone rallied around and we had our Crusade for Survival. There was a wonderful voluntary unity. It gave us confidence and we came out of the experience with a sense of participation.[625]

One of the biggest outcomes for Chandler was using the momentum gained from the Save the Bowl campaign to develop a shared cultural space for Angelenos. While many projects in Los Angeles seemed to be following the models in place in New York, the Music Center concept for Los Angeles was taking place concurrently with the development of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.[626] Seeing the potential of the growing city and being intelligent enough to both watch and analyze the strategies and outcomes of cultural growth in major urban hubs, including one of the world's leaders, New York City, she was able to come up with a plan that she would not only adapt to the specific needs of Angelenos, but for the published image of Los Angeles itself.

Not only had her reputation grown significantly within Los Angeles and across the nation from to the Save the Bowl success, but the extent of the reach of her network and influence also proliferated. She became a Regent at the University of California, a trustee at Occidental College, a Vice President at The Times, and was even invited to the Advisory Committee of the U.S. Information Agency.[627] In the celebratory 100th anniversary publication of the Los Angeles Philharmonic, *Past / Forward,* Chandler is quoted as saying, **"**I'm not a fundraiser in the first

---

625. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 21.

626. Bertrand Goldberg, "N.Y. Center Plans Shaped," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), December 27, 1959.

627. Klaz, *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler,* 6.

place…I raised and am raising large amounts of money for the Music Center, but that's because of the conviction in my life of the value of that center and the arts to human beings and to this community…It's a product that I believe in, so I can sell it."[628] As recorded in Klaz's oral history of Chandler, she shared that "music is one of the most universally understood forms of expression in culture…a unifier and also it's a human experience," sustaining her drive for the decade between the two campaigns to bring Angeleno communities together, envision and re-envision the music center model, develop a new Bunker Hill, and change philanthropy and culture in the City of Los Angeles.[629] With her growing involvement in major cultural outlets across Los Angeles, she gained more access to information, real estate, and wealth that provided the necessary networks for collaboration to launch the next campaign.

While a focus on targeted wealth would be necessary to raise such a large amount of money from individuals residing in Los Angeles, Chandler did not ignore the community at-large. Chandler targeted the far-reaching population of Los Angeles of whom were not donating through the newspaper. Chandler also created "Buck Bags" to be dispersed throughout the Bowl during shows. An adaptation of the "Penny Boxes" in the early days of the Bowl, "Buck Bags" were distributed to supplement the larger funding targets and passed around from person-to-person, again enacting social pressure. With so many people present at the performances, passing the bag along without putting something in it would be witnessed by the hundreds of other attendees. The Buck Bags were designed to create an air of authority and pressure from the moment the bag is presented by a staff member or volunteer to the first attendee. As soon as one person puts something in the bag, the following person—and so on—will feel obligated to

628. Traub, *Past / Forward,* 141.

629. Klaz, *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler,* 151.

support the cause. Over the course of campaign, the Buck Bags were also distributed in additional spaces, such as libraries and other public events, successfully bringing in an additional—and incredible—$2.2 million towards the Music Center campaign.[630]

More than anyone else, Chandler is credited with "bringing together the two main centers of power in Los Angeles: (1) the old money and established businesses of downtown, Pasadena and San Marino areas, and (2) the younger, more liberal-mainly Jewish establishment of West Los Angeles."[631] When asked if it was true if she tried to integrate the "old established society of east Los Angeles with the newer more liberal society of west Los Angeles," she simply stated: "Well, I don't think I tried to do it. I did it."[632] Together, these groups held a financial and political power across a span of over 30 miles, from one end of Los Angeles County to the other—a financial power that was previously unprecedented in a new, diverse, and dispersed city such as Los Angeles. Previous Music Center initiatives had failed simply because:

> the 'old money' and 'new money' faction within the city couldn't come together for the common cause of the arts. Dorothy Chandler bridged the gap most famously between Jewish housing developer S. Mark Taper and conservative financier Howard Ahmanson. Chandler saw their rivalry not as an impediment but as an opportunity: 'One wanted to give as much as the other. You had to know when to push and when to shove. It took a lot of understanding, a lot of listening to their personal lives.[633]

This initiative, under the direction of Chandler, changed the way in which philanthropy in Los Angeles would be understood, administered, and accomplished. Her focus on wealthy individuals for the extent of their wealthy was not used in another other community-inspired

---

630. "How Jews Helped Build L.A.'s Music Center," *Jewish Journal,* January 7, 2015.

631. Klaz, *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler,* 3.

632. Klaz, 147.

633. Traub, *Past / Forward,* 141.

project in Los Angeles to-date. While Carnegie had provided branch libraries to the City of Los Angeles, the city often frowned upon and shied away from reaching out to east coast wealth for fear for losing pride for the new and future Los Angeles. While money certainly existed in Los Angeles, it was very rarely put into its building projects. However, Chandler recognized that this wealth would open its pockets to developing a cultural phenomenon of unprecedented proportions for the city that would last for generations to come.

As previously discussed, some even called her targeted work to only look at the ultra-wealthy to support the wider populace of Los Angeles to be a gimmick, but her ability to understand a prospective donor's motivations made her successful at it. As she stated, she was required to be, "At various times a psychiatrist, a psychologist, a marriage counselor, and even a sort of family doctor. You have to know the family situation at all times. Divorce, illness, death—or just a routine change in the family financial situation—can inhibit contribution."[634] Chandler was able to connect disparate social groups from disperse locations over a singular, shared goal through bridging social capital.

With regard to fundraising for the Los Angeles Public Library, however, volunteerism was one of the strongest initial responses to the fire. An estimated 1,500 volunteers were recorded in the first few days to help remove books from inside the burned building.[635] These volunteers represented the diversity of the city. As reported in the *Los Angeles Times*, "The rescue effort was an idealized portrait of the face of Los Angeles, a multi-ethnic corps of

634. Traub, 141.

635. Garry Abrams, "TreePeople Work with Volunteers in Aftermath of Devastating Library Fire," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 5, 1986.

committed citizens determined to save a precarious civic resource."[636] In a remarkable turnout of community support, the immediate response illustrated the impact that the arson had on communities across the Los Angeles.

The volunteer support was so remarkable that the *Los Angeles Times* dedicated multiple articles in the weeks following the initial response to discuss the range of demographics. For example, hundreds of librarians traveled from across the state,[637] UCLA students who had never visited the Central Library,[638] patrons who came to reminisce over the community spirit of the library,[639] and unemployed Sunday school teachers from South-Central[640] were interviewed for their efforts to protect the collections that were perceived as belonging to the public. As such, the relationship between the library and Angelenos, regardless of age, race, or profession, was already embedded within the community, and the fire reignited this connection. Interestingly, the opportunity to volunteer for the library had provided some with the motivation to venture to downtown Los Angeles for the first time. A retired schoolteacher from Encino who traveled to the "unaccustomed environs of downtown Los Angeles," shared that she and a friend took the bus: "That was an experience. We'd never taken the bus before."[641] In other words, the city's

636. William Nottingham and Edward J. Boyer, "'Like Paying Interest on a Debt: 1,500 Rally to Library's Need in Ashes of Disaster," *Los Angeles Times,* May 5, 1986.

637. Bob Baker, "Library Races Against Time to Save Books," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* May 1, 1968.

638. Nottingham and Boyer. "'Like Paying Interest on a Debt."

639. Carol McGraw. "Memories Remain: Library a Magic Place for Regulars." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA)*,* May 4, 1986.

640. Abrams, "TreePeople."

641. Abrams.

desire to revitalize the declining downtown through a new library was being realized, just through the tragedy and threat of the loss of it. By engaging with the library, the citizenry was engaging with the city—and the city's services—in new ways.

The Save the Books campaign was designed to include participation beyond volunteers and corporations, but the timing of the arson attempt had restricted coverage of the event to the Los Angeles and California community. Taking place on the same day as the Chernobyl disaster, significant coverage in Los Angeles news outlets was also delayed. In fact, as noted by contemporary author Susan Orlean, the *New York Times* did not include any references to the arson at the Los Angeles Central Library throughout the entire length of the campaign.[642] In other words, even though the library fire was an unprecedented tragedy of significant worth, and the library's collections served more than just a local constituency, the competing attention with global nuclear danger limited the extent of potential donors. As such, the success of the fundraising campaign to Save the Books relied almost entirely on the local community.

In addition to corporate gifts, foundations also served a vital role. Throughout the first year of the campaign, all gifts donated over $100,000 were from corporations or foundations. An early gift of $2 million came from the J. Paul Getty Trust, which served as a lead gift to inspire donors from the arts and cultural sector of Los Angeles.[643] The Ahmanson, Ralph M. Parson, and Jones Foundation were soon to follow, along with the Lockheed Corporation and even the Los Angeles Unified School District. Together, these six and seven-figure corporate and foundation gifts totaled almost $4 million of the $5 million raised for the campaign by the end of its first

642. Susan Orlean, *The Library Book* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2018), 15-16.

643. "Looking Back: The Long Trek to Opening Day," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), Oct. 1, 1993.

year.[644] In other words, corporations and foundations funded almost 80% of the campaign, up to this point.

Nevertheless, a $10 million fundraising goal not only required a commitment from corporate and other big philanthropies, but a civic commitment by its most important members: Angelenos at-large. As previously mentioned, the Save the Bowl campaign was conducted as a "two-pronged campaign," with the first approach to target major donors in order to develop a robust leadership team that would help to garner additional lead gifts.[645] With seven-figure gifts lead gifts from corporations and foundations in the early days of the campaign, later major gift asks would turn to celebrities and other philanthropic leaders in Los Angeles for five to six-figure donations. The second approach, however, encompassed public appeals to target the Los Angeles community at-large. As extensive media coverage waned over the two years of the campaign, these mass marketing appeals were vital to the campaign's longitudinal success. To fill the gaps left by large corporations and foundations who had declined to support the effort, however, the multitude became central to the campaign.[646]

In addition to segmenting the messaging to various donor groups across the city, the appeals are also adjusted regarding the ask amounts in each of the mail strings. For example, the donation levels begin in the Don Quixote appeal that appeared in the Beverly Hills Weekly at $1,000, as opposed to the "Overdue Notice" ad appeal that started at $500 in the Los Angeles Times, or at $25 in the bookplate appeal to the general public.[647] Some of the ad efforts included

644. Wyma, "Central Library Wages a Battle for Recovery."

645. "Save the Books: The Campaign," 1.

646. Morrison and Decker, "One Year Later."

647. "Overdue Notice," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), February 29, 1987.

no designated ask amounts in order to test leaving the amount open for the individual to decide what that appropriate amount would be. According to market research in philanthropy, by testing the audience, the institution can assemble a demographic profile and can include a "psychological analysis of how donors trust an organization's brand and identity."[648] To that end, institutional leaders actively decide how to segment the donor population regarding the ask amount based on the market. In a more general appeal, however, it benefits the organization to leave the amount open-ended to gain the most from a large and untested demographic.

These varying ask amounts on the printed ad appeals indicate the efforts taken to maximize fundraising from public donors by segmenting the marketing based on market knowledge of capacity and ability to give. With an increase in linkage, ability, or interest by any prospect, the donation amount can be increased. While a donor is best suited to give when he or she possesses all three elements, a donor can be asked for a larger gift based solely on his or her ability. Thereby, in segmenting a distinct ad appeal to those in who live in Beverly Hills, the ask amount should be higher based on the higher average income of the households in the area. Nevertheless, without linkage or interest, those who receive the appeal in Beverly Hills may still not proceed to a donation. The lack of connection with downtown and the Central Library based on the fragmentation of communities in Los Angeles, the ad placed in the Beverly Hills News received less than a 2% response rate.[649] While market research based on ability was well-known, little analysis had been down about the connection that those living in the area had to the

---

648. Temple, Seiler, and Burlingame, *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, 341.

649. "Major Gifts," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

institution and lacked connection to the Los Angeles Public Library, namely because the community had its own library.[650]

In addition to creating visual ad campaigns, direct mail appeal letters, and a retail experience for the community at-large, much of the Save the Books campaign success, as well as the gifts that helped to reach the goal within that first year, were from specifically segmented appeals to the public. Segmentation of messaging does not directly imply a fragmentation of strategy. In fact, it means the adaptation of messaging across an already fragmented community to bring them together around a single cause. Diverse messaging strategies allow an organization to target and reach various populations who will better decode messages that relate to their personal identities based on their cultural background, economic standing, and personal experiences, as thereby their linkage, ability, and interest. Segmentation of messaging in print appeals permits philanthropy to bring disparate communities together for the public good.

Rituals and Recognition

Social capital through mass campaigns is mostly attained and communicated through recognition strategies. Recognition may include a name on the building, media coverage, or a named fund in perpetuity. These varying degrees of social capital are essential to the design of the mass campaign. While communities would participate and celebrate in mass campaigns for the public good, the elite would continue to benefit most greatly from their own participation through large-scale recognition opportunities—now also recognized by the masses in the media, not just within their own networks—and thereby their newly accumulated social capital.

650. Alison Martino, "Remembering Beverly Hills' Magical Public Library," *Los Angeles Magazine,* April 20, 2015. https://www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/remembering-beverly-hills-magical-public-library/

Moreover, emergency campaigns led to even more rapidly accumulated social capital due to the condensed timeframe of the campaigns. Not only are these intensive campaigns conducive to encouraging people to participate, but campaigns also add even more "high-pressure" stakes to the accumulation of social capital.[651] The development of the mass fundraising campaign—especially in crises—led to the rapid accumulation of social and cultural capital for participating donors, upholding the cultural infrastructure and social stratification that serves elite interests through its reproduction. The mass campaign, for the first time, however, involves the public in reproducing the social stratification in which they exist.

The influence of the big philanthropist, when not anonymous, also creates an imbalance of power. Those who have enough wealth or a personal collection to establish an institution in his or her name develops a power through the memory of themselves as individual, but through the face of an institution. Often created as a "memorial to himself," these forward-facing moments of philanthropy were seen as "a model to other rich men who…regard themselves as instruments for the general good, as trustees for humanity."[652] However, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, "elite culture often gave even greater honor to the Good Citizen—the public-spirited individual who sacrificed his desire for personal aggrandizement in order to enrich the holdings…of public institutions."[653] As shifting values take place on whether to honor the individual through this sort of "donor memorial," as an honor in tribute from the public for their larger donation to existing institutions, or today's ever-increasing self-created organizations

651. Cutlip, *Fundraising in the United States,* 87.

652. Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals*, 79.

653. Duncan, 82.

during the individual's lifetimes, as well as beyond, philanthropy has always been, and will remain, at the center.

In addition to recognition for financial donations from the public during the Save the Bowl campaign, Chandler also arranged recognition for the support of the musicians and conductors who spared their time at no charge to be revitalize community participation by performing on the Bowl stage and, in essence, served as the leading force behind saving the Bowl. Creating a printed Honor Roll banner, she displayed the names of twenty-four "distinguished artists and conductors [who] generously contributed their services during the Hollywood Bowl emergency…so that this great center of music and allied arts may survive."[654] While recognition is a standard component of philanthropy, in addition to the pressure that it exudes from the imagined community, Chandler ensured that every active participant of the Save the Bowl campaign shared in the feeling of success for contributing to a cause so integral for the betterment of the Los Angeles citizenry. With a total campaign fundraising goal of $11 million out of the $24 million needed to build the Music Center, new tactics would be needed including a daily honor roll for those giving $1 or more. Not only does this type of recognition give a sense of satisfaction to people for their past behaviors, but it also sets them up to be open for similar future opportunities to ask.

In the transition to the Music Center campaign, S. Mark Taper, a prominent real estate developer, banker, and philanthropist, was an ally to the project, but was also cultivated by Chandler for the ultimate gift. For another successful end to her fundraising initiative, a $1 million check, "…the largest single contribution yet received—was presented last month by S.

654. "Roll of Honor Marks Donation of Bowl Talent," *Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), August 27.

Mark Taper, financier and philanthropist, to Mrs. Norman Chandler, chairman of the building fund committee."[655] While the Music Center Progress Report would suggest that the donation was "unprecedented," it would be difficult to believe that this was not a part of Chandler's plan, let alone a specific ask that she made. This gift completed the funding required for the Forum, the second of the three Music Center buildings—becoming named the Mark Taper Forum—and brought "to well over $12 million the amount raised so far by voluntary contributions during the brief but enormously successful public fund drive."[656] As previously explained, many donors participate in philanthropy due to their desire for "enhancing one's social connections."[657] As such, Howard Ahmanson, chairman of the board of Home Savings and Loan Association and philanthropist, would also come to provide the last of the funding needed to complete the buildings, also receiving his name on a building. The naming of the Ahmanson Theater further surpassed the campaign goal, with an eventual total of $19 million raised.[658]

As the construction for the various buildings finished and the buildings opened over the next three years, the pre-named Memorial Pavilion was renamed the Dorothy Chandler Pavilion in honor of her success in bringing the Center to Los Angeles and honoring a cultural vision that was previously absent. Even though she was the center of the success of this effort and the guiding source of producing a new cultural image, she was still humbled by this honorable naming. While the Pavilion was named for her in the traditional sense of honoree for her time

655. "The Music Center Dedicated to Mrs. Normal Chandler," *Times Mirror Progress* 3, no. 4 (1964).

656. "The Music Center Dedicated to Mrs. Normal Chandler."

657. Santi, *The Giving Way to Happiness,* 21.

658. Vankin, "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force."

and commitment to the cause, the Music Center buildings marked a transitional moment of naming as a direct result of the value of a donation.

A testament to Chandler's vision and relentless pursuit of a performing arts center that would yield an unprecedented democratization of the arts, The Music Center continues to label itself the "cultural hub of Los Angeles as an all-inclusive place to connect and unite through the arts."[659] As Northcutt quotes, "The Music Center is a symbol of the new Los Angeles which grew out of the changed cultural picture made by the new order at Hollywood Bowl."[660] Even when the Music Center's initial fundraising campaign was reached and the center opened to the public, Chandler continued to develop naming opportunities for increased participation and generosity. While the construction of the buildings had been fully funded, "the goal of the new committee—which presents the only official women's auxiliary of the Music Center—is to raise a million dollars in seat endowments and thereby meet the costs of furnishing and equipping the three buildings of the complex."[661] A contribution of $1,000 to the Blue Ribbon committee would endow "in perpetuity an orchestra seat in either the Memorial Pavilion or Center Theater," and she required that each member of the Blue Ribbon committee accept the responsibility for "securing at least one endow-a-seat patron."[662] The extended participation of women as primary donors in the civic space provided a new methodology for reinvesting funds made in Los Angeles into cultural endeavors.

---

659. "The History of the Music Center."

660. Northcutt, *The Hollywood Bowl Story*, 22.

661. "Blue Ribbon Committee Seeks Seat Endowments."

662. "Blue Ribbon Committee Seeks Seat Endowments."

On the other hand, the distinction of the Save the Books campaign as an "atypical effort" led to a revision of the future of its fundraising instead of seeking direct replicability.[663] As indicated in the Development Committee Report that followed the campaign's conclusion, it was stated that "the STB campaign is not replicable and not an appropriate model for any future Library fundraising effort or development office."[664] Instead of remarking the unique and successful basis of a model for a perpetual public-private partnership, it was initially recommended for the Library to "wind down" its efforts.[665] In other words, the Save the Books campaign was coming to an end, yet discussions to fundraise with a new vision and under new guidance persisted.

The initial steps taken to end the Save the Books campaign and to transition into a new model included several reconfigurations. First, the Save the Books store was transferred to the library, now known as the Library Store. Second, the Friends groups of the library branches were filed as independent fundraising entities, with the Los Angeles Library Association to oversee them. Third, funds began to be distributed from the California Community Foundation account for the purchase of books as promised by the campaign. Lastly, an agreement to appoint a local fundraiser to advise on a strategy for the library's fundraising future was approved. These steps all contributed to the development of the foundation for a sustainable philanthropy model for the Los Angeles Public Library in perpetuity.

During the transition year between Save the Books and the next phase of the yet-to-be-determined philanthropic strategy for the library, the Development Committee produced the idea

663. Nordby, Walter, and Clark. "Development Committee Report."

664. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

665. Nordby, Walter, and Clark.

of a formal foundation, instated in June 1990, at the very end of the allotted consultancy period.[666] Unfortunately, in the following month, a hiring freeze was placed on the library and all efforts to continue with the Foundation had been stopped. Even so, in the fall of that year, the library began to send out a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a fundraising professional. Over the next several months, proposals were collected from the RFP, and while the Board was not too impressed with the proposals they received, they continued with the interview process and in the fall of 1991, Evelyn Hoffman, the former Vice President of The Music Center, was hired.

Within Hoffman's first 90 days, she created a list of 46 things to do to help brand the library and garner support for the Foundation, maintaining excitement for supporting the library. Most significantly, the Board approved on November 23, 1991, to "establish a 501(c)3 Charitable Nonprofit Organization to be known at the Los Angeles Public Library Foundation, to recruit officers and trustees, and to establish bylaws in cooperation with the City Librarian and Board."[667] While the name of the Foundation would continue to change over the next year or so as it was passed through legislature and the Board, the final name, the Library Foundation of Los Angeles, was agreed upon and officially formed in February of 1992.

To align fundraising as a more formal process, the Board established a donor recognition program in December 1991. Tabled almost two years earlier, on June 20, 1990, the Board discussed the development of a Donor Recognition Program to capture the efforts of the Save the Books campaign, deferring the launch of the program to the Development Committee.[668] The development committee determined that one of the spaces for a high honor naming location for a

666. "Meeting Minutes," Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1990.

667. "Meeting Minutes," 53.

668. "Meeting Minutes," 310.

supporter of the Los Angeles Public Library was the heart of the Library, the Rotunda. To be restored by conversationists and construction teams alike after the arson attempts, the Rotunda was named after Lodwrick M. Cook, as the developer and financier of the Save the Books campaign. This space was to be named for him "in gratitude for his outstanding leadership in the Save the Books Campaign, which brought together the Los Angeles community to rebuild the Central Library's collection following the 1986 arson fires and successfully concluded a fundraising campaign unparalleled in library history."[669] This recognition ultimately served as the exchange for his presence and leadership in the campaign's fundraising efforts.

In addition to Cook's Rotunda, many other parts of the Donor Recognition Program included a recognition for former City Librarians and Library Commissioners, Save the Books major donors, Blue Ribbon committee members, Fire Fighters, and for the public who contributed to Save the Books. All participatory groups received some sort of formal tribute, with the donors of smaller financial contributions receiving bookplates placed into a book of the library's collection that was purchased by the funds from the campaign, which continue to remain and circulate today. Former Mayor Tom Bradley also received his name on the new wing of the library after the fire in formal recognition of his role as a partner of the Save the Books campaign with Lod Cook. These naming recognition opportunities through a formalized donor program finally gave the donors, volunteers, and other participants involved the social capital desired through such a public and visible campaign. Prior to the Save the Books campaign recognition efforts, no naming had ever been associated with the library, except for the Central

669. "Meeting Minutes," 69.

Library's naming connected to the former Mayor of Los Angeles, Rufus B. von Kleinsmid, which was later renamed in honor of Riordan for improving the library system across the city.[670]

Conclusion

Contrary to Orlean's belief that, "In the saga of humankind, most things are done for money—arson especially, but there is no money to be made by burning libraries," in the case of the Los Angeles Public Library, there was indeed money to be found through the arson attempts at the Central Library. [671] In fact, there was over $10 million to be raised.[672] While Los Angeles is known more for its real estate deals than integration, car culture than community, and oil magnates than philanthropists, it is a resourceful city. As such, Orlean fails to understand that while the individuals who may have instigated the fires at the Central Library received no direct financial benefit for their actions, the Los Angeles Public Library system came to benefit greatly from an outpouring of financial support from the community to save it, and that philanthropy continues to support it today. In an age of greed and battering rams, the Save the Books campaign encompassed a re-centering of a Los Angeles identity through the call for philanthropic support—through both volunteerism and financial donations—to the Los Angeles Public Library for the public good in the fragmented metropolis.

Just as the Los Angeles Public Library benefited from this moment of crisis, so, too, did the Hollywood Bowl. The Save the Bowl's foundational whirlwind campaign conducted

---

670. "Deals and Dealmakers," *Los Angeles Business Journal,* Accessed October 28, 2020. https://labusinessjournal.com/news/2001/apr/30/deals-dealmakers-library-renamed-for-mayor-riordan/

671. Orlean, *The Library Book,* 97.

672. Sheryn Morris, "Save the Books!" in *Feels Like Home,* eds. Sheryn Morris, Christina Rice, James Sherman (Los Angeles: Photo Friends of the Los Angeles Public Library, 2018), 62.

outreach to vast Angelenos instead of an exclusive, targeted segment of the population. The success in reaching the fundraising goal within a condensed timeframe through the assistance of donation tracking through the *Los Angeles Times* served as an early indication of the growing alignment between financial and social capital. Chandler's ability to build momentum from the Save the Bowl campaign to create a targeted, segmented, and bridging campaign that applied both the tactics of big philanthropy alongside the inclusion of the multitude, bestowed her with the recognition of Los Angeles's best fundraiser. This model moved away from the direct application of the Ward-Pierce Model, creating a new philanthropic apparatus to mobilize each of the disparate forms of philanthropy within the multi-faceted campaign structure. These spontaneous expressions of support for cultural institutions contributed to defining a new philanthropy for Los Angeles and how to incorporate the public in more complex structures.

Yet, these campaigns also sought to uphold the social stratification by reproducing a normative cultural establishment within these institutions. The Save the Bowl campaign did acknowledge the elitist, hegemonic programming that moved away from the multitude was a dominant factor in the Bowl's closure, but over time, has continued to serve a clientele with access to excess capital with increasing ticket pricing. The opening of the Music Center enabled the creation of a new space, allowing the Hollywood Bowl to cater to multiple subjectivities. Even in the case of the Los Angeles Public Library, which has continued to provide free access to its materials and spaces, the Foundation's membership structure inverts its public mission to an exclusive, capital-centric, private organization. This paradox of community support to save cultural institutions and create sustainability for future generations while upholding its enlightenment-era infrastructure remains embedded within the discourse of philanthropy.

Nevertheless, philanthropy's vitality is captured through its establishment, sustainability, and growth captures, producing equal and open access to these cultural resources. Although the specific strategies of the campaigns were distinct, the tactics each followed a community-centric framework within a capital-centric paradigm. Between developing imagery to conjure symbolic cooperation through a social imaginary, a mechanism for segmenting Angelenos from across the city through print and digital media, and recognition spaces in support of permanent individualized legacies or donor memorials, these campaigns illustrate the intricate methodologies that shape philanthropic practice in Los Angeles today.

Unlike the focus on recognition in both the Save the Bowl and Music Center campaigns, Save the Books attributed its success to the entirety of the citizenry. As the campaign kicked off, up until the end when the campaign officially dissolved, these four strategies proved successful as part of the plan to mimic the Save the Bowl campaign, as well as to stand out from it. Through distinct imagery, extended media coverage, unprecedented support from ARCO, and volunteerism, the Save the Books campaign had the strategies it needed to succeed in such a fragmented metropolis. Even while the public and city officials had turned their attention away from saving the Central Library building, the arson reignited an interest that would compel people from disparate parts of the city to unite over the tragedy that had befallen an old, yet undeniable, icon of Los Angeles. By using these unique strategies during the campaign, and targeting major donors and the multitude, Save the Books highlights the power of bringing a fragmented city together through philanthropy for a cultural and civic institution.

By mobilizing the disparate socioeconomic communities of people across Los Angeles around a unifying effort, these fundraising campaigns evolved into the most engaging and memorable philanthropic efforts of cultural and civic institutions in the city. Community-centric

philanthropy for cultural organizations in Los Angeles started as early as in the mid-1800s but did not become organized into a campaign model that would permit the inclusion of the multitude in effective and empowering ways until the middle of the 20th century. Each of these campaigns awakened the community to civic engagement to sustain some of the longest standing civic institutions in the city, bringing together Angelenos around a revitalized institution in a fragmented metropolis through philanthropy. In the end, the successes of the campaigns by and for the multitude prove that Los Angeles is not a city of angels built on the legacy of individuals, but instead is a city constituted by a community who possess the ability to work together to accomplish the public good through philanthropy as a collective and cohesive unit.

EPILOGUE

Reimaging a Future of Philanthropy in a City of Angels

> And out of such study there should incidentally arise a more virile civic consciousness, a realization of the oneness of interest in the improvement of Los Angeles, a sense of cohesiveness rather than of competition between the different parts of the city, in realization that what is done for any particular section—it is to be done in accordance with a broad and comprehensive scheme—is done for all. – Charles Mulford Robinson[673]

As illustrated throughout this dissertation, an historical commentary on the physical structure and social consciousness of Los Angeles continues to be relevant to the desire for a more equitable and common identity to unite the whole. Charles Mulford Robinson, a pioneering urban theorist, advanced city planning techniques that applied elements of beatification to the radical potential of subsequent harmonious social order. Developed within the City Beautiful Movement, his ideas reimagined the physical construction of the city to directly influence the ways in which the citizenry interacted and engaged with their civic responsibilities through equitable landscaping. The reimagination of the design of the physical Los Angeles has always been conflated into real estate speculation, from the turn of the 19th century to today. When contemporary real estate, cultural institutions, and big philanthropy combined in an effort to revitalize downtown, the discourse finally shifted away from a lack of big philanthropy and civic institutions to a reimagination of the future of the city's philanthropy.

When the *Los Angeles Times* broke the news in 2010 that Eli Broad had chosen to build his private museum downtown, specifically on Grand Avenue, the long-anticipated destination for Eli and Edythe Broad's art collection legitimized a revitalized interest in the Grand Avenue

673. Charles Mulford Robinson, "Los Angeles, California: The City Beautiful," *Bureau of Governmental Research,* 1907, 14.

Project.[674] Breaking through the praise for a return of the arts to downtown through philanthropic leadership, however, was Bunker Hill's allegory of the destruction, relocation, and rebuilding of Los Angeles. With its continuous erasure of the past as a space for the imagination of the future, "Bunker Hill is an absence that is a presence."[675] Grand Avenue served as a contentious cultural corridor to Los Angeles long before The Broad Museum was announced. This contention not only emerged as a contemplation over the role of the space over time in contributing to the fragmented identity of Angelenos, but also as an illumination of the role of individuals and big philanthropy in shaping the culture of the city.

At the same time Broad received praise for re-developing downtown's cultural landscape through philanthropy, his influence on shaping cultural Los Angeles was scrutinized and questioned. Just months prior to the selection of Grand Avenue as the site of his new museum, the *New York Times* published an article arguing that "Every American city has its power brokers, but only Los Angeles has an Eli Broad. Mr. Broad dominates the arts here with a force that has no parallel in any major city."[676] Broad's impact in the city did not just encompass his role as "following in the footsteps of mega-collector like Norton Simon and J. Paul Getty," but also in the areas of scientific research and civic engagement.[677] Broad's authority in Los Angeles spans far greater than the sector of the arts, but also than that of the physical space of downtown.

---

674. David Ng and Jori Finkel, "Eli Broad says Grand Avenue will be Site of New Contemporary Art Museum," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 24, 2010, https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/la-et--broad-museum-20100823-story.html.

675. Nathan Masters, "The Lost Hills of Downtown Los Angeles," *KCET*, October 11, 2011, https://www.kcet.org/shows/lost-la/the-lost-hills-of-downtown-los-angeles.

676. Jennifer Steinhauer. "Iron Checkbook Shapes Cultural Los Angeles." *The New York Times* (New York, NY), February 7, 2010.

677. Ng and Finkel, "Eli Broad says Grand Avenue will be Site."

Raising his riches through real estate development, Broad's time in Los Angeles has undoubtedly shaped the physical city, contributing to its literal fragmented landscape directly through suburban housing developments. However, by placing the Broad Museum downtown, he used his philanthropy to bring the city back together.

As explored throughout this dissertation, while sources such as *The New York Times* claim that Los Angeles serves as an example of a "city that never quite came together" due is its lack of philanthropy or critical cultural institutions, philanthropy in Los Angeles is merely exceptional.[678] As a result, individuals like Eli Broad have come to fill a role in Los Angeles as a "an architect of its philanthropic culture."[679] His style of philanthropy has been both criticized and honored, but nevertheless serves both his own interests as well as the interests of the public good. As Ms. Resnick, a Los Angeles philanthropist, stated: "When Eli gives, it is like negotiating a business deal. It is not altruistic. It is not blind charity. And there is a difference between being generous and being charitable. But it doesn't matter because the good was still done."[680] Ms. Resnick's commentary summarizes the controversial discourse surrounding big philanthropy: does the practice of big philanthropy seek to support the interests of the public good, or does it uphold the social capital of the elite for the purposes of cultural and social reproduction? Can individuals in search of social capital through philanthropic participation act in self-interest as well as in the interest of the public good? Does it matter?

Broad's reputation as a leader of cultural development in Los Angeles supersedes the controversy of his big philanthropy driving the value of real estate in, under, and around his

678. Arango and Nagourney, "A Paper Tears Apart."

679. Steinhauer, "Iron Checkbook Shapes Cultural Los Angeles."

680. Steinhauer.

museum. Ann Philbin, the director of the Hammer Museum, states that "Eli is not the problem…The problem is that we don't have enough Elis in Los Angeles to balance out his generosity and the power of his influence."[681] Supporting "a longtime but misleading L.A. stereotype" of a lack of philanthropy in Los Angeles, Philbin's suggests that if additional big philanthropists existed, they would instill a balance of power and influence in the distribution and accumulation of his economic and social capital.[682] This type of commentary disregards the importance of the potential philanthropic power of the citizenry as a collective and cohesive social unit, limiting the exchange of capital to big philanthropists and ignoring the collective impact of acts of smaller philanthropy by many.

Now, in 2021, the conversation of philanthropy in Los Angeles has entered further into popular culture than in recent years for two reasons: first, the recent awareness in the media of the wealth disparities along ethno-racial lines sparked by Black Lives Matter marches and the potential of collective action; second, the passing of Eli Broad and the immediate question of the next big philanthropist to fulfill the role of cultural developer in the city. This dissertation's genealogical approach to tracing the historical foundations and shifts in philanthropy across time and space in Los Angeles directly serve as the initial contribution to working towards a reimagination of how philanthropy can better fulfill the public good. This study thereby presents the relevant foundational underpinnings of the embedded relationship between capital through which to apply a more in-depth critique of the layers of site-specific testaments to the impact of philanthropy. For example, the history of redlining and the location of the Los Angeles Public

681. Steinhauer.

682. Christopher Knight, "LACMA Has No One Else to Blame," *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), November 14, 2019.

Library branches provides insight into the way in which funding—both public and private—contribute to the social capital of independent communities in Los Angeles through the library as a public resource. In a mapping study of 20 branches from the Los Angeles Public Library system, half of the branches located in red or yellow areas were either closed or relocated, whereas all branches located in areas mapped as white remain active today.[683]

The further comparison of the role of the racially disintegrated citizenry of Los Angeles with the most widely recognized contemporary leader of cultural development in Los Angeles, Eli Broad, will serve as an opportunity to extract the complexities of exploitation in the relations of production, the accumulation of surplus capital by individuals, and the cyclical need for philanthropy as a remedy for the public good in more detail. In a radical reimagining of legacy, the Eli and Edyth Broad Foundation has been set up to continue to fund their priorities, including their museum, as well as their education and science initiatives, even after their deaths. If there were to be cause for concern surrounding the end of the impact of the Broad's private philanthropy, this would only come ten years after they have both passed. By design, Eli and Edyth have included in their wishes that the Foundation dissolve within ten years to ensure that the funds are spent for immediate impact as opposed to in perpetuity.[684] Unlike many private foundations and endowments which seek to fulfill a permanent legacy, the Broads understand the changing values and needs of society. Moreover, as social and cultural changes occur, the dissolution of the foundation will ensure that it is not funding projects and priorities which are no

683. "Locations and Hours: A Brief History," *Los Angeles Public Library,* Accessed October 20, 2019, https://www.lapl.org/branches

684. Gabriel Kahn, "Bullish About L.A," *Los Angeles Magazine,* April 2014. www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/bullish-about-la/.

longer relevant. By dissolving their family foundation, they acknowledge their influence by agreeing to return it to the public after they are gone.

This reimagination of the active engagement of the citizenry in philanthropy still requires an attentiveness to its potential conflicts of interest: "Philanthropy is commendable, but it must not cause the philanthropist to overlook the circumstances of economic injustice which make philanthropy necessary."[685] As this quotation by Martin Luther King, Jr. suggests, philanthropy exists as a positive force for society, but that it can also cause an ignorance towards the economic, social, and economic conditions that led to its development. Famous for his representation of the masses by way of economic, social, and racial justice, King's remarks on philanthropy illustrate the pervasiveness of the field across both institutions and individuals. The relations of production create the circumstances through which philanthropy becomes necessary to redistribute excess capital to the public, but nevertheless can serve to ensure that few individuals maintain the power to elect the mode of distribution through institutions to uphold a prescribed cultural set of values.

Although Martin Luther King, Jr.'s speech served to unveil vital critiques to systematic inequities over fifty years ago, its call for caution continues to be relevant today. As Michael Edwards, a leading expert on civil society, philanthropy, and democracy, states:

> At a deeper level the new philanthropy could influence social norms in directions that may be harmful to long-term social change, by reorienting attention to the possibilities of individual achievement instead of collective action, or by eroding trust, cooperation, self-sacrifice and solidarity as groups are forced to compete with each other for resources in order to capture easily-measurable financial returns and results. By ignoring social movements, politics and government – which seem to be too messy or conflicted for most

685. Martin Luther King, Jr. "On Being a Good Neighbor," sec. 2, sermon, *A Gift of Love* (1963).

> new philanthropists to fund – some of the most important capacities for long-term social change may be denuded over time.[686]

In a time when inclusion, diversity, equity, and accessibility are at the forefront of the discussion surrounding society and, in particular, the non-profit and philanthropic sector, the design of the mass campaign can help to incorporate these ideals into philanthropy's ideology, discourse, framework, and function. While philanthropy is the result of the inequities developed by the exploitation of human and material resources, it should not be confused as an exploitative system within itself, but as a remedy to the ongoing problem. As such, finding a solution in which democratic principles, guidance, and participation from the public, in conjunction with big philanthropy can come together through distinct and timely campaigns for the public good will serve to more effectively counterbalance the extraction of capital from those communities who need it the most until the time that a more radical solution is implemented to dismantle the production and accumulation of surplus capital. Moving forward, the field of philanthropy, both as a theoretical and practical concept, becomes a central opportunity to shift the ways in which the flow of capital exchange contributes to the public good in the 21st century.

686. Michael Edwards, "From Love to Money: Can Philanthropy Ever Foster Social Transformation?" *New Philanthropy and Social Justice: Debating the Conceptual and Policy Discourse*, edited by Behrooz Morvaridi, 1st ed., (Bristol University Press, Bristol, UK; Chicago, IL, USA, 2015), 38. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1t89dwz.7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"13th Annual Metro Market Study." *Charity Navigator.* Accessed March 20, 2018. https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=studies.metro.main.

"400,000 Library Books in L.A. Never Have Had Other Than Rented Home." *Los Angeles Express* (Los Angeles, CA), May 25, 1921.

"400,000 Burn Victims Need Your Help." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

"$4,000,000 Y.M.C.A. Campaign on To-Day." *New York Times* (New York, NY), November 10, 1913.

"About the Library." *Los Angeles Public Library*. Accessed August 13, 2019. https://www.lapl.org/about-lapl/about-library.

Abrams, Garry. "TreePeople Work with Volunteers in Aftermath of Devastating Library Fire." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 5, 1986.

"Accepts Carnegie Offer." *New York Time* (New York, NY), February 12, 1911.

Acs, Zoltan J. *Why Philanthropy Matters: How the Wealthy Give, and What It Means for Our Economic Well-Being.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Adamic, Louis. "The Bright Side of Los Angeles." *Facts You Should Know About California.* Ed. E. Haldeman-Julius. Little Blue Book, no. 752 (1927).

Allen, William H. *Modern Philanthropy: A Study of Efficient Appealing and Giving.* New York: Dodd, Mead, 1912.

Amaya, Hector. *Citizenship Excess: Latinos/as, Media, and the Nation.* New York: New York University, 2013.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* New York: Verso, 1983.

Arango, Tim, and Adam Nagourney. "A Paper Tears Apart in a City that Never Quite Came Together." *New York Times* (New York, NY), January 30, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/30/us/los-angeles-times.html.

Arnsberger, Paul, Ludlum, Melissa, Riley, Margaret, and Mark Stanton. "A History of the Tax-Exempt Sector: An SOI Perspective." *Statistics of Income Bulletin*, 2008.

Au-Yeung, Angel, Deniz Çam, Kerry A. Dolan, Lauren Debter, Antoine Gara, Christopher Helman, Sergei Klebnikov, Chase Peterson-Withorn, Ariel Shapiro, Chloe Sorvino, Michela Tindera, Giacomo Tognini, Lisette Voytko and Jennifer Wang. *"*America's Top Givers: The 25 Most Philanthropic Billionaires." *Forbes*. January 19, 2021. Accessed July 31, 2021. https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbeswealthteam/2021/01/19/americas-top-givers-the-25-most-philanthropic-billionaires/?sh=60b9e89d1f59

Augst, Thomas. "Introduction." In *Institutions of Reading: The Social Life of Libraries in the United States,* ed. Thomas Augst and Kenneth Carpenter. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 2007.

Babchuk, Nicholas, and Ralph V. Thompson. "The Voluntary Associations of Negroes." *American Sociological Review* 27, no. 5 (1962): 647–655.

Baker, Bob. "Library Races Against Time to Save Books." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 1, 1968.

Banham, Reyner. *Los Angeles: The Architecture of Four Ecologies.* London: The Penguin Press, 1971.

Barkan, Joanne. "Plutocrats at Work: How Big Philanthropy Undermines Democracy." *Dissent Magazine.* October 22, 2013. https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/plutocrats-at-work-how-big-philanthropy-undermines-democracy

Bart, Peter. "Remembering Dorothy Chandler as Los Angeles' Music Center Turns 50." *Variety.* December 10, 2014. https://variety.com/2014/voices/columns/remembering-dorothy-chandler-as-los-angeles-music-center-turns-50-1201375040/

"Behind the Headlines." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), December 1, 1935.

Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics.* London: Routledge, 1995.

"Bertram to Alexander." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1924.

Beugelsdijk, Sjoerd. "A Multilevel Approach to Social Capital." *International Studies of Management & Organization* 39, no. 2 (2009): 65–89. Accessed July 30, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/40397758.

"Beverly Hills." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

Billitteri, Thomas. "Venturing on a Bet." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy.* June 1, 2000.

Bishop, Matthew, and Michael Green. *Philanthrocapitalism: How Giving Can Save the World.* New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2009.

"Blue Ribbon Committee Seeks Seat Endowments." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1987.

Bluestone, Daniel M. "Detroit's City Beautiful and the Problem of Commerce." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 47, no. 3 (1988): 245–262. Accessed July 30, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/990300.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education,* edited by J.G. Richardson, 241-258. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction*. Milton: Routledge Kegan and Paul, 1984.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1990.

"Bowl Comeback Stimulates Art Interest—Mrs. Chandler." *Times Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), July 1951.

"Bowl Fund Drive Gets Under Way." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 31, 1951.

Breisch, Kenneth A. *The Los Angeles Central Library: Building an Architectural Icon, 1872-1933.* Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2016.

Bremner, Robert. *American Philanthropy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Brisson, Daniel S., and Charles L. Usher. "Bonding Social Capital in Low-Income Neighborhoods." *Family Relations* 54, no. 5 (2005): 644–653.

"Bunker Hill Urban Renewal Project." University of Southern California Archives, 1959.

Burk, Penelope. *Donor-Centered Fundraising.* Chicago: Cygnus Applied Research, Inc, 2003.

Callahan, David. *Wealth, Power, and Philanthropy in a New Gilded Age.* New York: Vintage Books, 2017.

Cao, Jerry. *Los Angeles Public Library.* Los Angeles: University of California, 1977.

Carnegie, Andrew. "The Gospel of Wealth (1889)." Accessed September 4, 2020. https://production-carnegie.s3.amazonaws.com/filer_public/ab/c9/abc9fb4b-dc86-4ce8-ae31-a983b9a326ed/ccny_essay_1889_thegospelofwealth.pdf.

Carnegie, Andrew. "The Best Fields for Philanthropy." *North American Review* 149, no. 397 (1889).

"Carnegie Gifts Find Opposition." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), April 16, 1912.

Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History, ed. Mark McGarvie and Lawrence Friedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Charles, Ann. "Traditional Philanthropy Gives Way to a New Power." *Business Ethics.* Accessed December 2, 2019. https://business-ethics.com/2010/10/15/1544-traditional-philanthropy-gives-way-to-a-new-kind-of-power/

Cherry, Kendra. "The Basics of Prosocial Behavior." *Very Well Mind.* April 30, 2020. https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-prosocial-behavior-2795479.

"Chronology." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1990.

"Cities: The New World." *TIME*. July 15, 1957.

"City Council Minutes." County of Los Angeles Archived Digital Vault. February 14, 1911. http://clkrep.lacity.org/oldcfidocs/

"City Library, One of 2811 Memorials to Carnegie, Will Observe Anniversary." *Oklahoma News* (Oklahoma City, OK), October 24, 1935.

Cole, Eddie R. "Segregation Is Immoral: Race, University Systems, and Bureaucratic Resistance." *The Campus Color Line: College Presidents and the Struggle for Black Freedom*. Princeton University Press (2020):119–155. Accessed July 29, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvz938tq.8.

Coleshill. Dareen. "What is a Donor? And What is Donor-Centric?" *Development for Conservation.* May 23, 2017. Accessed December 21, 2020. https://developmentforconservation.com/2017/what-is-a-donor-and-what-is-donor-centric/.

Concept Los Angeles: The Concept for the Los Angeles General Plan. Los Angeles: Department of City Planning, 1970.

Conley, Aaron. "Capital Campaigns." in *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising*, eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016.

"Correspondence." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

Crawford, Dorothy Lamb. *Evenings On and Off the Roof: Pioneering Concerts in Los Angeles 1939-1971.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Cube, Caroline. "Hollywood Bowlsheviks." University of California, Los Angeles Library Special Collections, December 1, 2015.

Cutlip, Scott. *Fundraising in the United States: Its Role in America's Philanthropy.* New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990.

Cunningham, Hugh. "The Multi-Layered History of Western Philanthropy." In *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy.* Eds. Tobias Jung, Susan D. Phillips, and Jenny Harrow. New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 2019.

Daly, Siobhan. "Philanthropy as an Inherently Contested Concept." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 23, no. 3 (2012): 535-557.

Davis, Margaret Leslie. *The Music Center of Los Angeles County: The First Fifty Years*. San Marino: Huntington Library Press, 2014.

Davis, Margaret Leslie. *The Culture Broker: Franklin D. Murphy and the Transformation of Los Angeles*. Los Angeles, University of California Press, 2007.

Davis, Mike. *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles.* New York: Verso Books, 1990.

"Deals and Dealmakers." *Los Angeles Business Journal*. April 30, 2001. https://labusinessjournal.com/news/2001/apr/30/deals-dealmakers-library-renamed-for-mayor-riordan/

DellaVigna, Stefano, List, John A., and Ulrike Malmendier. "Testing for Altruism and Social Pressure in Charitable Giving." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127, no. 1 (2012): 27-34.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America.* London: Penguin Books, 2003.

Deverell, William. *Whitewashed Adobe: The Rise of Los Angeles and the Remaking of its Mexican Past.* Berkeley: University of California, 2004.

Dickson, Edward A. *University of California at Los Angeles: Its Origin and Formative Years.* Los Angeles: Friends of the UCLA Library, 1955.

Didion, Joan. "Will Power." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 31, 1997.

Ditzion, Sidney H. *Arsenal of a Democratic Culture: A Social History of the American Library Movement from 1850 to 1900.* American Library Association, 1947.

Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Dunning, Glenna. "A Wanderer and Homeless Waif." In *Feels Like Home,* edited by Sheryn Morris, Christina Rice, James Sherman, 11-36. Los Angeles: Photo Friends of the Los Angeles Public Library, 2018.

Edwards, Bob, and Michael W. Foley. “Much Ado About Social Capital.” *Contemporary Sociology* 30, 3 (2001): 227-230.

Edwards, Michael. “From Love to Money: Can Philanthropy Ever Foster Social Transformation?” *New Philanthropy and Social Justice: Debating the Conceptual and Policy Discourse*, ed. Behrooz Morvaridi (2015): 33-46. www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1t89dwz.7.

Estrada, William David. *The Los Angeles Plaza: Sacred and Contested Space*. Austin: University of Texas, 2008.

Farkas, Gergei M., and Elisabet Lindberg. “Voluntary Associations' Impact on the Composition of Active Members' Social Networks: Not an Either/Or Matter.” *Sociological Forum* 30, no. 4 (2015): 1082–1105.

“Fete Carnegie Birthday; Cite Benefactions in L.A.” *Herald Express* (Los Angeles, CA), November 25, 1935.

Fine, David. *Imagining Los Angeles: A City in Fiction.* Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2000.

“Fire Alarm.” *Los Angeles Herald* (Los Angeles, CA), Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1986.

“Fire Destroyed Them but You can Save Them*.” Association of College and Research Libraries.* Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, June 28, 1986.

Florida, Richard. *The Rise of the Creative Class: How It’s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life.* New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Fosdick, Raymond B. *The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation.* New York: Harper, 1952.

“Franklin Murphy Dies.” *New York Times* (New York, NY), June 17, 1994. www.nytimes.com/1994/06/17/obituaries/franklin-d-murphy-78-dies-leader-in-arts-and-publishing.html.

Frumkin, Peter. *On Being Nonprofit: A Conceptual and Policy Primer. C*ambridge: Harvard University, 2002.

Fogelson, Robert M. *The Fragmented Metropolis: Los Angeles, 1850-1930.* Berkeley: University of California, 1967.

Gamm, Gerald and Robert Putnam. “The Growth of Voluntary Associations in America, 1840-1940,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, no. 4 (1999): 511–557.

Gelt, Jessica. “50 Moments in Music Center History.” *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), November 14, 2014. https://timelines.latimes.com/50-moments-music-center/

"Gift to Bowl Top Halfway Mark in Drive." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 1951.

Gilder, Joseph B. "The Carnegie Who His Friends Knew." *The Sun* (London, UK), August 17, 1919.

Giridharadas, Anand. *Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2018.

"Glittering Coast Tough on Culture." *Leavenworth Times* (Leavenworth, KS), July 18, 1951.

Goel, Vindu. "East vs. West." *New York Times* (New York, NY), November 6, 2016. https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/06/giving/philanthropy-in-silicon-valley-big-bets-on-big-ideas.html

Goldberg, Albert. "The Sounding Board: Hollywood at the Crossroads." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), September 11, 1949.

Goldberg, Albert. "The Sounding Board: Hollywood Bowl Strikes Out." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 22, 1951.

Goldberg, Bertrand. "N.Y. Center Plans Shaped." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), December 27, 1959.

Guillow, Lawrence E. "Pandemonium in the Plaza: The First Los Angeles Riot, July 22, 1856." *Southern California Quarterly* 77, no. 3 (1995): 183–197. Accessed July 30, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/41171763.

Gutmann, Amy. "The Value of Voluntary Groups." *Identity in Democracy*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press (2003): 86–116. Accessed July 30, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7s35j.6.

Gross, Robert. "Giving in America: From Charity to Philanthropy." *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History.* eds. Mark McGarvie and Lawrence Friedman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Halberstam, David. *The Powers that Be.* Urbana: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Hall, Peter Dobkin. "A Historical Overview of Philanthropy, Voluntary Associations, and Nonprofit Organizations in the United States, 1600–2000," in *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Yale University Press, 2006.

Hall, Stuart. "Encoding, Decoding." In *The Cultural Studies Reader.* Eds. Simon During. New York: Routledge (1993): 90-103.

Hall, Stuart. "Notes on Deconstructing the Popular (1981)." In *Cultural Theory: An Anthology.* Eds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Hanifan, L. J. "The Rural School Community Center." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67 (1916): 130–38. Accessed June 18, 2020. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1013498.

.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *The Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire.* New York: Penguin Books, 2004.

Hawes, Daniel P., and Austin Michael McCrea. "Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor and We Might Buy Them Dinner: Social Capital, Immigration, and Welfare Generosity in the American States." *Political Research Quarterly* 71, no. 2 (2018): 347–360. Accessed 13 July 2021. 347. www.jstor.org/stable/26600477

Herzog, Patricia, and Heather Price. *American Generosity: Who Gives and Why.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Hicks, Cordell. "Hollywood Bowl Interest Grows as Opening Near: Women's Groups Taking Lead to Assure Season's Success." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 1, 1951.

Hicks, Cordell. "Inspiring Response at Meeting Gives New Hope to Bowl Future." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 6, 1951.

Hise, Greg, and William Deverell. *Eden by Design: The 1930 Olmsted-Bartholomew Plan for the Los Angeles Region.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

"Historical Notes." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1992.

"Historical Resident Population: Spanish and Mexican Period, 1781 to 1846." Los Angeles Almanac. Accessed February 15, 2020. http://www.laalmanac.com/population/po01.php.

Hohns, John. "Power Brokers! Pinpointing the Most Powerful Californians and What They Do." *PSA Magazine* (1975): 46.

Hollywood Bowl Board of Directors*. A Brief History: Symphonies Under the Stars.* Hollywood Bowl Association, 1926.

"Hollywood Bowl Closes for Season." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 15, 1951.

"Hollywood Bowl Pamphlet." *LA Philharmonic Scrapbook.* Los Angeles Hollywood Bowl Special Collections, 1951.

Hopkins, C. Howard. *History of the Y.M.C.A. in North America.* New York: Association Press, 1951.

Horvath, Aaron, and Walter W. Powell, "Contributory or Disruptive: Do New Forms of Philanthropy Erode Democracy?" in *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies: History, Institutions, Values, 87-122.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Horkeimer, Max, and Theodor Adorno. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception (1944)." In *Cultural Theory: An Anthology.* Eds. Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

"How Jews Helped Build L.A.'s Music Center." *Jewish Journal.* January 7, 2015.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York: Random House, 1961.

James. Russell. *Inside the Mind of the Bequest Donor: A Visual Presentation of the Neuroscience and Psychology of Effective Planned Giving Communication.* Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 2013.

Jenken, John, and Michael Buckland. *The Hollywood Bowl: Tales of Summer Nights.* Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.

Jones, Isabel Morse. *Hollywood Bowl.* Los Angeles: Hollywood Bowl Association, 1920.

Jung, Tobias, Phillips, Susan D., and Jenny Harrow. *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy.* New York: Routledge, 2015.

Kahn, Gabriel. "Bullish About L.A." *Los Angeles Magazine* (Los Angeles, CA), April 2014. www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/bullish-about-la/.

Karasick, Norman M. and Dorothy K. Karasick, *The Oilman's Daughter: A Biography of Aline Barnsdall*. Encino: Carleston Publishing, 1993.

King, Jr, Martin Luther. "On Being a Good Neighbor," sec. 2, sermon, *A Gift of Love* (1963).

King, Willford Isbell. *Trends in Philanthropy.* New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1928.

Klaz, Anita. *An Oral History of Dorothy Buffum Chandler.* Northridge: California State University, 1981.

Knight, Christopher. "LACMA Has No One Else to Blame." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), November 14, 2019.

Koegel, John. "Canciones del Pais: Mexican Musical Life in California After the Gold Rush." *California History* 78, no 3 (1999).

Kohl-Arenas, Erica. "Critical Issues in Philanthropy: Power, Paradox, Possibility, and the Private Foundation." In *Funding, Power, and Community Development.* Eds. Niamh McCrea and Fergal Finnegan. Bristol: Bristol University Press, 2019.

"Laird of Skibo Won't Yield." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 5, 1910.

Lawrence, William. *Memories of a Happy Life.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1926.

Le, Vu. "How Donor-Centrism Perpetuates Inequity and Why We Must Move Toward Community Centric Fundraising." *Nonprofit AF.* May 15, 2017. Accessed December 21, 2020. https://nonprofitaf.com/2017/05/how-donor-centrism-perpetuates-inequity-and-why-we-must-move-toward-community-centric-fundraising/.

Lee, Zoe, and Lucy Woodliffe. "Donor Misreporting: Conceptualizing Social Desirability Bias in Giving Surveys." *Voluntas* 21, no. 27 (2010): 569-587.

Letter from Carlton Ketchum, September 6, 1961. In "Material for Article on the History and Trends of Fundraising Campaigns for Colleges and Universities." Ketchum Firm Archives.

Letter from Dorothy Chandler to Jacqueline Kennedy, University of California, Los Angeles Library Special Collections, 1962.

"Library Rules Modified." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 4, 1913.

Lipsitz, George. *The Possessive Investment in Whiteness: How White People Profit from Identity Politics.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2006.

Literary Digest. Dec. 13, 1913.

"Locations and Hours: A Brief History." *Los Angeles Public Library.* Accessed October 20, 2019. www.lapl.org/branches

Lod Cook letter to Abraham Spiegel. Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, November 20, 1986.

"Looking Back: The Long Trek to Opening Day." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), Oct. 1, 1993.

"Los Angeles Central Library: Issue Background," *Los Angeles Conservancy*. Accessed August 13, 2019. https://www.laconservancy.org/issues/los-angeles-central-library

Los Angeles County Culture and the Community. Los Angeles: Civic Bureau of Music and Art of Los Angeles, 1927.

"Los Angeles Public Library." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), January 1, 1899.

"Los Angeles Public Library, 1872-1920: How the Library was Established—How it has Grown—What it is Doing To-day for Greater Los Angeles—Why it Should have Central Building." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1920.

Los Angeles Star (Los Angeles, CA), April 2, 1859.

"Los Angeles! You Need a Library." *Los Angeles Record* (Los Angeles, CA), June 4, 1921.

Loury, Glenn. "A Dynamic Theory of Racial Income Differences." In *Women, Minorities, and Employment Discrimination*, edited by P. Wallace and A. LaMonde. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1977.

Lyman, Rick. "Dorothy Chandler: Arts Patron in Los Angeles." *New York Times.* July 8, 1997. https://www.nytimes.com/1997/07/08/arts/dorothy-chandler-96-dies-arts-patron-in-los-angeles.html

"Major Gifts Report." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1987.

Marshall, Joanne M. "Grassroots Philanthropy on the Prairie." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 93, no. 8, (2012): 34–38. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23210370.

Martin, James R. *The University of California (in Los Angeles): A Resume of the Selection and Acquisition of the Westwood Site.* Los Angeles: University of California, 1925.

Martino, Alison. "Remembering Beverly Hills' Magical Public Library." *Los Angeles Magazine.* April 20, 2015. https://www.lamag.com/citythinkblog/remembering-beverly-hills-magical-public-library/

Masters, Nathan. "The Lost Hills of Downtown Los Angeles." *KCET*. October 11, 2011. https://www.kcet.org/shows/lost-la/the-lost-hills-of-downtown-los-angeles.

Marx, Karl. "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of the Political Economy, Vol. 1.* Seattle: Pacific Publishing Studio, 2010.

McCarthy, Kathy. *American Creed: Philanthropy and the Rise of Civil Society, 1700-1865.* Chicago: University of Chicago, 2003.

McCrossen, Alexis. "'One Cathedral More' or 'Mere Lounging Places for Bummers'? The Cultural Politics of Leisure and the Public Library in Gilded Age America." *Libraries & Culture* 41, no. 2 (2006): 169–188. Accessed 2 Aug. 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/25541979.

McCulley, George. *Philanthropy Reconsidered: Private Initiatives, Public good, Quality of Life.* Bloomington: AuthorHouse, 2008.

McGlew, James F. "Politics on the Margins: The Athenian 'Hetaireiai' in 415 B.C." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 48, no. 1 (1999): 1–22.

McGraw, Carol. “Memories Remain: Library a Magic Place for Regulars.” *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 4, 1986.

McKeever, Brice. “Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2018: Public Charities, Giving, and Volunteering. *National Center for Charitable Statistics.* Accessed March 22, 2021. https://nccs.urban.org/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2018#highlights.

McWilliams, Carey. *Southern California: An Island on the Land*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith, 1973.

Meares, Hadley. “The Women Who Made Los Angeles the Athens of America.” *Curbed Los Angeles.* July 21, 2015. https://la.curbed.com/2015/7/21/9938774/the-women-who-made-los-angeles-the-athens-of-america-1

Meares, Hadley. “Sunkist Skies of Glory: How City Leaders and Real Estate Barons Used Sunshine and Oranges to Sell Los Angeles.” *Curbed Los Angeles.* May 24, 2018. https://la.curbed.com/2018/5/24/17350622/los-angeles-history-promoted-boosters-ads

“Meeting Minutes.” Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, 1990.

Miller, Judith. “In Los Angeles, a New Generation Discovers Philanthropy.” *New York Times* (New York, NY), December 8, 1997.

Miranda, Gloria E. “Racial and Cultural Dimensions of ‘Gente de Razón’ Status in Spanish and Mexican California.” *Southern California Quarterly* 70, no. 3 (1988): 265-278.

Mirande, Alfred M. “Social Mobility and Participation: The Dissociative and Socialization Hypotheses.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (1973): 19–31. Accessed July 31, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/4105732.

Moniz, Amanda B. “Giving in America: A History of Philanthropy.” *History News* 72, no. 4 (2017).

Moody, Michael, and Tory Martin. “Increasing Critiques of (Big) Philanthropy.” *Dorothy A. Johnson Center for Philanthropy.* November 17, 2020. Accessed December 23, 2020. https://johnsoncenter.org/blog/increasing-critiques-of-big-philanthropy/

Morris, Sheryn. “Save the Books!” In *Feels Like Home,* edited by Sheryn Morris, Christina Rice, James Sherman, 61-74. Los Angeles: Photo Friends of the Los Angeles Public Library, 2018.

Morrison, Patt, and Cathleen Decker. “One Year Later: Wounds of the Library Fire Slow to Heal.” *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), April 28, 1987.

“Moves Management Best Practices.” *Blackbaud.* https://www.blackbaud.com/support/howto/coveo/renxt/bb-moves-mgmt.html. Accessed September 5, 2020.

Muchnic, Suzanne. *LACMA So Far: Portrait of a Museum in the Making.* San Marino: The Huntington Library, Art Collections, and Botanical Gardens, 2019.

Murphy to Otis Chandler, Papers of Franklin D. Murphy, Box 28, Folder 2, Department of Special Collections, University Library, University of California, Los Angeles, March 21, 1983.

Murphy, Annie. "Helping Everyone to Help Themselves: Andrew Carnegie and Libraries." January 28, 2020. https://www.lapl.org/collections-resources/blogs/lapl/helping-everyone-help-themselves-andrew-carnegie-and-libraries

Murphy, Cullin. "The Atlantic: A History." *The Atlantic.* November 1994. https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1994/11/the-atlantic-a-history/

Murphy, Franklin D. "My UCLA Chancellorship: An Utterly Candid View." Interview by James V. Mink, transcript 1976. Oral History Collection, University Library Special Collections.

"National Medal for Museum and Library Service." *Institute of Museums and Library Services.* Accessed July 30, 2019. https://www.imls.gov/our-work/national-medal-museum-and-library-service.

Nederhof, Anton J. "Methods of coping with social desirability bias: a review." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 12, no 3. (1985): 263-280.

Newmark, Harris. *Sixty Years in California, 1853-1913.* Kindle.

Ng, David, and Jori Finkel. "Eli Broad says Grand Avenue will be Site of New Contemporary Art Museum." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 24, 2010. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/la-et--broad-museum-20100823-story.html.

Nordby, Leslie, Walter, Virginia, and Barbara Clark. "Development Committee Report." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection, February 8, 1988.

Northcutt, John Orlando. *The Hollywood Bowl Story.* Hollywood: Hollywood Bowl Association, 1962.

Northcutt, John Orlando. *Magic Valley: The Story of the Hollywood Bowl.* Fashion press, Inc. 1976.

Nottingham, William, and Edward J. Boyer. "'Like Paying Interest on a Debt: 1,500 Rally to Library's Need in Ashes of Disaster." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 5, 1986.

Olmsted Brothers and Harland Bartholomew & Associates. "Parks, Playgrounds and Beaches for the Los Angeles Region." Citizen's Committee on Parks, Playgrounds, and Beaches. 1930.

Orlean, Susan. *The Library Book.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2018.

Orum, Anthony M. "A Reappraisal of the Social and Political Participation of Negroes." *American Journal of Sociology* 72, no. 3 (1966).

Ostrower, Francie. *Why the Wealthy Give: The Culture of Elite Philanthropy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

"Overdue Notice." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), February 29, 1987.

Painter, Matthew A., and Pamela Paxton. "Checkbooks in the Heartland: Change over Time in Voluntary Association Membership." *Sociological Forum* 29, no. 2 (2014): 408–428.

"Past Leaders: Franklin Murphy, 1960-1968." University of California, Los Angeles. Accessed December 1, 2019. http://www.pastleaders.ucla.edu/murphy.html

"Pathbreaker: Charting Andrew Carnegie's Life and Legacy in the Hall that he Build." *Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy*. https://www.medalofphilanthropy.org/pathbreaker-charting-andrew-carnegie/

Payton, Robert L. *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988.

Payton, Robert L., and Michael P. Moody. *Understanding Philanthropy: Its Meaning and Mission.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.

Phillips, George Harwood. "Indians in Los Angeles, 1781-1875: Economic Integration, Social Disintegration." *Pacific Historical Review* 49, no. 3 (1980): 427–451. Accessed July 30, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/3638564.

Pierce, Lyman L. *How to Raise Money.* New York: Harper, 1932.

Pinkley, Virgil. "Editorials." *Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), July 25, 1951.

Prince, Russ Alan, and Karen Maru File. *Seven Faces of Philanthropy: A New Approach to Cultivating Major Donors.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Prine Katie, and Elisabeth Lesem. "Prospective Donor and Donor Research and Database Management." In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising,* eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016.

"Public Libraries in America." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), June 11, 1900.

"Publisher's Wife Helping Cultural Desert to Bloom." *South Mississippi Sun* (Biloxi, MS),. December 23, 1974.

Putnam, Robert D. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Smith and Schuster Paperbacks, 2000.

"QuickFacts: Los Angeles city, California." *United States Census*. Accessed March 10, 2020. https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/losangelescitycalifornia.

Rand, Christopher. *Los Angeles: The Ultimate City.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

"Rescue Hollywood Bowl!" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 17, 1951.

Reich, Robert. *Just Giving: Why Philanthropy is Failing Democracy and How it Can do Better.* Princeton: Princeton University, 2018.

Reich, Robert, Cordelli, Chiara, and Lucy Bernholz. *Philanthropy in Democratic Societies: History, Institutions, Values.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016.

Reich, Robert. *The Common Good.* New York: Penguin Random House, 2018.

Robinson, Charles Mulford. "Los Angeles, California: The City Beautiful." *Bureau of Governmental Research.* 1907.

"Roll of Honor Marks Donation of Bowl Talent." *Mirror* (Los Angeles, CA), August 27, 1951.

Sargeant, Adrian. "Donor Retention: What Do We Know and What Can We Do About It?" *Nonprofit Quarterly.* August 15, 2013. https://nonprofitquarterly.org/donor-retention-nonprofit-donors/. Accessed December 21, 2020.

Sarti, Jenny. *The Giving Way to Happiness.* New York: Penguin Random House, 2015.

"Save the Books." *YouTube.* Accessed March 17, 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=8&v=CR0-MMV7hBE.

"Save Hollywood Bowl!" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 4, 1951.

"Save the Books Fundraiser." *YouTube*. Accessed March 17, 2019. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ACqtmEqvAxM.

"Save the Books." Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collection. Accessed March 17, 2019. https://www.lapl.org/collections-resources/blogs/lapl/save-books

"Save the Books Fundraising." Los Angeles Public Library. Accessed March 17, 2019. https://www.lapl.org/collections-resources/blogs/lapl/save-books

"Save the Books: The Campaign." Private Collection of Judy Ostrander, 1986.

Schneirov, Richard. “Thoughts on Periodizing the Gilded Age: Capital Accumulation, Society, and Politics, 1873-1898. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 5, no. 3 (2006).

Schrank. Sarah. *Art and the City: Civic Imagination and Cultural Authority in Los Angeles*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Schwartz, John J. “Introduction to the Transactions Edition, in *Fundraising in the United States: Its Role in America’s Philanthropy, xix-xxx.* Scott Cutlip. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 1990.

Scott, Allen J., and Edward W. Soja. *The City: Los Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century.* Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997.

Scott, John C. “Membership and Participation in Voluntary Associations.” *American Sociological Review* 22, no. 3 (1957): 315–326. Accessed July 31, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/2088473.

Sewell, William H. “Social Mobility and Social Participation.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 435 (1978): 226–247. Accessed August 2, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/1043097

Shera, Jesse H. *Foundations of the Public Library: The Origins of the Public Library Movement in New England 1629-1855.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Sherman, Gene. “Even a Briton Conceded Long Ago that the Bowl was Something Heroic.” *Los Angeles Times.* July 25, 1951.

Sherman, James. “From Belle to Burden and Back Again.” In *Feels Like Home,* edited by Sheryn Morris, Christina Rice, James Sherman, 37-52. Los Angeles: Photo Friends of the Los Angeles Public Library, 2018.

“Showed of Gold Rings Money Clock.” *New York Tribune* (New York, NY), November 27, 1913.

Skocpol, Theda. “America's Voluntary Groups Thrive in a National Network.” *The Brookings Review* 15, no. 4 (1997): 6–19. Accessed 9 June 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/20068644.

Seiler, Timothy L. “Individuals as a Constituency for Fundraising.” In *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising,* eds. Eugene R. Tempel, Timothy L. Seiler, and Dwight F. Burlingame. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016.

Smith, Caroline Estes. *The Philharmonic Orchestra of Los Angeles: The First Decade, 1919-1929.* Los Angeles: United Printing Company, 1930.

Smith, Catherine Parsons. “Founding the Hollywood Bowl.” University of Illinois Press. *American Music* 11, no 2 (1993).

Smith, Catherine Parsons. *Making Music in Los Angeles: Transforming the Popular.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Social Capital and Poor Communities. Edited by Susan Saegert, J. Phillip Thompson, and Mark R. Warren. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2005.

"Solicitation Response Status." *Blue Ribbon Committee*. Los Angeles Public Library Rare Books Collections, 1987.

Soss, Joe, Fording, Richard C., and Sanford S. Schram. "The Devolution of Color: Race, Federalism and the Politics of Social Control." *American Journal of Political Science* 52, no. 3 (2008): 536–553.

Starr, Kenneth. *Material Dreams: Southern California Through the 1920s.* New York: Oxford University, 1990.

Starr, Kenneth. Foreword to *The Los Angeles Central Library: Building an Architectural Icon, 1872-1933, vi-x.* Kenneth Breisch. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2016.

Stanley, Alessandra. "Silicon Valle's New Philanthropy." *New York Times* (New York, NY), October 31, 2015.

Steinhauer. Jennifer. "Iron Checkbook Shapes Cultural Los Angeles." *The New York Times* (New York, NY), February 7, 2010.

"Tax-Exempt Status for Your Organization." Department of the Treasure Internal Revenue Service. January 2020. Accessed July 21, 2020. https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p557.pdf.

Temple, Eugene R., Seiler, Timothy L., and Dwight F. Burlingame. *Achieving Excellence in Fundraising.* Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, 2016.

"The Blue Ribbon." *The Music Center.* Accessed June 15, 2019. https://www.musiccenter.org/support/ways-to-give/the-blue-ribbon/

"The California Story." *Hollywood Bowl Association*. Huntington Archives, 1950.

The Cleveland Jewish Community Federation. "1910 Report." Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland Records, Western Reserve Historical Society, 1910.

"The City: Brightness in the Air." *TIME*. December 18, 1964.

"The History of the Music Center." *The Music Center.* Accessed January 31, 2020. https://www.musiccenter.org/visit/about/history/

"The Los Angeles Library." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), February 16, 1902.

"The Music Center Dedicated to Mrs. Normal Chandler." *Times Mirror Progress* 3, no. 4 (1964).

"The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2019." National Center for Charitable Statistics. Accessed July 21, 2020. https://nccs.urban.org/publication/nonprofit-sector-brief-2019#the-nonprofit-sector-in-brief-2019.

"The Prices Too High." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), May 19, 1887.

"Tom Bradley Wing: History and Design." Los Angeles Public Library. Accessed January 29, 2020. https://www.lapl.org/branches/central-library/art-architecture/tom-bradley-wing

Tollit, F. G. "Reactions to Hollywood Bowl's Closing." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 19, 1951.

Traub, Derek. *Past / Forward: The LA Phil at 100.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles Philharmonic, 2018.

"Tribute to Bowl Slated Tomorrow." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), August 1951.

"Trust Indenture." *The J. Paul Getty Trust.* 2006. http://www.getty.edu/about/governance/pdfs/indenture.pdf

Turgot, Anne Robert Jacques. *Reflections of the Formation and Distribution of Wealth.* London: E. Spragg, 1774.

"Use the Donor Pyramid to Focus Your Attention in the Right Places." *Capital Campaign Masters.* Accessed August 21, 2021. https://capitalcampaignmasters.com/use-the-donor-pyramid-to-focus-your-attention-in-the-right-places/

"Using Venture Philanthropy: Angel Funding for Nonprofits." *University of Notre Dame.* October 13, 2020.

Vankin, Deborah. "Dorothy Buffum Chandler was the Driving Force Behind the Music Center." November 14, 2014. https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/la-et-cm-ca-music-center-buff-chandler-20141116-story.html

Van Slyck, Abigail. "The Utmost Amount of Effective Accommodation": Andrew Carnegie and the Reform of the American Library," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50, np. 4 (1991): 359-383

Van Slyck, Abigail. "Free to all: Carnegie libraries and the transformation of American culture, 1886-1917." Berkeley: University of California, 1989.

Van Slyck, Abigail. "The Lady and the Library Loafer: Gender and Public Space in Victorian America." *Winterthur Portfolio* 31, no. 4 (1996): 221–242. Accessed August 2, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/1215236.

Villanueva, Edgar. *Decolonizing Wealth: Indigenous Wisdom to Heal Divides and Restore Balance.* Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2018.

Voluntary Giving in a Free Land: A History of Ward, Dreshman, and Reinhardt and its Influence on Fundraising in the United States. New York: Ward, Dreshman, & Reinhardt, Incorporated, 1955.

"Wanted, a Library Building." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), March 4, 1900.

"Wanted: A Public Library Building." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), January 14, 1901.

Ward, Charles. *The Intensive Fundraising Campaign.* New York: Young Men's Christian Association, 1917.

"Will Carnegie Give us a Library?" *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), July 26, 1902.

Williams, Charles Whiting. "Cleveland's Federated Givers," *Review of Reviews* 48 (1913).

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Wilson, William. "A Birthday Present for a Cultural Catalyst." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), October 16, 1992.

Wilson, William H. *The City Beautiful Movement: Creating the North American Landscape.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Wirth, Louis. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." *American Journal of Sociology* 44, no. 1 (1938): 1–24. Accessed July 31, 2021. www.jstor.org/stable/2768119

"Wise Fools." *The Daily Palo Alto* (Palo Alto, CA), April 24, 1923. https://newspaperarchive.com/stanford-daily-apr-24-1923-p-2/

Woo, Elaine. "Eli Broad, Billionaire Who Poured Wealth into Shaping L.A., dies at 87." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), April 30, 2021.

Woodard, Michael D. "Voluntary Association Membership among Black Americans: The Post-Civil Rights Era." *The Sociological Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1987): 285–301.

Wyma, Mike. "Central Library Wages a Battle for Recovery." *Los Angeles Times* (Los Angeles, CA), November 20, 1986.

"Y.M.C.A." *New York Times* (New York, NY), November 10, 1913.

Young, Dennis. *If Not for Profit, For What? A Behavioral Theory of the Nonprofit Sector Based on Entrepreneurship.* Lexington: Lexington Books, 1983.