

Altruism in Life

The Double Helix and the Five Donors

Daniel S. Helwig

©
Copyright 2018
By
Daniel S. Helwig
All Rights Reserved

Altruism in Life
The Double Helix and the Five Donors

A Capstone Project
submitted to the Faculty of
The Graduate Program in Liberal Studies
and of
The College of Arts and Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
Master of Arts in Liberal Studies

By

Daniel S. Helwig

Loyola University Maryland
Baltimore, MD
May 6, 2018

Contents

Altruism Analysis.....	1
Interview Analysis	16
Appendices	32
Appendix A: Subject 1.....	32
Appendix B: Subject 2.....	42
Appendix C: Subject 3.....	49
Appendix D: Subjects 4 and 5.....	63
Works Cited	77

Altruism Analysis

I have worked in the nonprofit sector as a fundraiser for most of the thirty-one years I have been in the workforce. I have worked for small four-person businesses that were affiliates of larger organizations, huge healthcare monoliths with billion dollar operating budgets, and higher education nonprofits situated between the two extremes. Regardless of the size and scope and mission of the organization, my employment success has always been measured by the amount of money I could raise for its cause. If a professional career could be considered a journey, like, say, an airline flight, my vocational goal of finding people who can give money away, and soliciting these people for contributions could be said to have provided me with a window seat to gaze down upon the landscape of human altruism as demonstrated by philanthropy.

In the spring of 2017, Professor Suzanne Keilson led a course in Personhood at the Extremes as part of the Liberal Studies curriculum at Loyola University. Throughout the course, Professor Keilson asked us to examine the difference between thinking machines and humans, and between humans as a species and other animals, as we attempted to define what it means to be human in the 21st century. One of the traits we considered in examining “human-ness” was altruism: Did it exist in other species? Does it exist as a trait that is distinctive in humans, and if so, is it a genetic tendency in all humans? Upon the completion of the course, these questions as to the genetic, biological, and environmental bases of altruism remained and the intersection of these questions with the vocation of development created a natural opening for the completion of my academic work for a Master of Liberal Studies degree.

For the purpose of this work, I define altruism as a selfless action which demonstrates concern for others and has no expectation of return benefit. In this paper, I will examine the historical and biological basis and natural presence of altruism as a human behavior. I will review research on the biological foundations of altruism within our species and make rough comparisons and contrasts with other species. I will examine the specific origins within the human brain where an altruistic impulse may originate and activate. I will review altruism as a philosophical aspect of our species to ask whether an impulse of caring is an imbedded part of the self. I will compare these philosophical and biological bases of altruism with four interviews of five individuals who have been exceptional benefactors in their lifetimes, comparing each of the individuals with an archetype of givers established by a landmark study and book in the latter part of the 20th century. As a part of these interviews, I will ascertain whether subjects believe that nature or nurture most influenced their capacity to care for humanity in an outsized fashion. Throughout this

paper, I will demonstrate that altruism is a genetically wired impulse, intertwined with biological, sociological, psychological, and societal influences that enhance, promote or deter its existence. Finally, I will establish conclusions and propose future research areas based upon my findings, candidly assess the limits of my study, and suggest enhancements or modifications future scholars may wish to consider in preparation for advancing this discussion.

The fact that altruism exists at all seems contradictory to evolutionary biology, which would predict that selfish behavior leads to more resources, rewarding an animal with a greater likelihood of survival and thus an ability to pass on its genes to a succeeding generation. A compilation of the work of many mathematicians, evolutionary biologists, and geneticists considering the question of the origins of altruism can be found in the biography of chemist George Price, entitled, *The Price of Altruism*, written by Oren Harman. Price was a complicated individual. He was breathtakingly intelligent, often misunderstood, unkind to his family, unable to hold steady work throughout much of his life, and in the end, an atheist who converted to Christianity and lived life as an evangelist of sorts in a seedy part of London; however, he made contributions which still inform our views of the possibility of altruistic behavior as a genetic trait.

Price made important connections between the mathematical likelihood of altruism within a gene pool and relatedness. Price's work that holds that the greater the genetic match between two sets of individuals, the higher the likelihood of altruistic behavior. Siblings, for example, within a species, would show a greater likelihood of altruistic behavior than cousins within the same clan. According to standard genetics siblings will share on average 50% of genes, while cousins might only share 25%. Price theorized that parents in a species behave altruistically towards descendants, and that siblings likewise, and to a lesser degree cousins, all for the sake of survival of the children, siblings, etc and the corresponding preservation of the genetic code of the family. His work is still theoretical; a question as complex as altruism is not determined by a single gene, and therefore, this debate continues. His biography places his scholarly work in context with mathematicians, evolutionary biologists, and chemists in the decades immediately preceding and during Price's life.

What is fascinating about *The Price of Altruism* is that the book weaves perspectives that run alongside an investigation into altruism into the topic. Conversations about altruism can quickly evolve into questions about the fundamentals of human existence and the organization of society. Harman coordinates a contextual analysis of the economics, political science, philosophy, and theoretical biology positions related to, and juxtaposed with, Price's studies. Leaders in all of these fields became

reference points, collaborators, or agents of dismissal in a sort of worldwide conversation that Harmen traces throughout the 20th century. Leading thinkers attempted to square genetics, the relative “goodness” of humankind, ideal forms of governance, and the relative benefits of economic systems provided by governments. Harmen’s integration of so many elements of society into the question of altruism in part created the impetus to compare a biological and genetic overview of the subject with a series of interviews with individuals whom society might easily deem altruistic.

The text traces Charles Darwin’s journey in 1832 on the HMS *Beagle*, in which he notices the iridescent zoophytes, small marine animals glowing in the water. The prevalent belief at the time was that God had placed them in the ocean to help sailors navigate on stormy nights. Darwin saw that what was causing the glow was the dead zoophytes decomposing among the live ones, that no divine intervention was at play. “This was purpose enough, God’s benevolence notwithstanding.” (Harmen loc 508)

Darwin also looked for ways that altruism could be a result of natural selection, defined as the genetic tendency of an organism to adapt to its environment and transmit desirable traits to future generations in greater numbers. Because species exist within an environment that is not supportive, Darwin saw the cooperation that exists between and among members of species exist in a vacuum as evidence of a genetic link of helpfulness. While wild dogs may fight over food left in a garbage can, the winner vanquishing the loser and thus providing an ongoing opportunity to perpetuate his strength and fitness in the species, both of the dogs also face a common enemy in the environment. He realized that while two members of a species may compete with each other for resources, invariably they also compete with nature. “For if the struggle could mean both competition with other members of the same species and a battle against the elements, it was a matter of evidence which of the two was more important in nature.” (Harmen loc 555) Darwin thought that species could have instincts for the provision of aid which may have a genetic basis. “The social instincts which no doubt were acquired by man, as by the lower animals, for the good of the community, will from the first have given him some wish to aid his fellows,” (Darwin 103) Darwin was providing a path to morality and altruism.

Peter Kropotkin saw the work of ants, bees, and many other species as evidence humans are wired for cooperation, and “if the altruism of the hymenoptera (the biological order of insects that would include wasps, ants and bees) was imposed by their physiological structure, in these ‘higher’ animals it was cultivated for the benefits of mutual aid.” (Harmen loc 622) Pelicans would form semicircles of cooperation and trap fish within them, heading for shore. While not exclusively the case, antelope,

deer, and many wild mammals living in herds seem to work cooperatively against predators.

Kropotkin saw natural selection attempting to find ways to avoid competition and he took those views and superimposed them onto political systems. “Left to his own devices, man would cooperate in egalitarian communes, property and coercion replaced by liberty and consent.”

Darwin suggested that altruistic groups may have shown a greater likelihood of survival; thus, the collection of genes favoring altruism and a tendency to altruistic behavior would have been rewarded in this fashion. “If selection sometimes worked at a level higher than the individual, even the ultimate sacrifice of the stinging bee or ant centurion could evolve.” (Harmen loc 400)

Darwin’s suggestion also led George Price to consider antlers. From an evolutionary standpoint, antlers were curious. Biologists had studied deer and determined that antlers were used to dissipate heat, and male deer are larger and therefore have a greater need to dissipate heat, and thus, you have male deer with antlers. But from an evolutionary standpoint, why not have the antlers serve as greater weapons? Male deer already use their antlers in combat, so why hadn’t evolution provided a path to antlers that were more effective in harming the losing combatant? Price saw the answer in the dynamic of the Cold War between America and Russia – the threat of deterrence.

Suddenly it all connected: If deer really needed to cool off, skin flaps and large ears were surely a less expensive route to follow than seasonal renew of antlers... .. Rather, they were ingenious accessories to nature’s invention of limited combat... .. Here was its logic: If a group of male deer varied in both fighting ability and ability to deescalate combat, one could go about calculating just how each deer might fare against another.” (Harmen loc 3319)

Price imagined that over generations, these limited combat strategies evolved. Price saw game theory and genetics coming together, and it was the beginning of how he came to view altruism as a mathematically discernable trait.

Just as with two poker players staring each other down, Price had considered combat to be a game in which each animal’s strategy is dependent on the other. That led him to see that if animals adopted a strategy of ‘retaliation’ whereby they normally fight conventionally but respond to escalated attacks by escalating in return, this (discretion) would be favored by selection at the

individual level. It was a strikingly original insight.
(Harmen loc 4288)

Price saw altruism as “the flip side” of combat. “Since an individual would increase in fitness both by helping others and thereby avoiding attacks, and by attacking deviants enough to cause them to help him, both the tendency to cooperate and the tendency to attack those who did not cooperate would be selected for in evolution.” (Harmen loc 3354)

Others have followed Price’s lead, not always from the field of biology or genetics. Economist Robert Frank finds the argument persuasive. “To do well in life, our simian and hunter-gatherer ancestors needed to forsake the short-term temptation of self-interest, since they lived in small, mutually dependent groups” (Harmen loc 5350) Frank said that life was a dance, and we couldn’t do it alone, so we must account for a genetic predisposition for help. “Since in evolutionary terms life is a game in which one seeks trusted partners to play with, emotions that trigger loyalty and altruism (even to rational ones) are adaptations for regulating behavior.” (Harmen loc 5350)

While the book segues between biographic sketches of the protagonists and connections to world events, it always eventually returns to altruism and its possible presence. Philosophers, geneticists, economists, and government leaders alike were all influenced by the question of whether mutual aid was a genetic tendency. What is important to keep in mind is that the progression of thought brought about by Charles Darwin’s *On the Origin of the Species*. Darwin could not shake the thought that although natural selection was the rule of nature, this same natural selection may also be operating a level that influenced cooperation, and by association, altruism. For the purposes of this paper, it is sufficient to say that Darwin’s work was cross-influential, that it led to a reimagining of a great many philosophical and economic theories and strategies, and that leading scientists and philosophers of the day saw the question of mutual aid, and therefore, altruism, as fundamental to the very nature of the human species.

Throughout *The Price of Altruism*, Darwin’s work is a constant thread. And Darwin believed that if we wanted to understand our own values, judgments and morality, we needed to look at the natural world around us. “The mind had been crafted by millions of years of evolution. If man wanted to comprehend his own morality, he’d need to take a careful look back at animals.” (Harmen loc 5369) (A modest review of altruism and reciprocity within various species follows within this analysis in Harmen’s work.)

The question of whether such social tendencies such as altruism exist within the gene pool, and more specifically if natural selection can occur at anything above the individual “selfish gene” level (Dawkins), are still in play, meaning that the question of group selection is at this point, still

unsettled. Michael Gazzaniga, professor of psychology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, is director of the Sage Center for the Study of the Mind. Gazzaniga's book, *Human, the Science Behind What Makes Our Brain Unique*, briefly touches upon the ongoing debate. There are camps of evolutionary biologists who contend that group selection is a theoretical possibility, "if group advantageous behavior maximizes relative fitness within the social group." (Gazzaniga 82) If humans do have a genetic predisposition to behave in an altruistic manner, we should be able to find the regions within our brain responsible for this behavior and trace back evolutionary reasons for our socially-wired brains to function as they do.

Gazzaniga maintains that our departure from primates was based upon a development of social order, and that we needed bigger brains to keep track of our social groups. "And the fact is, in order to survive and prosper, we had to become social. So understanding how we got here requires reviewing evolutionary biology, and to understand the biology of our current social abilities, which include phenomena such as altruism, we need to remind ourselves how evolution works." (Gazzaniga 83) He points out the fact that in most mammalian species, the female of the sex has a more finicky attitude about mating; while the male has more interest in mating, period. As humans developed, female choices "influenced physical, behavioral, and social evolution in males," (Gazzaniga 87) which could have created a feedback loop in which behaviors such as altruism are just one more fitness indicator. If females prefer altruists, they will mate more frequently with altruists, ensuring a greater number of altruists in the gene pool.

In fact, perhaps the development of speech itself is an altruistic tendency. Speech may have begun as a worthwhile way of passing along information about where the woolly mammoth was last evening or whether the fish are biting, but we quickly developed a tendency for solving problems in groups, grooming one another in talk (gossip is just another form of grooming), and demonstrating our fitness to one another with our language. Evolutionary psychologist Geoffrey Miller contends that, "Most speech appears to transfer useful information from the speaker to the listener, and it costs time and energy. It seems to be altruistic. What fitness benefit can be attained by giving another individual good information?" (Gazzaniga 107) While language also affords the opportunity for deception, we likely would have evolved with a predisposition to punish "cheaters." Offering unreliable information over time would have led to a breakdown of group work or perhaps jeopardized the survival of the clan or group.

Altruism may have evolved with our concept of reciprocity, combined with our sense of self or theory of mind. Gazzaniga says that "It is probable that many of the moral emotions arose in the context of reciprocal altruism... .. However, reciprocity is not built on an innate

sense of fairness; it is built on an innate sense of reciprocity.” (Gazzaniga 133) If we have an innate sense of reciprocity – you hold the door open for me and I in return hold it for the next person – and we have a theory of mind which enables us to imagine the benefit the recipient receives from this charitable gesture, a predisposition towards altruism is an easy link to make.

From a brain development perspective, science has located the region that controls or is activated by altruism. “The ability to understand others' perspectives has previously been associated with activity in a brain region known as the temporoparietal junction (TPJ).” (Science Daily) TPJ is the section of the brain that activates in considering and managing social relationships. Researchers conducted magnetic imaging on the brains of participants while they played a computer game in which they and anonymous partners were splitting a theoretical pot of money. More generous participants had more activity in the TPJ, and more difficult decisions with regards to generosity showed a spike in activity, also.

Several studies have begun to explore whether altruism may be plotted as stronger or weaker among individuals, based upon certain mental constructs, world views, or even diagnosed conditions, suggesting that an ability to process an emotional response based upon an outside impulse is variable. A Duke University study from 2007 showed that the characteristic is possibly more tied to how people view the world than their actual actions within the world (ScienceDaily) Specifically, the ability to perceive the individual, meaningful interactions among human beings is not a fixed ability, and a greater ability to perceive meaningful interactions is correlated to a greater predisposition to respond altruistically. That is to say, if a person believes that individual action can have a corresponding effect, he or she is more likely to behave altruistically

Individuals within the autism spectrum disorder usually display behaviors which indicate a difficulty with social relationships. Does this translate to less of a tendency towards altruism? A 2014 British study surveyed over 500 students for the presence of autism spectrum disorder, then took the highest and lowest 10% of scorers and conducted a second survey designed to determine how each group would respond to a situation which asked them to offer assistance to a bystander. Individuals who scored higher on the initial survey were more likely to choose a more selfish response to the hypothetical situation, and more likely to believe they would be satisfied with their actions afterwards. (British Psychological Research Journal) An interesting, if small, Master's Degree study by Steven Thomas (Thomas) reviewed how autistic and non-autistic audiences responded to messaging asking for charitable support for a refugee crisis. Thomas provided sad images of refugee children to both groups, and then sad images and a corresponding story to both groups, to determine if there was measurable difference between the groups in their

response rate for empathy, sympathy or charitable inclination. Both groups showed a similar (a statistically insignificant difference) willingness to donate when shown the sad images, but the autistic group showed a markedly lower tendency to contribute when the sad images were paired with a story. Thomas speculated that two factors could be at play: 1.) the inability of some autistic individuals to process cognitive empathy; or 2.) the tendency of autistic distress to inhibit a charitable response. (Thomas) Using the autism spectrum as a proxy for social skill variances within the human species, then, one might conjecture that altruism exists in all humans within the limits of each individual's ability to process and understand the emotions and needs of others. (Science Daily)

To this point, we have examined possible theories about the biological bases of altruism as a behavior. We have traced the possible biological and genetic roots of altruism, beginning with the work of Charles Darwin, continuing through the twentieth century and through to today. We have considered the development of speech, altruism and social reciprocity, and isolated the tendency for altruism within the brain. At this point, before considering too deeply the tendencies and characteristics of other animals, we pivot to the philosophical examination of altruism.

Philosopher Thomas Nagel, in his book, *The Possibility of Altruism*, argues that altruism exists because we are both "one" and "someone;" that is to say, our theory of mind allows us to simultaneously see ourselves as individuals and as part of a group.

Altruism itself depends on a recognition of the reality of other persons, and on the equivalent capacity to regard oneself as merely one individual among many." (Nagel 3) Nagel argues that altruism is a component of behaving rationally, and he distinguishes between feelings and behavior in his analysis. "The altruism which in my view underlies ethics is not to be confused with generalized affection for the human race. It is not a feeling. (Nagel 5)

In spite of this disclaimer, Nagel believes desire can be/should be considered to be intertwined with rational motivation. Although desire, "even if it is in fact universal, is nevertheless merely an affection to which one is either subject or not," (Nagel 4) Nagel says that ethical conduct must recognize and, in part, synthesize these desires. "The picture of human motivational structure as a system of given desires connected in certain ways with action is a very appealing one, and it can seem that any persuasive justification of ethical conduct must find its foothold in such a system." (Nagel 5)

Nagel makes his case at the intersection between ethics and motivational theory, positing that "conscious beings must apply the

system of normative principles to themselves when forming their intentions... The general thesis to be defended concerning altruism is that one has a *direct* reason to promote the interests of others – a reason which does not depend on intermediate factors such as one’s own interests or one’s antecedent sentiments of sympathy and benevolence.” (Nagel 15)

Nagel attempts to remove sentiment from the equation and concentrate on altruism as an interaction which is at the confluence of self-interest of two or more parties. He defines altruism, as a result, in a mechanical fashion.

There is in other words such a thing as pure altruism (though it may never occur in isolation from all other motives). It (altruism) is the direct influence of one person’s interest on the actions of another, simply because in itself, the interest of the former provides the latter with a reason to act. (Nagel 80)

To Nagel, the fly in your soup or the cell phone you left on the hood of your car is an automatic and rational impulse for me to intervene. He calls this impulse altruism and believes it is a natural byproduct of us being both “one” and “someone” all at the same time. Our ability to project how we might feel is based upon our theory of mind.

Nagel calls upon the familiar sandbox argument that every parent has given their child in attempting to train up a toddler, the old *How would you like it if someone did that to you?* saw. If you have ever admonished a four-year-old for throwing sand or stealing buckets or generally exhibiting foul and egregious behavior at the expense of another four-year-old, you understand the effectiveness of the argument parents naturally employ. Nagel analyzes the reasons why we may be susceptible to this argument, then looks to poke holes in these arguments, and finally concludes that judgment plays the leading role in the argument.

There is something else to the argument; it does not appeal solely to the passions, but it is a genuine argument whose conclusion is a judgment... You would think that your plight gave the other person a reason to terminate or modify his contribution to it, and that in failing to do so he was acting contrary to reasons which were plainly available to him. (Nagel 83)

Nagel believes that our ability to rationally see and assess the outlook of someone else is the key to altruism’s existence. “Recognition of the other person’s reality, and the possibility of putting yourself in his place, is essential.” He says that we recognize ‘the other’s’ situation and it creates within us a natural objectivity that allows us to place our own needs and desires in their stead. Furthermore, this objectivity creates within us the

mindset that we are not helping because of specific connection, or correspondingly that others would not help us because of who we are specifically; rather, we help or we are helped because we are someone who requires it. It boils down to his contention that we have a default setting: “It is neither paradoxical nor counter-intuitive to maintain that one automatically has a reason to help someone in need if there is no reason not to.” (Nagel 128)

To Nagel, it is rational for us to behave altruistically because we are motivationally accepting of the fact that human happiness has value and is worth pursuing; therefore, we are accepting of the fact that others may also pursue happiness. “Since it is widely believed that human interests and happiness have value as ends, an argument which shows that such value must be objective will be in effect an argument for altruism, since it will mean that the ends are common rational objects of pursuit for everyone.” (Nagel 97)

Nagel establishes that altruism is a byproduct of our sense of self superimposed by our understanding that we are one of many, all of whom can be expected to be pursuing common goals. We see in others our own needs and we act altruistically as an automatic impulse. He concedes however, that altruism can be tempered by many situations, resulting in the book’s title, *The Possibility of Altruism*. “Even though altruistic motives depend not on love or any other interpersonal sentiment, but on a presumably universal recognition of the reality of the other persons, altruism is not remotely universal, for we continually block the effects of that recognition.” (Nagel 145)

If not universal, is altruism the special attribute or characteristic of being human? Nagel suggest that our theory of mind allows us to be wired for empathy – in varying degrees – and we have developed social organizations that teach it as a tenet or major thrust. Kropotkin’s ideas notwithstanding, comparing what we call altruism in humans with what might be considered altruism in other species is more difficult. At this juncture, it may be necessary to distinguish between altruism as a societal good and nurturing as instinct. “A mother does not typically nurture her baby because she empathizes with it, sympathizes with it, or feels morally bound to do so. She nurtures it because she loves it.” (Scientifique)

For about fifteen years, I owned a small farm in rural Pennsylvania. This provided a first-hand look at the behavior of some species. I learned a lot. For example, a mother cat in rural districts such as those surrounding the farm would distribute her litter hither and yon, to neighboring properties and barns where they could stake out a new claim. This instinct seems cold and calculated and in the best Darwinian tradition. When I moved to the farm, there was already a young, resident barn cat, who may have arrived in just this fashion. This cat eventually had a litter of kittens, one of whom remained on the property and became

a house cat. Years later, these cats would continue to groom one another, while neither would groom other cats on the premises. This seems to support Price's contention that we can mathematically predict the likelihood of altruistic behavior based upon closeness of the genetic relationship. It is important at this point to disclaim that when we consider animals, it is nearly impossible to prove intentionality of actions. As a result, it is difficult to call any animal behavior purely altruistic, simply because we can see the behavior, but we cannot for certain draw a straight line to the reasons underpinning the action, and so this analysis is limited to behaviors which, by human standards, may help explain our own behavior.

It is also important to note the distinction between altruism and reciprocity. Many species of birds are known for warning others of danger or raising other nesting pairs' young. However, Walter Koenig, Ph.D., of the Hastings Reservation and Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, says this is more about reciprocity, an exchange with perceived mutual benefit. "No definite case of reciprocal altruism is currently known in birds, but examples in which this phenomenon may be involved include helping behavior in a few cooperative breeders and cooperative feeding in a few taxa including gulls, jays and juncos." (Koenig)

Another story from the life of a gentleman farmer: When my daughter was a teenager, she became an equestrian and I learned a great deal about horses. Horses are herd animals who are most comfortable in the presence of other horses or, at the very least, other herd animals such as sheep or goats. I remember vividly the experience of bringing new a new horse into the pasture when two horses were already present. My daughter and I came up the driveway with the new horse in the trailer, backed the horse off the trailer and opened the gate, letting her into the pasture. For the space of about 90 seconds, the three horses sniffed, reared and pawed the ground around the gate. In an amazing, nonverbal display, these half-ton mammals communicated the decision of which horse would be in charge – it would be the new horse. And there was no more discussion on the subject.

The creation of social order within a group is not necessarily altruistic, although the horse in charge is most often "on duty." He or she stays awake and upright, while the others may rest, sometimes even laying down in the pasture. The other horses defer leadership; they gain rest and a more peaceful existence. It is a bargain struck rather than selfless regard for another.

But when horses are "friends" with one another, during the hot summer months, you will often see them stand beside one another in opposite directions to one another, each using their tails to swish and swipe the flies away from the head of the other. This is a reciprocity that is mutually beneficial, and while it may not be altruistic, it approaches the

characteristic, and it is curious that only horses that are “friends” will behave in this way.

Once under attack, though, herd animals demonstrate a desire to cluster. Generally, the smaller the animal, the tighter the cluster of the pack; thus, sheep cluster very tightly when danger is detected, while horses or other large animals will travel together, but not right next to one another. “Each animal will attempt to push itself into the middle of the group where it will be safe from predators. The strongest animals will end up in the middle of the milling herd.” (Grandin and Deesing) Thus, herd behavior is both preservationist for the group and a demonstration of the survival of the fittest.

Altruism between and among species does exist anecdotally. In 2013, a group of whales in waters off the coast of Portugal befriended a bottlenose dolphin while under the watchful eye of evolutionary biologists, accepting him as part of their group, playing with him, and socializing. (Andrews)

In controlled environments, and as part of extended experiments, some of our closest primate neighbors do not exhibit a tendency to altruism. In a study published in 2006, chimpanzees were given the opportunity to share or provide “fair” distributions of food to each other, and they “made their choices based solely on personal gain.” (Jensen, B and Call) However, some researchers believe that primates may have an evolutionary disadvantage in comparison to other mammals, such as wolves or other predators, when it comes to social interaction, as revealed by work by neuroscientist, Gregory Berns, M.D., Ph.D. (Berns)

Berns is the Distinguished Professor of Neuroeconomics at Emory University. In his 2013 book *How Dogs Love Us: A Neuroscientist and His Adopted Dog Decode the Canine Brain*, Berns argues that dogs are better suited to feel empathy and love, the building blocks of altruism. “Because wolves were predators, they were already well evolved for intuiting the behavior of other animals, which meant that wolves had a high level of interspecies social cognition, perhaps even a theory of mind.” (Berns loc 3057)

Berns believes that dogs may be “man’s best friend” in reality. “The defining trait of dogs, therefore, is their interspecies social intelligence, an ability to intuit what humans and other animals are thinking. (Berns loc 3075) His longitudinal studies are revealing much more to us about the similarities of brain function and helping us decode empathy, what he calls “the fundamental attribute of love.” (Berns loc 3078) It seems likely that the more we learn about our canine friends, the more we will learn about our own ability to love and empathize with another. While the heroic stories of dogs saving their owners from the edges of a precipices on dark winter nights or cats which find their way home after inadvertent journeys under the hoods of pickup trucks will always promote a certain

sense of wonder and encourage a belief that other species care about us, dogs and cats don't go out of their way to assist a perfect stranger in peril – regardless of whether that stranger is human, canine or feline. Only our species will knowingly and without any expectation of gain extend a favor or provide resources from our own bounty to an unknown stranger.

In the examination of other species, we have looked for both the biological and anecdotal evidence for the presence of altruism. There is ample evidence of social order and some evidence of reciprocity, but not a great deal of evidence of absolute altruism. It also appears that the closer an animal's success is linked to interaction with the human race, the greater the tendency either of humans to see actions as motivated by altruism or for the animals themselves to behaving in manners that could be considered empathetic or perhaps even altruistic.

Having considered the conversation about altruism from a biological, and philosophical perspective, we've learned that if altruism exists as a trait, it is linked to the presence of a theory of mind. We may have developed a social empathy because group function required cooperation, amplified by our impressive language skills which appear to be much more robust than other species. Other species, large and small, have similar societal orders and rules, but our theory of mind allows a projection of the concerns of others onto our own lives. The next portion of the paper will consider individuals who demonstrate great altruism by Western civilization's standards – they willingly give away resources which could have been stored for the future.

In the course of studying altruism, it occurred to me that individuals who are exceptionally generous may have a view of the subject that is worth considering. As indicated in the opening paragraphs, my vocation in the world of nonprofit fundraising has given me an outstanding opportunity to make a study of this unique, subset of humanity. Since graduating from college in 1986, most of my professional life has been in the field of philanthropy. My work has involved the conversion of altruistic tendencies in human beings into contributions to benefit nonprofit organizations. I have worked in healthcare, in social service organizations in and higher education, encountering philanthropists in many settings and from myriad backgrounds. In my time in the profession, I have learned that regardless of the timespan under consideration – a day, a month, or a year or more – and regardless of the number of gifts processed by the institution – ten, one hundred or three thousand or more – there will always be two or three top gifts which make up 40 percent or more of the total of contributions. The impact that ultra-generous donors have on total fundraising, and therefore on institutional mission, cannot be overstated.

In 1994, a landmark study of philanthropists was published, *The Seven Faces of Philanthropy*, by Russ Alan Prince and Karen Maru File. Prince and

File identified seven archetypes of charitable contributors and explained that the motivations of contributors are quite varied. Prince and File wrote their book to assist nonprofits in their search for finding more support. They felt that by defining types of contributors, nonprofits could more effectively solicit and steward support for their nonprofit missions.

Because our careers have focused on working with nonprofits in various capacities, we saw an opportunity to advance the field by developing a framework of donor behavior. Thus the Seven Faces framework, built on a multi-year program of research and testing, is the application of social science methods to the development field. (Prince and File loc 38)

They grouped benefactors into the following archetypes: communitarians – people who believe it makes good sense to do good and benefits their communities; dynasts – people who have inherited both their wealth and the socialization to make charitable contributions; repayers – donors who have personally benefited from an institution or service and have developed a sense of obligation; investors – contributors who give to maximize a tax benefit or estate consequence; devout – donors who are motivated almost exclusively by religious motives; socialites – people who enjoy the social aspects and networking benefits of charitable activities; and, last but not least, altruists – donors who make contributions out of a perceived need, and often wish to remain anonymous. (Prince and File)

In about 30 years of discussing charitable endeavors with contributors, I have met donors who match all of the Prince-File definitions. In their analysis, Prince and File suggested that altruists represent 9 percent of the donor population. After a lifetime in the profession, I would offer that most of the major contributors with whom I've had the pleasure to work have demonstrated a strong altruistic tendency, but they have rarely made contributions from purely altruistic motives or without additional impulses. The donor who drops the gold coin into the Salvation Army bucket may be seemingly actuated by purely altruistic motives, but my sense is that he/she loves reading the story the next day in the newspaper. If altruism is founded upon an innate desire to assist others, it is unquestionably nourished in a positive feedback loop.

As indicated in the opening paragraphs, my vocation in the world of nonprofit fundraising has given me an outstanding opportunity to make a study of this unique, subset of humanity. In my time in the profession, I have learned that regardless of the timespan under consideration – a day, a month, or a year or more – and regardless of the number of gifts processed by the institution – ten, one hundred or three thousand or more – there will always be two or three top gifts which make up 40 percent or more of the total of contributions. The impact that ultra-

generous donors have on total fundraising, and therefore on institutional mission, cannot be overstated.

Interview Analysis

I interviewed five individuals as a part of my research – one couple and three unique individuals, ranging in age from 49 to 94. All of these subjects made their homes in the central part of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and all of them had made gifts of \$1 million or more in their lifetimes. I had personally engaged each of these contributors for support of an institution for which I was under the employ, and each of them had provided generous support. Each of them also had myriad other causes for which he/she provided generous support. My conversations ranged from 45 to 90 minutes, and for each of the individuals, I attempted to glean their thoughts on the basis and origins of their generosity, understand how they believe it correlated to an altruistic impulse, and ascertain what aspects of their lives influenced their of exceptional generosity.

Subject #1 is a male executive who has been a part of a successful family business that has thrived for three generations. He is married with five children. He says family lore and legacy helped to inform his views of charity.

I remember my father talking about my grandfather being helpful to people. There were people that would come to their front door who were hungry and they would invite them in and have a meal with them. And I remember him talking about my grandfather...at the end of a long work day my father saying, "I just want to leave Dad," and he'd say, "No. Wait a minute. There are kids lined up outside with their bicycles that need to be welded." Their bikes were broken and they had brought them to the shop to be fixed. And, he said that he kind of learned it that way. I kind of learned it from my father's stories talking about his grandfather. He would fix the kids bikes for free so that they could be on their way and use their bikes again.

Along with family history, subject #1 said that his own personal views had evolved on charity. He credits his spouse, her different upbringing, and just the process of aging as providing him with the inspiration to reconsider his motives and his charitable impulses.

What I was exposed to was more kind of...you're giving which is helping the community but it's also helping the business and it's helping you personally. As I learn more about that and thought more about that...it's not really the reasons why I want to give, you

know? And it has caused me to think about it more and think about... I think I would do it differently; given the choice I would do it differently and now that I am almost 50, which I will be in March, I think I can make the choice now to do it differently.

Subject #1 has subsequently begun to think about charity a purely altruistic gesture, eschewing all recognition for the gift and often preferring to remain anonymous if possible.

Now, the business side ... that's the way I was raised ... remember that's an important piece of it and you want to capture it because it's all part of the business kind of benefit to get out of it. So again I am changing my views as I go through time. I think differently ... I think that you should be giving because you want to help somebody or help an organization that can help others. And that's the sole reason you're doing it, maybe you feel good because you were able to help in some way. But, you're not doing it because you want them to give you an award or you want them to put your picture all over the newspaper. Then it feels like it cheapens the giving, it cheapens the gift.

Subject #1 matches the Prince-File archetype of altruist very closely.

Altruists give because they believe it is a moral imperative, and because it helps them grow as human beings or evolve spiritually. Altruists make giving decisions without the input of advisors and are not usually interested in active roles in the nonprofits they support. A far greater proportion of altruist than any other group focus their philanthropy on social causes. (Prince and File loc 253)

When I asked Subject #1 if the laws were changed in a way to eliminate a financial benefit to donors, imagining a future where contributions were not incentivized by the tax code, he indicated that he believed that the perceived benefit to the contributions would still sway businesses and business owners. "I think business owners realize that's (the tax deduction is) a benefit. That's another reason they want to give. But is it the sole reason they give? Probably not. I think they give for other reasons and I think they give for visibility for their business and for themselves."

Subject #1's experience and upbringing in a family where caring for the community was both good for the community and good for business led him to become much more discerning about his purpose in giving,

and much more altruistic in his approach. He could also point to experiences as a youth in a family where wealth and stature also served as a detriment to his altruistic urges. I asked him specifically about whether urges to assist others – say rescuing someone from a burning home or stopping at the scene of an accident, were an innate response, and his answer was surprising.

I think most people, not everyone, would want to help. It leads me to think about things that I was told when growing up about helping people that are in situations like that (accident on the side of the road). And I not sure it was all good ... I heard things like, “Well if you do something wrong you could be sued and given your position in the community or business or whatever that’s a big deal.” You know, so I don’t think comments like that helped me to want to help others. Do you know what I mean? So in general I think we are ... naturally most people would help others. But I think we can get information from others that may rethink that.

Throughout his life, Subject #1 has had experiences that have allowed him to see the connectedness of community, the mutual benefit of altruism expressed through charitable support.

We can continue to learn about philanthropy and expand our horizons; my wife is helping me to do that with the adoption of our two children from China, and learning about the needs of orphan Chinese children and medical needs. Our one daughter was actually helped by an organization, Love Without Boundaries. People in the United States raised money for her heart surgery. And she had life-saving heart surgery in China before we adopted her. And we didn’t know this until we got her picture and learned later that she had been helped by this organization. They saved her life and now she’s our daughter. I mean that’s incredible. I mean it’s just amazing to me.... And then you realize, Wow, we are all connected in some way.

Subject #1 is an evolved altruist. He believes that we are all connected and that he has a duty to help. He has no expectation of return benefit to any gift that he or his family provides. He believes that while nature may provide everyone with an impulse to help, nurture can aid or deter that impulse.

Subject #2 is a white female executive managing a second-generation family business in central Pennsylvania. She is between the ages of 50-70 and is married with no children. Her father began the business. Subject #2 lives in the town in which she was born, where her father founded the business. Subject number two has given more than \$1 million to charities in the region in which she lives and for other varied purposes across the globe.

When I asked Subject #2 for her earliest memories on altruism and behaving in a manner that cared for others, her response was clear and she could point to a specific experience.

There is a very early memory that comes to mind. I was maybe in junior high school, that kind of age, and a babysitter that we had for me and my brother years before was ill and was in the hospital and my mother was going to see her, and she said, "(REDACTED), get your coat." And I said, "I'm not going to the hospital," and she said, "Oh yes you are."

"Why do I have to go?"

"Because Nana is sick in the hospital, and just because you don't want to go is not enough of a reason. She will appreciate it and she will enjoy this visit. You are going to take this time and go with me."

Subject #2 said that this experience was the first time she could remember a specific experience that provided a glimpse of how she was raised – the idea that we cared for others, we did things to show we care, and we did not expect reciprocity.

She really had to take me aside and said, "This is what we are doing."

This is what you are expected to do. This is what people do. More importantly this is what we do and this is what you are expected to do. And I think even though there was no money involved in that particular case specifically, it was the notion that you do things for other people because it's valuable to the other person even if you don't get anything out of it. And there is a relationship, and the other person really benefits from you doing whatever it is, which I really think is the basis of altruism and ultimately charitable philanthropy is the same thing.

Subject #2 said there were other, more conventional memories of modeling that her parents provided that showed that behaving in an altruistic manner towards the community was important.

In the same regard my parents, both of them, were both very active volunteers in the organizations, whether it was my father was in the Rotary or my mother on the hospital auxiliary for years and numerous other organizations. They devoted their time to things and they didn't insist that I do them, but it was modeled for me my whole life. And I don't know if I ever thought of it as an expectation. It was just what they did...

... It was just the right thing to do. There was no expectation. I never heard it mentioned, implied, assumed. Whether it was the babysitter, whether it was belonging or working for Rotary or any of the other organizations that both of them spent time with, or charitable giving. It was never any expectation of return benefit.

Subject #2 aligns with the archetype of communitarian. "Communitarians see themselves in a web of interlocking relationships in their local communities... ... Because they have been successful, communitarians recognize a strong psychological bond to their local environment." (Prince and File loc 297)

Although reciprocity is not something that subject #2 considers when she makes charitable commitments, and although repayment or community benefit is not a factor in the considerations she makes in her giving, subject #2 said that acknowledgement is important to her.

If I were to give something to ... say one million dollars ... to an organization and all I got was a thank you note that looked just like everybody else's thank you note, I would be miffed. That was not a thank you that was commensurate with the size of the gift. A thank you is a form of recognition and I have some sense of ... it's a sense of equity for me.

And somehow, and I don't know how this fits, the way these thank you(s) have come has also been ... you feel more involved. You get to know the people better, you see what's happening, you get to go wherever this thing is whatever you're supporting. Someone makes a little fuss over you ... but you feel more a part of it. I don't know if I am explaining this very well but ... because if

it's some issue / subject like education / wildlife that you care about you kind of like to feel like you are helping. And, all you can do is give money and nobody is asking you to be an employee ... that's not what you are asking for either, but you just want to know this is working.

Subject #2 believes that a feedback loop helps to show that an altruistic gift has had its intended impact. As a business person, she makes investments for an expected return on those investments, and at some level, charitable investments pass a similar test – not that they must produce a return financially, but that they must produce the desired effect.

Subject #2 does believe that an innate desire to assist exists within the species. She sees it in the automatic response sometimes evident in emergency situation.

We all have seen stories of some accident or something and bystanders just rush to the car, drag somebody out. The car may be on fire ... risking and they pull somebody out. Well they didn't have to do that and they will say afterwards. "It just happened; it wasn't conscious ...didn't stop to think I just ran over to help"...clearly someone was in danger or in need of help. And so there is obviously something there that we go to help our fellow man under circumstances...not even somebody you know....it can't be because you think you will be rewarded afterward....it is such an automatic thing...

Subject #2 sees some similarities to our response to the response of a species she has invested other charitable dollars to protect – elephants. Subject #2 has contributed major commitments to the Nature Conservancy in an effort to preserve elephant habitat and reduce poaching. She believes evidence of the both the benefits of group behavior and also the "hard-wired" nature of belonging may be seen in the behavior of elephants.

I guess I would look at where you need groups. I know a little bit about elephants...they are always in a community...they travel together...they raise young together...mom and aunt and grandma take care of the kids in a communal way. Elephants are pretty big creatures so one elephant could protect one baby but they don't... ... it's not even a choice...they do ... it's the way it is...they don't consciously choose. Various animals in packs... They are not choosing to; they need

to. So there is some functional benefit to that group behavior, in those cases. And, there are plenty of those cases with humans. It's one of those cases ... Hillary Clinton talks about it takes a community or it takes a village to successfully raise children. And there is certainly a certain truth in that. How much of this is innate, how much is just because one can't do it ...and you need other....even in older days when ...say go back 200 hundred years when dad was out working trying to make money on the farm and mom was figuring out how to get food ...did cooking and was busy...trying to maintain...you needed more people. There is something innate about it.

Yet, Subject #2 recognizes that in spite of a perceived "innate" response to behave altruistically or to recognize that humans function in a community, she stumbles over the fact that contemporaries with similar upbringing are not endowed with similar charitable or altruistic impulses.

And I think of some of my friends who live different lives. They're not on boards they don't do volunteer activity. They may do some charitable work but I think it's very little. Not because they can't ... they just don't. And some of them are pretty close friends of mine and I think we grew up very similarly... ... There is some innateness there. But there is not enough innateness for my friends to be philanthropic or to volunteer. So you manifest (it) differently at different levels...different degrees.

Subject #3 is a fascinating widowed woman who was born in central Pennsylvania, lived in other parts of the nation with her husband (now deceased), and returned to the region in her reclining years. She is elderly and lives in a retirement community. She and her late husband had no children during their long marriage to one another.

Subject #3 grew up on a farm during the Great Depression. She felt that living on the farm insulated her from the serious issues of hunger that some people faced.

My mother's family were all farmers so we always had plenty to eat. But I always liked clothes and I wanted fancy shoes and I had to wear plain shoes that cost \$1.98's without any design, that's how awful the Depression was for young people. The old people were worried about (bigger things). The young were sad

because they couldn't have the best of what they thought they wanted.

Subject #3 had a specific memory of altruism growing up on the farm. It involved a family member who was elderly who came to stay at the farm during the summer.

We would spend summers with our grandparents on the farm and there would be a wagon and horse come by and an old lady would get out, and I would notice that they were filling a mattress with straw. So this was a great grandmother who only spoke Pennsylvania Dutch. We never had a conversation. But, she would be dropped off and spend a month and do mending and be like a slave almost. And, it was family...somebody's mother or something. But, then another wagon would come by a month later...it would be no longer than a month, and she would pack up her bag and she would go someplace and that's what they did with the elderly family instead of putting them in some home...well I guess they didn't have any money to pay for to be anywhere. So they just rode her around. And I remember, I thought it was so funny after she left that day, they took the mattress out of her bedroom and they set fire to it. Now, as an adult I think I wonder if she had bugs? I mean why would they burn it? But, I guess they wouldn't know what else to do with it. Not give it to somebody else to sleep on.

Subject #3 felt that in her part of rural Pennsylvania, perhaps informed by the Depression, families did not contribute to the welfare of the greater community. She says that times were very hard, and that families pretty much had to concentrate on survival. "My memories are everybody had trouble supporting themselves. The people I knew...I wasn't with, what they called the rich people. Because mother worked at home. A sewing factory would bring her like collars to deliver; so that she could be at home with my brother and me."

Subject #3 felt that her late husband's family was similar in their makeup and comportment to her own family, not given to charity or to profligate spending. Although her husband's family were not farmers, they were of the same Pennsylvania German heritage and in the same community, and they made their vocation in working with farmers.

They lived well but they never joined anything. (REDACTED)'s family loved counting their money. I noticed old timers like that that worked so hard or

inherited it, they liked to see how much money they could have... ... And, I think like those ladies and they were farmers originally before that. At least their spouses were and they just cared about a few nice things and no debt and that sort of thing. They weren't interested in joining a club or taking a cruise. They thought that was ridiculous. They just invested it and made more...

.... After we were married and in the summertime trucks with farmers would line up all night long because they needed their money they wanted to sell their grain and move on. And I would work all night then with my husband because the other people who were doing those jobs had their day and it was just interesting for me to see how hard people worked and how much they needed their money and they'd want to be paid right away that's why we would be open all night. And they didn't want to wait until morning they wanted when they left to take their check with them. So you learn that life isn't easy for everybody. People worked hard to get their money.

Subject #3's husband graduated from a college in the region where she currently lives. She said that her husband began to make contributions to the college during his lifetime because she felt that his instruction had made a difference in his life. In this way, Subject #3's husband is a classic "re-payer" in the Prince-File archetype of contributors. Subject #3 continued to provide support to the college after his demise, in recognition of her husband's wishes and because she believe its mission is important. "The only thing that we did together was things at the college, if they wanted a building or something. And when he passed away I supported things I knew he would like there which were buildings."

Like George Price's mathematical formula attempts to prove, Subject #3 believes that altruism is strongest at the bond between and among family. She points to her contemporaries for evidence.

I think people with families have a different feeling about giving money away. They want it for their children. Most of my friends feel that way. If I didn't have children they would say...like they are making up for what I do...they don't do because of their children. And, I can understand that. Because if you struggled to make a lot of money and you have, say, four or five kids you wouldn't want them to struggle that much.

Eventually, Subject #3 began to branch out in her support, assisting with charitable support for healthcare, for other colleges and private schools, for youth development, for blindness and disabled, and for theater/arts organizations. Subject #3 became known in the region for her charitable endeavors as a benefactor who was exceptionally generous. Subject #3 identifies most closely with the Prince-File archetype of socialite. “Socialites do not believe that they are philanthropic because they have money are are able to give some away. Instead, they believe that philanthropic behavior is part of their personality, and that having wealth just allows them to express this side of their personality in the way they do.” (Prince and File loc 669) She tied her generosity back to the fact that she has no immediate family for whom she may wish to secure a future.

I feel that not having a family, why would I not want to share with somebody who is less fortunate? And, actually I guess in my heart, I feel like it was (REDACTED- late husband)’s gift. I just feel like you should share. It’s a warm feeling to know that you made life easier for somebody. And I have nieces and nephews and so did (REDACTED-late husband) and he set up trusts for them years ago. And I figure they have that and will have it until the money runs out. I don’t plan on giving them another thing. Let them do for themselves. They do well enough with their trusts so And just like when you go and see what buildings these people are working from and what they do to help people. It just is a good feeling to be part of it.

When I pressed Subject #3 to make a commitment regarding whether people have a natural tendency to be altruistic, to care for another, or whether we learned this (or not) over time, she felt that the tendency was innate, echoing some of Nagel’s perspectives, that humans have a rational ability to imagine a better life for another and that they reflect that reality in their own actions. “If you had somebody that you felt you could make life better for, that that would be worth supporting. Or if you find out what you could do to make their life better, most people would do it, and you wouldn’t have to have a big thank you or anything. That’s the way I feel about it.”

Subjects #4 and #5 are a married couple who live in central Pennsylvania. Subject #4, the male, was born in the region and managed a successful family business, leaving only to for college and returning to work and then own the business. Subject #4, the female, married Subject #4 approximately ten years ago. She was originally from New England and had family who were in blue-collar professions. She worked in

healthcare all of her life, eventually as an executive. Both are between 65-80 years old. Subjects #4 and #5 have given more than \$15 million to regional and national charities.

Both Subject #4 and #5 pointed to the role of family in forming their earliest views of our need to support others. They pointed to parents as modeling a way to treat others, for charitable intent, and for humanitarian concern.

Subject #5:

I came from a relatively poor community. We were blue collar. Mother and father when they both retired they were making \$14,000 a year back in 1966 or something. But my father was an electrician and he ... we couldn't give financially but if there was somebody in the church that they were building a new house and they needed the house wired, my father would do this at no cost. (Subject #4: he gave service) He gave services. And my mother did work for a doctor but it was my dad that I remember was doing things for others.

Subject #4:

First of all, yes, I was mentored. My father was a generous person period. In a lot of ways my father was a very kind gentle person. But I think that your statement of what causes ... I still think it's your surroundings and part of it ... why are some people more generous or kind or ... I don't know. That's a good question. I think part of it if you're in an area where you are helping people. If you are going in an area where you are more financially or using money as capital and so on, you are going to use that capital to grow businesses. You are helping people more people to have employment, and doing a great job and things like that.

Although their careers were very different from one another, both thought of their careers as contributing to their outlook on helping others. Subject #4 saw his role in life as to provide opportunities for others through employment, and to provide a valued service to society. Subject #5 entered healthcare at first because of what she saw as the limited options as she was entering the workforce, but also because of her inclination to help others.

Subject #5:

At the time when I graduated from high school there were only three things for women ... being a secretary, a nurse or a teacher. Now we are talking, Dan, back in the sixties. And that was it, there weren't all these other degrees for women to get into... ... there was never a question in my mind of what I wanted to be from as early as I can remember I wanted to be a nurse. And, that's how my career started... ... If anybody needed anything and I was working, even though I really couldn't afford to do it, I would help them. Whether it was their rent ... maybe one of my nurses was having a hard time I would help them in anyway ... I would give them extra hours, but even financially at times doing things I really couldn't afford to do. But it was like my heart just went out to them.

Subject #4:

I wanted my businesses to prosper ... the more I earned, the more I could give away, the more I could do. My goal was not to maximize profits and minimize expenses. No it wanted them both to go together. Now there is a way to be competitive and there's a way to be fair ... labor was by far the biggest cost. And, now today health care is the biggest cost. So overall my philosophy was to mentor people in a way You are going to get a better and better job and get more and more financially secure. If I'm helping somebody who is helping themselves, they're working harder. They're doing more.. I've also been more helping people who are trying to help themselves. And to the maximum I can do it.

When Subject #4 and Subject #5 came together, they had very different outlooks on charitable support and to some degree this tension is still at work in the decisions that they make about support. Subject #5 tends to look at a possible grant based upon the needs of the regional or national population, and whether a gift could be an influential part of meeting needs. Subject #4 tends to look at the business side of the nonprofit; is the grant likely to lead to more success for the organization in executing its mission?

Subject #5:

I think as far as philanthropy, so much of it is about relationships and then learning about, you know, what an organization's doing. And, does it strike a chord

with you. We donate to (REDACTED) Health Services and that's an organization that serves like 3,500 WIC, which is Women Infants and Children, a month. They basically help ... and that's. I mean mine has been more trying to help people.

Subject #4:

And I guess that's the challenge the college has. You want to help a winner. I don't care at what level. I think the Y(MCA) is very well run. It's obviously a non for profit. It helps a fair amount of the community as far as... But over the years it has been very fortunate to have good management and the Y does a good job. And so for helping them I have no problem. They are a good organization that serves the community and they do it in a good manner.

In this way, Subject #4 acts very much like an investor in the Prince-File archetypes, and Subject #5 is closer to an altruist. Subject #4 wants to understand how this particular gift will assist a charity in its mission, and also meet some financial goal for the charity. Subject #5 is less interested in the financial goal of the organization, more interested in the people assisted by the project and whether or not that project speaks to what she sees as a societal need.

When I asked whether some level of caring for others was hardwired into our beings, Subject #5 was quick to support the idea that all of us are born with the capacity to care for others: "See I think you gotta help... .. I really do have a visceral response if I feel like I've helped somebody. Whether that was like a genetic thing ... I don't know. It's not euphoria, but it's just a like I said it just a visceral reaction. I feel if I've done something." In this way, Subject #5 most closely aligns with the altruist archetype in the Prince-File study. "Altruists say they support nonprofits principally because it gives their life a greater sense of purpose. Altruists associate their charitable behavior with personal fulfillment; they give from within themselves." (Prince and File loc 763)

When faced with the same question of whether altruism could be innate, interestingly, Subject #4 turned the conversation upside down, to consider the reverse of caring. If he could not determine whether there was an innate possibility that we all have altruism within us, he could say that we are genetically predisposed not to do harm.

I read a book once about the effect the first time you shot somebody ... like in World War II when you could see the person you were shooting ... you threw up ... a lot of soldiers; the second one you were upset

but not as much; by the time you killed the fifth person, you were fine.... so you learn the reaction. Your natural instinct was not to kill.

Subject #4 is very much aligned with the investor archetype in the Prince-File study. "Investors are skeptical that anyone is truly altruistic or selfless. They personally do not feel this way and are able to recognize such an approach to philanthropy." (Prince and File loc 560) It was much more difficult for Subject #4 than his spouse to consider an innate response; his ability to see the response as innate was linked to an his ability to preserve life as also innate.

Both Subject #4 and Subject #5 relayed a story to me about a lost dog – Subject #4 had ordered flowers for Subject #5, and as they were being delivered, a beloved pet escaped unbeknownst to Subject #4. Subject #5 was frantic. Hours later, a good Samaritan found and returned the pet, and wanted no thanks or payment in return. It had struck both of them, in the course of our conversation, as an act of altruism. In the final analysis, both Subject #4 and Subject #5 believed that there could exist a genetic tendency to altruism, but that this tendency was strongly aided or deterred by the environment for upbringing, by profession, and by life lessons.

Subject #5:

You know that as you learn more about need and you are in an environment that is like here ... you know that people do give, that (your outlook) can change ... if you already have the genetic tendency that (environment) enhances it. But it can also be a deterrent.

The five interviewees for this project were diverse in their outlooks, but relatively similar in their demographic makeup. When pressed, each of the subjects believed that humanity may be hard-wired with an impulse to help another. However, all of the subjects expressed a strong belief that environment plays a role that is at least as prevalent to any genetic makeup. Subject #1 indicated that the environment can lead one to act on a caring impulse or can lead one to withhold care. Subject #2 pointed to elephants, large mammals that act in community to care for the growth and development of their young, as evidence of our own need for community, but she was stymied in understanding how she felt a need to care for others that was not evidenced by her peers. Subject #3 said that she believes if you see someone who needs help, you have an instinct to act upon those needs, but she reflected upon her Depression-era upbringing with clear memories that families in the depression were not sharing people. They were not generally altruistic, possibly because the Depression created an environment that made each family more

concerned with its own future. Subject #4 felt she always wanted to be in a caring profession, to help others, but she acknowledged that some of that may have come from limited options in her youth and an example set by her father. Subject #5 was least certain of the genetic tendency, but he saw the correlation between an innate desire to not take another human being's life as a possible inverse to the question, which made this genetic tendency a plausible scenario.

Subject #5, unexpectedly, provided me with remarks that provide the best anecdotal evidence that altruism is a genetic or biological presence. If we can agree that we have an innate aversion to taking another human's life, that aversion comes from somewhere within us, and it is likely based upon the same philosophical foundations explored by Nagel; that is to say, our theory of mind is our own personal projection screen of our own life – whether it is the life at the other end of a rifle sight, or the life at the highway intersection in the green canvas jacket, holding the cardboard sign that says, “Please help – daughter needs life-saving surgery.”

Although this paper was the culmination of hours of research, it was broad, and in some ways, the topic is too comprehensive to be the subject of a comprehensive review. A narrower paper looking specifically at the brain function of individuals engaged in charitable behavior would be an interesting topic for follow-up. The presence of social media and its influence on sense of self, plus its influence on altruistic behavior, is another area that I believe requires further investigation. The work of Douglas Rushkoff and how it may intersect with social sense of community, responsibility, and self, would be an interesting analysis, particularly paired with the work of Nagel. The interviews themselves were likely too narrow a slice of humanity for close scrutiny. Ideally, follow-up study would consider the charitable or altruistic impulses in cultures and regions which are international and attempt to remove any Judeo-Christian bias to the discussion.

In spite of these deficiencies and the obvious need for additional research, the examination of the topic through this paper has attempted to weave the various threads of altruism together, to create a fabric that wraps up humanity like a blanket that cannot easily be rent. Altruism is a genetically wired impulse. Throughout the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century, geneticists and theoretical biologists have found reasons to believe that our species developed a social order that required cooperation; altruists provided beneficial behavior that allowed for the genetic predisposition to flourish. There are specific locations within the human brain where an altruistic impulse may originate and activate, and altruism may be modulated based upon conditions affecting growth and development of social skills. The fact that humans possess a theory of mind forms the philosophical underpinning for our ability to consider the straits of another as we consider our own existence. Finally, each of the

benefactors interviewed as part of this analysis saw both nature and nurture at work as an influence on humanity. We are both “some one” and part of a larger herd, and we project our own feelings, thoughts and desires onto the lives of those who need help.

Appendix A

Subject #1, February 12, 2018

White male

Lifetime resident of central Pennsylvania

35-50 years old

Has personally given \$500,000 to a charity, matched by a family foundation's \$500,000 gift.

Dan: Give some kind of review if you can of when you may have first thought about charitable giving, altruism, or giving back. Is this something your family talked about?

Subject 1: Actually I made some notes but with that particular question. I would say my first involvement in philanthropy was with the family foundation. I got involved at an early age. I don't remember what age that was but I joined our board of trustees. There I began to learn more about giving and what it was all about. So I would say that my first exposure is probably that.

Dan: Were you still in college or working as a professional at that time?

Subject #1: It may have been while I was still in college or shortly after.

Dan: So maybe in your mid-twenties. If you could wind back the tape and talk about whether there anything about that in your upbringing?

Subject #1: I remember my father talking about my grandfather being helpful to people. There were people that would come to their front door who were hungry and they would invite them in and have a meal with them. And I remember him talking about my grandfather...at the end of a long work day my father saying, "I just want to leave Dad," and he'd say, "No. Wait a minute. There are kids lined up outside with their bicycles that need to be welded." Their bikes were broken and they had brought them to the shop to be fixed. And, he said that he kind of learned it that way. I kind of learned it from my father's stories talking about his grandfather. He would fix the kids bikes for free so that they could be on their way and use their bikes again. So that would probably be another way that I learned about it.

Dan: As you raise your own children, how does that translate as you think of yourself as a business executive and as you think of yourself as a

leader? How does care for others translate how you talk about it in your own family life?

Subject #1: Well as it relates to my kids I would probably have to give a lot or most of the credit to my wife because she is a very giving individual and does influence them in that way I believe. I am thankful that she does that. But it is just through her discussions with our children of what is really important in life. Thinking that through with them and talking that through with them, help them think about it themselves. And, so just recently one of my sons....they typically get money for Christmas from their grandparents...he decided instead of spending it on himself which you typically do when you are a young teenager...which is often common although not in all cases I say for our kids it was...he decided that he was going to go out and buy some blankets and deliver them to the needy in Lancaster City. So that's what he did.

Dan: That's great.

Subject #1: I think he gave them out at the (REDACTED) Mission. It was something he wanted to do.

Dan: One of the things I was reading about in the philosophy of altruism is why it exists as a trait. It was posited that because we can think of ourselves as "one" and we can think of ourselves as being "someone" meaning there is a group that we belong to at the same time. So your son kind of showed that he thinks of himself but he also thinks of himself as having a greater role in society. How old is he?

Subject #1: He's 18.

Dan: 18. If you had 100 of his peers in the parking lot out here and you had to guess how many of his peers would feel a sense of responsibility; not to the extent as your son but ... How prevalent do you think that view is in society?

Subject #1: You know I think it varies so much. I think it varies by the various generations and what they are thinking. I think it varies by their upbringing. It varies by the...it's a nurturing question, really. And I think it's...I think you can't put your finger on one particular thing. I think there are so many variables. And that gets to some of the notes I was taking down. I was thinking of people who grew up very poor so they have that understanding of what it's all about so they ... Some of them

tend to be very compassionate, very caring because they were in that position. If they are no longer in that position now...they are like, "Yeah, now I want to share with others because I know what that feels like." And then others who are more like, kind of, "OK, now I have all this money I don't want to give it away. I'm afraid I'm going to lose it. Because I don't want to be in that position that I was in many years ago." So, again, I think it's personality, it's their upbringing, it's their feelings about money and about others and it just seems like a really complicated kind of thing.

Dan: I think it is. I don't know if it's easier to talk about yourself or your son or your family. It sounds like your son feels like he has a sense of responsibility for others and I hear you saying that some of that comes from the example that you may have talked about and some of that may come from the values that your wife, especially, may have tried to instill in him. I just want to try to get to a point where we figure out if your son...whether the people that feel that they have to keep everything because they don't know what may happen still feel a sense of responsibility to others.

Subject #1: And, I think some of them do; but I think it is in varying degrees. You know. "Well," they say, "I can help a little or maybe I have more than I need, maybe I can spare a little, just 'cause I have that I have that fear that maybe I'm going to lose it all one day." And then the other different factors are they do have money how did they get it? Did they earn it themselves? Was it inherited? And, how does that come into play? It impacts different people differently, how they think, and how much of that is what they learned, or genetically what they were born with. How do you figure that out? That's the question, right?

Dan: Yeah. And, it's difficult.

Subject #1: Another place where I learned about philanthropy was through church and Sunday School and helping others and how important that is. I would probably say that I have thought more thoroughly about karma over the past few years, just recently trying to figure out in my own mind – what's philanthropy all about to me, not to my father or to my family? What does it mean to me? And, again, I probably give all the credit or most of the credit to my wife for really helping me think about that. And, because I grew up in a situation that is I guess unique in some ways and I think it just made me...she helped me think differently about philanthropy than how I was raised and what I saw. Because she is coming from a totally different perspective on it. An outside perspective

that's different from what I have experienced my whole life. It's really helped me to think about it more...

Dan: Do you think you are ... if you had to guess will your children feel differently about philanthropy they you would have at their age?

Subject #1: Oh, yeah. My view was different in that...or the view that I was exposed to was different than her view is I would say. What I was exposed to was more kind of...you're giving which is helping the community but it's also helping the business and it's helping you personally. As I learn more about that and thought more about that...it's not really the reasons why I want to give, you know? And it has caused me to think about it more and think about... I think I would do it differently given the choice I would do it differently and now that I am almost 50, which I will be in March, I think I can make the choice now to do it differently...so that's what I am doing.

Dan: it's interesting because the Prince-File study of charitable support led by two sociologists in the 1980s, devised a system of seven different archetypes of philanthropists. I don't know if you have ever read it.

Subject #1: No

Dan: What you described first, best as described as a communitarian. Someone who believes there is a virtuous cycle involved with charitable support but also believes there is a return on investment for the individual and for the community. And, what's good for the community is good for my business and what's good for the business is good for the community. And that's probably from a business perspective over the years I've been involved...probably the most prevalent attitude. There are dynasts ... people who inherit wealth... there are people who are motivated out of their religion ... there are people who are just altruists ... pure altruists who believe, very strongly, that their gifts should be anonymous ... that any type of connection that what they are doing takes some of the spirit out of what they are trying to accomplish in society.

Subject #1: And that's really what I am leaning toward is the more altruistic giving. What was the first one you mention?

Dan: Communitarian

Subject #1: Communitarian has been most of my exposure. While that does benefit the community, it also does benefit the business. To me it's not really the spirit of how I want to give. I think differently ... I think that you should be giving because you want to help somebody or help an organization that can help others. And that's the sole reason you're doing it, maybe you feel good because you were able to help in some way. But, you're not doing it because you want them to give you an award or you want them to put your picture all over the newspaper. Then it feels like it cheapens the giving, it cheapens the gift. But that's just my perspective. Someone else can say no that's not true ... it's encouraging others to give. It's a leadership giver, it's great for the community.

Dan: Well, all I can tell you it's ... I would encourage you to stay principled in how you'd like that to happen because you do great things with your work. And I have met a lot of philanthropists over the years who would prefer to keep things on the low down. And there's nothing wrong with that perspective. From my perspective there's nothing more powerful in the world than having somebody who believes in your cause and is willing to make a gift to it and doesn't want to be recognized for it. It both motivates other volunteers and it motivates staff members because it's a pure example of societal benefit and it's re-enforcing for many people like me who work in this kind of work. So thank you both for your support and for your outlook. What kind of notes did you make as you were thinking about this?

Subject #1: Sure. I kind of talked about them a little but let's see if I missed anything. I think I touched on most of them. Just to reinforce what we already talked about ... I know individuals who give generously but don't feel the need to tell everyone / anyone about it. They just do it and then they feel good about it. They are doing it for the sole benefit of the receiver or organization in need with perhaps a side benefit that they know they are doing good and this makes them feel good helping others. This is more along the lines of the altruistic giver in my mind. And then the other interesting thing I've observed, just serving on non-profit boards. It can kind of go the other direction where the non-profit organizations expect big donations from donors and if they don't get what they want or expect they bad-mouth the potential donor in front of others and yet that donor may have other interests or focuses, which is totally fine. So it really seems unfair, you know, for organizations to do that. They will say well they have so much money they could easily give us X amount and a (you can enter whatever expletive / description of the individual that you want to) but it's like well that's kind of unfair, and it turns off other donors I think, because why would I want to give to an organization that bad-mouths potential donors? It's just not good. As I

have mentioned I have learned over the years about different ways to give and why people give. It has helped to shape my own views on giving based on my own values.

Dan: And so when you think about altruism as it relates to charitable support, what kind of calculus do you go through to kind of figure out where you feel most strongly about helping society?

Subject #1: As far as where to focus my giving, my wife and I are actually in that process right now ... talking through that. And, we just set up our own foundation through the Lancaster Community Foundation. They have resources on staff that can help us with that and they are helping us to think through what the needs are in the local community and how we can be helpful. We have certain interests but we have a lot of different interests. At this point we are not saying we are targeted in this particular area. We want to learn more. What are the needs and where could we make the greatest impact. And do that in a way that is not for our own personal exposure or gain ... just because we want to do it - we want to help.

Something else I wrote down here ... I believe that giving and expecting something in return is not giving. It's more torture for the receiver of the gift of for the community, etc. in order to get more from the donor you must succumb to their wishes and without that cash you cannot operate your non-profit to help others ... to a terrible position. To grovel at a donors feet in order to help the people you're trying to help. Now if the donor is fair with their expectations then it works, I guess.

Dan: Right. That's what you hope for.

Subject #1: That's what you hope for. But I'm not sure that's always the case. That's the risk, that the donors are nor reasonable sometimes.

Dan: It's kind of fascinating if you don't realize this. But, I have to explain this to the staff when I hire them. You know that the federal government created the tax exempt status because they thought of non-profits as a public good. Like a park. So people who give contributions to the Red Cross or contributions to Lebanon Valley College, the money that is given is supposed to be in support of mission, an unrestricted contribution. Originally all gifts were unrestricted. And then it was like you can take a restricted contribution, like for instance to build a building, if both the donor and non-profit agree that the non-profit wants to take on that restricted activity. But it starts to get more complicated the longer you

move that conversation past the original mission. So your outlook is a good one. Let me ask you a question, hypothetical, so first answer it from your perspective and from society's perspective. If the tax code were changed tomorrow and you could not deduct gifts that were given to charity, would it affect what you and your family decide to do in terms of support?

Subject #1: No

Dan: You would do the same thing.

Subject #1: I believe I would. Because that is not why I am giving ... giving to get a tax deduction. And with the donor advisory fund set up I don't even know how all that works. So, I'm not worried about it.

Dan: No you won't have to worry about it because ... make the contributions into the donor advisory fund...the appropriate time and them they can flow out whenever you and the non-profit decide to do that.

Subject #1: I mean I know there is a benefit to do it but I don't think of it that way. I don't think ... that's not why I'm doing it. Now, the business side ... that's the way I was raised ... remember that's an important piece of it and you want to capture it because it's all part of the business kind of benefit to get out of it. So again I am changing my views as I go through time. Yeah, but that doesn't feel right to me ... that's not way you are doing it. I guess if there is a benefit to someone who is managing that and take care of that for us.

Dan: But you're making choices.

Subject #1: That's right.

Dan: So if you think you would have to project out into society and if you had to guess to me the tax code change tomorrow and gifts to non-profits are no longer deductible would it have an impact on how much society or the American society gave to non-profits?

Subject #1: That's hard to answer. Because I think business owners realize that's a benefit. That's another reason they want to give. But is it the sole reason they give? Probably not. I think they give for other reasons and I think they give for visibility for their business and for themselves.

I'm not speaking for myself here... In terms of business people so I think they would continue for those reasons because they still feel like... hey this is going to benefit me so in some way it's going to benefit my business in some way. Therefore, I will still do it ... I won't be maybe as happy about it but I'm going to do it. That would be my guess, you know. And they would grumble and be upset about it but I think they would still do it because I think they would see the benefit for themselves and for their business. I guess that's the cynical response. I would hope that they would do it because they feel it's really good for the community and it's good for them to give and it's not just for business or themselves. That would be my hope.

Dan: I am just curious because like the higher education sector in Europe is different in that it's not supported very much by charitable support because they don't have the same set up. So there is very little philanthropic reinvestment in higher education in Great Britain or in Europe largely which are pretty much public institutions. So here we have churches and colleges and universities which are like one and two for destinations for philanthropic support. So they have done a pretty good job of creating what I will call non-mandatory transfers of wealth in America. And they pretty much serve as a kind of ... if you kind of think about it over all term. They pretty much transfer wealth to another generation. Because you or your contemporaries you have already been generous. It is kind of a wealth transfer action but the beneficiaries are always a generation or two or three behind.

Subject #1: I think it varies so much it's hard to say and are they more apt to help someone they know then someone they don't know. I think it depends on the person.

Dan: What if it was you? Are you more apt to help someone that you don't know or someone that you do know?

Subject #1: I'd do both but it's just an interesting question. Because they are both important, but I can see someone saying well why would you help someone that you don't know when someone you do know needs help. I can see someone saying that. And my response would be because they need help too. And yeah that's just something good to ponder for awhile. But I didn't answer your question. because I can't answer your question.

Dan: Well, it's a difficult question to answer.

Subject #1: Ask me the question again, I'll see if I can answer it.

Dan: I guess ... if you had to come down on one side or another ... Is it in our nature genetically that we are wired to consider ourselves as being part of a greater community ... therefore we are wired to care if there is an accident on the side of the road we want to stop and help or if see an advertisement on television for hurricane victims we want to help? Or whether we are wired to be predisposed to keep our hands in our pockets most of those times?

Subject #1: You know, I think most people want to help. I think most people, not everyone, would want to help. It leads me to think about things that I was told when growing up about helping people that are in situations like that (accident on the side of the road). And I not sure it was all good ... I heard things like, "Well if you do something wrong you could be sued and given your position in the community or business or whatever that's a big deal." You know, so I don't think comments like that helped me to want to help others. Do you know what I mean? So in general I think we are ... naturally most people would help others. But I think we can get information from others that may rethink that.

Dan: So there's an innate, plus nurturing component. But if you had to guess about nature, you'd guess from a natural perspective we understand that we are part of community that we could benefit from helping one another.

Subject #1: Yes

Dan: We can be taught both how to be charitable or altruistic and also how to be cautious when helping others, that it could backfire, impact you in a negative way.

Subject #1: Right

Dan: Well, that's a fair answer. There, we solved that problem.

Subject #1: And, like I said I am learning a lot from my wife because she is a situation where she didn't get that those kind of messages or that kind of feedback. So it's more freeing, I'd say, to just be able ... if you want to help somebody help them. Don't worry about that so much. Because that's what matters, helping others.

Dan: It is. Anything else you would like me to know about this as I am thinking through this?

Subject #1: Just that the learning side is important and we can continue to learn about philanthropy and expand our horizons and again, my wife is helping me to do that with the adoption of our two children from China and learning about the needs of orphan Chinese children and medical needs. And, our one daughter was actually helped by an organization, Love Without Boundaries. People in the United States raised money for her heart surgery. And she had life-saving heart surgery in China before we adopted her. And we didn't know this until we got her picture and learned later that she had been helped by this organization. They saved her life and now she's our daughter. I mean that's incredible. I mean it's just amazing to me. So we have helped that organization. And plan to do more of it. But it just expanded my whole ... because my whole focus growing up was communitarian - you would never go outside your community. Why would you do that - why would you help people outside your community? That just doesn't make any sense.

Well maybe it does ... maybe it does make a lot of sense. In my case it makes a ton of sense. So again, it's figuring those things out and expanding our horizons and learning. It's been great for me, at least.

Dan: Well the connectedness is something sometimes you can miss. You know, you just don't understand the connectedness until you get outside your local zone.

Subject #1: Yes. And then you realize ... wow we are all connected in some way.

Appendix B

Subject #2, March 7, 2018

White female

Lifetime resident of central Pennsylvania

50-70 years old

Has given more than \$1 million to a charities, as part of personal and family foundation contributions

Dan: We are talking about altruism. My question is whether altruism is something that you learn or whether it is genetically wired within us. Could you talk a bit about what your earliest remembrances of charity or helping others within your family?

Subject #2: As I thought about it a little bit, there is a very early memory that comes to mind. I was maybe in junior high school, that kind of age, and a babysitter that we had for me and my brother years before was ill and was in the hospital and my mother was going to see her, and she said, "(REDACTED), get your coat." And I said, "I'm not going to the hospital," and she said, "Oh yes you are."

"Why do I have to go?"

"Because Nana is sick in the hospital, and just because you don't want to go is not enough of a reason. She will appreciate it and she will enjoy this visit. You are going to take this time and go with me. You are not going by yourself. You will go visit Nana."

And, I fussed and fumed and complained. She really had to take me aside and said this is what we are doing. This is what you are expected to do. This is what people do. More importantly this is what we do and this is what you are expected to do. And I think even though there was no money involved in that particular case specifically, it was the notion that you do things for other people because it's valuable to the other person even if you don't get anything out of it. And there is a relationship, and the other person really benefits from you doing whatever it is, which I really think is the basis of altruism and ultimately charitable philanthropy is the same thing.

In the same regard my parents, both of them, were both very active volunteers in the organizations, whether it was my father was in the Rotary or my mother on the hospital auxiliary for years and numerous other organizations. They devoted their time to things and they didn't insist that I do them, but it was modeled for me my whole life. And I don't know if I ever thought of it as an expectation. It was just what they did.

Dan: if you look back on that... on the modeling you got from your parents... I talked to some folks. I had one interview where a second generation business person said that his father believed that it was good for the community and good for business. So in the sense of it being a connected community, there was a reciprocity to altruism. So I am curious as to whether or not, as you look back and reflect on your parents.

Subject #2: It was just the right thing to do. There was no expectation. I never heard it mention, implied, assumed. Whether it was the babysitter, whether it was belonging or working for Rotary or any of the other organizations that both of them spent time with, or charitable giving. It was never any expectation of return benefit.

Dan: And so were there influences besides your parents that influenced the way you think about altruism or care for others?

Subject #2: Certainly the behavior modeled by my parents was clearly most significant issue. And I think of some of my friends who live different lives. They're not on boards they don't do volunteer activity. They may do some charitable work but I think it's very little. Not because they can't ... they just don't. And some of them are pretty close friends of mine and I think we grew up very similarly. And I started to think, were your parents...did they do the same sorts of things that my parents did? It's a long time ago so it's hard for me to remember. But I know this one friend her mother...she was in some of the same groups as my mother, because that was what our age mothers did back then in part. I'm not sure about her dad ... I'm not sure what that modeling looked like.

But if you don't have it modeled for you as an expectation and a way of life, maybe you think you can't afford it. I guess some people do it because they expect something in return. I could understand that, or they think it will boost their stature in the community or whatever.

Dan: So if you had to put your finger on whether or not we have some kind of genetic tendency towards altruism or whether or not it's entirely learned, do you have a sense where you 'd come down?

Subject #2: I think that there is some ... I think I would have hesitated to use the word altruism or maybe that's an appropriate word. We all have seen stories of some accident or something and bystanders just rush to the car, drag somebody out. The car may be on fire ... risking and they pull somebody out. Well they didn't have to do that. Nobody said that and they will say afterwards. It just happened; it wasn't conscious ... didn't stop to think I just ran over to help....clearly someone was in danger or in need of help. And so there is obviously something there that we go to help our fellow man under circumstances...not even somebody you

know...it can't be because you think you will be rewarded afterward...it is such an automatic thing...

Dan: Do you think it is possible that as a group some groups of people are more successful because they are more supportive of one another.

Subject #2: I don't know I guess I would look at where you need groups. I know a little bit about elephants...they are always in a community...they travel together...they raise young together...mom and aunt and grandma take care of the kids in a communal way. Elephants are pretty big creatures so one elephant could protect one baby but they don't.

Dan: They choose to work in a community

Subject #2: Well it's not even a choice...they do ... it's the way it is...they don't consciously choose. Various animals in packs. They are not choosing to. They need to. So there is some functional benefit to that group behavior, in those cases. And, there are plenty of those cases with humans. It's one of those cases ... Hillary Clinton talks about it takes a community or it takes a village to successfully raise children. And there is certainly a certain truth in that. How much of this is innate, how much is just because one can't do it ...and you need other....even in older days when ...say go back 200 hundred years when dad was out working trying to make money on the farm and mom was figuring out how to get food ...did cooking and was busy...trying to maintain...you needed more people. There is something innate about it

Dan: Just like the elephants.

Subject #2: Yeah there is some innateness there. But there is not enough innateness for my friends to be philanthropic or to volunteer. So you manifest differently at different levels...different degrees. I don't know that's a tough one.

Dan: It's made me think a lot actually about education because as you said we need teachers. Because having my own college experience...my kids college experience...my own graduate school...some online, some in person. It's curious to me...it gets to the point of what is the innateness of humans. What is our need for social interaction. So if we have a strong need for social interaction. How does that all come together with the direction we are going in society. Separating and connecting by a device rather than, you know, across the table.

Subject #2: Not well, in my opinion, my personal opinion. I think about that a lot ... about how ... especially about young people because they are more into their gadgets and electronic world than everybody else. Although not by any stretch exclusively. That's so...to me that's antisocial and me centered. And I think these kids are being...they are not learning

the social skills to get along in a broader society unless everyone communicates with a gadget. And then we'll probably all kill each other because people will be selfish...and bad consequences will emerge.

Dan: Do you see ... I mean you have probably hired several generations of employees during time leading the company. Do you see it change in the level ... I guess I'll just say altruism ... a change in the level of sociability through generations of people that you have hired? That you could make kind of a sweeping generalization about.

Subject #2: I'm not sure I could make a generalization about the generation in that regard because I've never ... I don't think about them that way, and I don't know what their outside activities, financial or otherwise. So I not sure I ... even if I had the data I'm not sure I would know. I don't know and actually I've never given any thought ... I don't know if this new millennial generation is as compassionate or altruistic as generation have been in the past. More or less, I don't know.

Dan: And so, when you make decisions related to charity. How does that happen in terms of thinking about the greater societal good? How does your view of the world influence what you want to do there?

Subject #2: Good question. On one level I have learned it's actually a hard responsibility to give away money. People just think you write a check and it's real easy. You want organizations that will use your funds responsibly ... you want to be sure they are using it on projects that ... a project that is funded and they do that work that will have an outcome that is what is anticipated and is what you are expecting it to be. Picking those organizations isn't a piece of cake. On the other hand, I think you go with ... and I think some of this depends on how much money you have to give away. If you are Bill Gates and need to give away a million dollars a year ... the nature of the problem you are going to work with has to be commensurate with the size of funds you are talking about. Which means it's not about supporting the local Humane Society. You have to be looking for something bigger. And if you've only got \$10,000 that you are giving away then you've got to go to something at a different scale. At some point you start thinking about the impact of the funds. As opposed to just a couple of bucks in the plate that is passed around at church. It's beyond the \$20 in the Salvation Army. If you start at some level of funds, that could vary from person to person. And so when you do start thinking about where can I have an impact ... it's not only where CAN I have impact, it's where do I WANT to have an impact. What are those issues or places or how you think about it. What are the organizations that are looking for money ... who are doing something that I really care about. And where I can either align my interests or the funds are sufficient to

have an impact that I think is important that will accomplish something that I think would be really good.

Dan: Is this something as a family that you talked about when you were growing up or that you have developed over time with your own family?

Subject #2: I was aware of the things that our family foundation invested in ... and you kind of think of it as an investment. I guess we had some discussion about it ... the (REDACTED) Foundation. Not exclusively but largely funded things in the local community. And it was the giving back. Basically, this is the area that allowed my family to generate these funds, make this money and then giving it back to those organizations that need help in the community that has helped me.

Dan: So one of the studies that was done on charitable support came up with several different types of donors. (Reviewed the archetypes.) Do you see yourself in any of those categories?

Subject #2: Um, yeah.

Dan: Not purely one or the other but does...

Subject #2: No, but you know in the case of the college it's because I am a firm believer of education and I want ... kids need education. And we need to make that experience not fluffy; we need to make it substantive and help kids in that regard. So that one is a cause that I think is really important and let's face it, virtually all colleges need private donations.

I have other interests particularly in wildlife and in nature and so another big piece of my personal giving is directed toward to the Nature Conservancy. And specifically and again I had to zero in ... well I could have just written them a check it would have gone to the general whatever but I wanted to feel like I was making a difference to something. And learning about the horrific elephant poaching that's been going on more recently. There have been several waves of it and stops and then it starts again. And I thought that's something that I really care about. So have been supporting some specific efforts in central Africa.

Dan: I'm just going to guess if the Nature Conservancy sends you a note of thanks (Subject #2: they do) you're happy about it but if they never put your name on a building or celebrate your contributions in some kind of appropriate or even oversized way that wouldn't have any influence. You're not into in for that. You don't really care if they ...

Subject #2: No I like it because it's a way of saying ... gee your gift is really meaningful and it is impactful and we do get it that you really want to help the elephants.

Dan: I guess what I am trying to get to is the question about recognition and its role in decisions about charity or altruism ... because there is like a part of this from the genetic standpoint that, you know, maybe altruism exists because, at some level, it was recognition of sexual fitness. People said, you know that male species or female species is really very kind. He must have extra resources that he is able to be so generous. So it was a proof of fitness that allowed the gene to develop and the tendency to develop. And if there was no recognition there would be no evidence or proof of fitness. So what I am trying to get to is the role of recognition in your decisions.

Subject #2: If I were to give something to ... say one million dollars ... to an organization and all I got was a thank you note that looked just like everybody else's thank you note I would be miffed. That was not a thank you that was commensurate with the size of the gift. That thank you is a form of recognition and I have some sense of ... it's a sense of equity for me.

And somehow, and I don't know how this fits, the way these thank you have come has also been ... you feel more involved. You get to know the people better, you see what's happening, you get to go wherever this thing is whatever you're supporting. Someone makes a little fuss over you ... but you feel more a part of it. I don't know if I am explaining this very well but ... because if it's some issue / subject like education / wildlife that you care about you kind of like to feel like you are helping. And, all you can do is give money and nobody is asking you to be an employee ... that's not what you are asking for either, but just want to know this is working. And so maybe that fits into the investment type of model.

Dan: Well maybe part of it is somebody making a fuss but part of it is proof that what you called the nature of the problem equal to the amount of money you have is a feedback loop that showed that this worked (Subject #2 agrees). So let me propose a question that is related to that. Let's take the Nature Conservancy was allowed to send you a letter about what they were doing with your money to report back but not provide you with any recognition that someone has done this to any other supporters. But you could get the feedback to what is working ... you could even for yourself go over and check it out. But you could not get recognition or financial incentive through the federal government for making a contribution. Would it influence what you like to do there?

Subject #2: For me personally, the public recognition ... in some broader sense than the thank you or the things we described would not matter at all. They don't even publish a list of donors at any level. The tax part of it isn't going to change my level of activity. But I can imagine that it may for many people. I don't think it will matter for Bill Gates. He's got a lot to

give away and he's going to give it away regardless. Because what else is he going to do with it ... build another gargantuan house.

Dan: Right. So think about ten of your friends. If charitable support is no longer a tax deduction and they are not allowed to receive any recognition for their contributions, do you think that all ten will continue to give at the level that they are or modifies or what percentage do you think will hang in there.

Subject #2: That's a tough question. I sure it will matter to some whether will they actually sit and do the calculation ... I gave \$100 and the government was covering 30% of that ... I will make it \$70. Most people aren't that hot with math so they probably wouldn't do the numbers.

Dan: You're right about that.

Subject #2: I've never had this conversation with any of my friends to I don't really know how they would feel about these issues or the degree of public recognition, how important is that for them. You know I look at it from my own perspective and say well what would you need that for ... why would it matter.

Dan: Is there more that you have thought about sharing that we haven't talked about thus far?

Subject #2: No, certainly the thoughts that came to mind when I read your note are the ones that I shared with you. I haven't thought about charitable giving in a lot of those contexts that you have shared ... that's kind of interesting as well.

Appendix C

Subject #3, March 28, 2018

White female

*Current resident of central Pennsylvania, has lived in many places in the United States
80+ years old*

*Has given more than \$5 million to a charities, as part of personal and family
foundation contributions*

Dan: Subject #3, thanks so much for spending a few minutes with me today. I am doing a paper that will be about 30 pages in length. It will be first looking at altruism from kind of the genetic perspective, where does it exist in the brain and what parts of the brain influence it, and then looking at it philosophically, and then looking at it from a kind of sociological study, bring it all together with some of these orals histories I've got.

Subject #3: I'm happy to talk about anything. I am one of those ladies that never is quiet.

Dan: Could you just give a little background like where you were born and raised and what your family did.

Subject #3: I grew up on a farm in (REDACTED) County near (REDACTED) and I actually spent my summers there with my grandparents. When my grandmother passed away my grandfather wouldn't leave. So then we moved from the city of (REDACTED) and I was a preteen then. So the rest of my youth was on the farm.

Dan: So you're growing up years were kind of on the farm, Your father, before you moved to the farm, what kind of work was he in?

Subject #3: During the Depression he was in a business that was making like, not plaster< but what do you put in house?

Dan: Drywall?

Subject #3: Yeah and then that went belly up during the Depression, and that's the only thing I really remember about the Depression because my mother's family were all farmers so we always had plenty to eat. But I always liked clothes and I wanted fancy shoes and I had to wear plain

shoes that cost \$1.98's without any design, that's how awful the Depression was for young people. The old people were worried about (bigger things). The young were sad because they couldn't have the best of what they thought they wanted. So I can still remember those years. Didn't like them.

Dan: Subject #3, as you got through your high school years did you tell me that you started working in retail?

Subject #3: I worked for Walden Book Company when they were in town. They were a New York firm but they rented space and department stores and ours was (REDACTED) of (REDACTED) and I am sure there was one here at your department store downtown as well and they would interview people to run them. Then you would get to go to New York because in those days, you sold greeting cards and they had rental libraries because it wasn't like you could pick up a paperback book; there were none.

Dan: There was no paperback.

Subject #3: And when they did come out they that ruined our library... They would run a library, a rental of five cents a day or something and all the city people would come into your department store to bring your books back, which brought in more customers (to the department store) that sometimes might not be in there.

Dan: So, wow I didn't know that so book stores actually ran rental libraries.

Subject #3: And you would charge whatever. Maybe five cents a day and another person would lower to four cents a day and you would have to beat that competition. Then I began going into New York to buy for other stores; they would rent space all over the East Coast.

Dan: You became kind of a buyer.

Subject #3: Yeah, it was like that. Seeing what was new. For a country kid, I would come to (REDACTED) and get on the train and go to New York and stay at the Algonquin Hotel.

Now I am going back to the 50's. When I first met the boss there he was sitting with a movie star I met him in the bar room and I guess I still had

a lot of Pennsylvania Dutch, because when they would ask me questions the actress would say “the rain in Spain falls mainly on the plain.” And, I thought, well what ails her? I didn’t even know what they were referring to. And, after years later when I learned what it was about...I should have smacked her because they really baited me when they discovered my Pennsylvania Dutch accent. But, I didn’t get it, of course, so I wasn’t offended until 25 years later.

Dan: How about that. But that must have been a real experience though.

Subject #3: it really made a different person and in those days I wasn’t afraid to do anything. The warehouse for the books like especially the children’s books you could choose what you wanted to have shipped to your department in (REDACTED) and I would get off that train where ever it would stop and I would get off to walk around and see what the town was like and it didn’t matter where it was and I was never afraid; you didn’t have to be afraid back in those days, at least I didn’t know you should be or were supposed to be, and then catch the train to go back into the city. I just felt like such a big shot; it was so wonderful for a farm girl to get out of town.

Dan: Refresh my memory, how did you and your husband meet?

Subject #3: Well, in our day there was a lot of dancing. I don’t know if you knew the ballroom down in (REDACTED)?

Dan: (REDACTED)?

Subject #3: Yeah. They would have a Friday night dance and they would have big bands come in and the first big band was Harry James that I went to see and I saved some money and the tickets weren’t expensive and I just loved...everybody danced then. And, Harry James was playing and he came out during intermission. I think he was probably going for a drink or something and I tapped his arm and I said “Harry, you’re going to be a star,” and he looked at me and said “Honey, I already am.” and kept on walking, like where did you come from. I didn’t know who I was talking to, I knew who he was. I didn’t know I was going to offend him by saying he was going to be star. I never forgot that because I thought I was such a big shot and when he said that I felt like a dumb farmer’s daughter...

...And we danced until they would leave. And, people cut in you really didn't have to have a partner or anything. But, in the end, three years later everybody was hooked up with somebody you know or something.

Dan: So it was the (REDACTED) Ballroom that you brought you two together.

Subject #3: Well, he had a girlfriend.

Dan: Oh, he did.

Subject #3: And, we went up to (REDACTED) Park, did you ever hear of that?

Dan: Yeah, I've heard of (REDACTED).

Subject #3: And, they used to have a big porch and, uh what did they call those music machines that you put a quarter in?

Dan: Jukebox?

Subject #3: Jukeboxes, yeah, and you'd dance on the porch there. And, we took a group in our day. There would be a car with maybe 5 or 6 people in it. Not everybody had a car like they do now. And, we would all pile in and go up there and go to the park and then in the evening go over and dance on the log porch or the cabin porch there. My husband, I knew him from the group but I didn't and he went down on a swing and he called to his girlfriend and said "Louise give me a push" she said "Aw, push yourself" And I thought, he's pretty cute I'm going to push him so I did. Three months later we were married. And everybody said that will never last. So 54 years later I thought...yeah.

Dan: You kind of took it upon yourself to give him a push.

Subject #3: And, it wasn't that heavy, it was kind of nice.

Dan: How about that!

Subject #3: And, it drove our parents crazy. They said well you don't even know each other.

It was such a different time and you were naive about a lot of things. You didn't feel like you needed to know much about somebody. You just had to know if you liked them or not.

(Long story about renting an apartment, pushing a ladder over on a peeping Tom.)

Dan: And, how old were you then when you two got married?

Subject #3: 23

Dan: You were 23.

Dan: So, if you look back on the time before you were married and when you were living at home. Or, (REDACTED)'s folks and how they might have felt about altruism, helping other people, responsibility towards others. Do you have any kind of memories that helped to guide you?

Subject #3: Well, I think when you grow up...and I had one brother, I still have him; he has dementia, but, we would spend summers with our grandparents on the farm and there would be a wagon and horse come by and an old lady would get out, and I would notice that they were filling a mattress with straw. So this was a great grandmother who only spoke Pennsylvania Dutch. We never had a conversation. But, she would be dropped off and spend a month and do mending and be like a slave almost. And, it was family...somebody's mother or something. But, then another wagon would come by a month later...it would be no longer than a month, and she would pack up her bag and she would go someplace and that's what they did with the elderly family instead of putting them in some home...well I guess they didn't have any money to pay for to be anywhere. So they just rode her around. And I remember, I thought it was so funny after she left that day, they took the mattress out of her bedroom and they set fire to it. Now, as an adult I think I wonder if she had bugs? I mean why would they burn it? But, I guess they wouldn't know what else to do with it. Not give it to somebody else to sleep on.

Dan: That's amazing. When you moved to the farm you said you never had to worry about food but probably some families did.

Subject #3: Oh yeah. In our neighborhood in west (REDACTED) I remember there was a large family and they would take a wagon like on Tuesdays and I don't know where they would go. I forget what it was

called but you could take your wagon and get food. And, now today I was just with the woman who runs the health clinics here in (REDACTED) and I looked at what beautiful changes for poor people to come into these lovely health centers all over town...I would say I went in four of them because I support them and it was nice to see what I was supporting. And, they are run well...there are volunteer, well maybe everybody's paid, but the people who come there I don't think any of them can pay. But they get wonderful...well some of the doctors are here waiting to pass their tests and they're from different countries and they do work free there. And, I think the patients might pay what they can. But, each one that I have been in and I've been in five now are run beautifully. And, most people maybe not most but a good deal of them are maybe Hispanic who have been patients there. I was in four. Now I think that was amazing.

Dan: Compared to the way it was.

Subject #3: Yeah. And I don't know how it used to be, but I wasn't here then. But to see what's...and then last week...I support the foundation that takes care of disabled people. Have you ever been to that?

Dan: I have heard of it but I've never been through it.

Subject #3: It blows you away. And now they are even going to start breeding their own dogs. And now I am interested in supporting the puppies and stuff...because I got lots of kisses from the dogs. I went down there so I thought I've got to keep them coming...they're really sweet. It's a wonderful place. No wonder everybody comes to (REDACTED). Because there is so much! If you don't have anything there's someplace to go for help.

Dan: I think that is true.

Subject #3: It's amazing to me.

Dan: Do you remember anything from your growing up years about how your folks felt about charity or the church or supporting other people.

Subject #3: My memories are everybody had trouble supporting themselves.

Dan: Everybody was just having a hard time.

Subject #3: The people I knew...I wasn't with, what they called the rich people. Because mother worked at home. A sewing factory would bring her like collars to deliver; so that she could be at home with my brother and me. So that she could earn some money.

Dan: Piece work

Subject #3: Yeah. And dad would take whatever type of job. And so I think moving on the farm was like an easy decision because you didn't have much to give up.

Dan: You didn't have much.

Subject #3: Yeah and so that was an easy decision to be there and make some money.

Dan: Right.

Subject #3: I saw how hard my mother worked. A farm lady just doesn't work in the house she has the cows and the chickens and everything in the book plus going out to help in the barn and in the fields sometimes.

Dan: It was hard work.

Subject #3: It is, and especially hard for women. At least it seemed that way. I guess because I saw...and my dad like to ride...we had a riding horse and my brother would say "I'm having some guys over do you want ride with us". I said "well we only have one horse." And he said "Oh, Jim will bring some from their family." And I said, "Are they farmers? And he said, "Who else do we know?" I was not interested in meeting a farm boy.

Dan: That's how you could see it coming together. If you ended up marrying farmer, it would be a hard life.

Subject #3: That's what I thought. I saw enough of that. How much you had to do. And for a woman, they not only had the house to do but they would help in the barn...threshing time and if they weren't doing that they were cooking meals for the hired hands. It was just work, work, work. So, I knew I never wanted that for a life.

Dan: Yeah, I can certainly...

Subject #3: And, then my husband's family owned the (REDACTED) Milling Company, (a feed mill). So when dad would have a load of wheat to take over to sell, one time I said to dad, "I'll go along with you." We would sit in lines in (REDACTED)...all farmers with their trucks lined up because it would take all night to get to the end and then the next day it would start all over again. So my dad said, "What do you mean you want to come along? Sit in a line all day?" And I said, "There is a guy I want to check out...somebody said that his family has this mill we are going to." So he looked disgusted but I didn't care I got into the truck and went. So I did that a couple of times. So the next dance we got a little chummier...it was like 3 months we dated and then we were getting married and everybody said you're crazy you hardly know each other.

Dan: So you and your husband end up owning the feed mill in (REDACTED).

Subject #3: It was his family's. (REDACTED) Milling Company

Dan: Right and eventually he sells to another company.

Subject #3: To ConAgra

Dan: And, then you guys end up going all over the nation.

Subject #3: Then he sold the company. He graduated from (REDACTED) College and that was back in 1940. And when he came home he said to his father, he said I've learned that this business of having a mill of running by water and all that, that's all in the past. You have to have a new way of doing things. And his dad said well if that's what you learned in college that's why we sent you. So they had people come from Austria and redo the mill. The building still the same old building stone and everything and still the producer. It was all upgraded then.

So when we had no children or anyone to pass it to in the family, and my husband said I would like to sell it and his dad said if that's what you want to do.

Dan: Right. So when you guys owned the feed mill in (REDACTED) and you probably started generating a little more income for the two of you. Did you start to become charitable at that time, the two of you, you and (REDACTED)?

Subject #3: No, they were not. They lived well but they never joined anything. (REDACTED)'s family loved counting their money. I noticed old timers like that that worked so hard or inherited it, they liked to see how much money they could have.

Dan: Just accumulated it.

Subject #3: And didn't care about maybe a fur coat or a Cadillac but that was as far as they would go. And, I think like those ladies and they were farmers originally before that. At least their spouses were and they just cared about a few nice things and no debt and that sort of thing. They weren't interested in joining a club or taking a cruise. They thought that was ridiculous. They just invested it and made more.

Dan: So the idea of giving it away never occurred to them.

Subject #3: No they were not like that. They kept it within the family and if the family didn't need it, it went back in the business. So, it was our generation that blew it all, made it work or ended up with nothing.... After we were married and in the summertime trucks with farmers would line up all night long because they needed their money they wanted to sell their grain and move on. And I would work all night then with my husband because the other people who were doing those jobs had their day and it was just interesting for me to see how hard people worked and how much they needed their money and they'd want to be paid right away that's why we would be open all night. And they didn't want to wait until morning they wanted when they left to take their check with them. So you learn that life isn't easy for everybody. People worked hard to get their money.

Dan: Then you sell the mill to Conagra and (REDACTED) takes a job at other places.

Subject #3: Well, he said he's retiring. I was playing golf in those days. And I played with one of the business executives from Conagra. And I said did you find a job for my husband and he said well I don't think he wants to work he's retiring. I said, he thinks he's retiring. If don't ever tell on me, I'd like you to offer him something. My feeling was whenever we'd meet somebody and get to know them well, he was always intrigued by a self-made person that worked hard...drove this big truck and had this big cement company or whatever, and I thought I feel like he should know that he could have done all of this himself, without help, but he could never be sure; is the way I felt. Because everything just fell on him.

And not that he was lazy, he worked hard. But I'm sure always felt...that is the way I read it. He always felt that he never challenged himself.

(Stories about life in Kansas City, Michigan, moves and people.)

Dan: I guess so. So did you ... I know that (REDACTED) was probably charitable to his college prior to his passing.

Subject #3: Yes that was thing because he felt that really made him unique in his family. Not everybody did back then. The girls today ... (scholarships she provides)... I sponsor them ... they want to study in some God-forsaken country ... they are not shy about anything. It's just such a different time in the world. It fascinates me how smart women are.

Dan: It's a different time, for sure. After (REDACTED)'s passing, you continued to be charitable and even more so.

Subject #3: Yeah. Well, I was never in charge of anything so I didn't even know what kind of heat we ever had. We never had a house payment; we never had a car payment. So I never knew anything he took care of that. And when my little bank account would be out he would put something in it. And, I don't know why I never thought to ask but I think if you don't have a family to share your future...you just don't get to that point, maybe. At least we didn't, so I thought when he passed away well I don't know what will happen to me. He had everything just so taken care of then.

Dan: You didn't need to worry.

Subject #3: I just ... and he cared a lot about (REDACTED) College...and I was there just last night. It's funny you should say that. There's a young man here, I eat all my meals up at the diner, and he's from Mexico and he's such a smart young fellow and I was telling the college president about him. And they had a dedication for the new art department going in there and a dinner and so I invited this young man and he's so smart. His father is the chef up at the diner and his mother is a bus girl and they barely speak English. But he doesn't have his blue card or green which ever you need, and he's so smart and he graduates from (REDACTED) high school here this year. And, so the president was really impressed with him too.

And, it was so interesting after the dinner we were getting ready to leave. The young man said (REDACTED), I've never been to anything like this ... it was so wonderful. He had even called the secretary of the college and asked how he should dress. He didn't want me to know that he didn't know how to dress and he looked wonderful. I was proud.

Dan: But I want to get back to some of the questions that I had. It sounds, Subject #3, like some of the decisions about charitable support that you make you just started to make after (REDACTED) passed away.

Subject #3: Yes. The only thing that we did together was things at the college, if they wanted a building or something. And when he passed away I supported things I knew he would like there which were buildings.

Dan: But you said he wanted to give to his alma mater because he ... they had such a big role to play in his success.

Subject #3: Yeah.

Dan: So, since then you have been involved with charities in (REDACTED) counties, also. So if you look at it from an evolution standpoint, Charles Darwin came along and said the way species survive is by taking care of themselves, each one. And, the strong survive and the weak fall by the wayside. Well, it doesn't make any sense to give things away from a kind of genetic standpoint right because why would you try to help some other person if your just trying to worry about your own survival. And when you said about the farm wives and the farmers not really thinking about giving it away because they were used to not having anything.

Subject #3: Yeah, that's right.

Dan: So what has happened that made you say ... you know what, I should be giving it away.

Subject #3: I feel that not having a family, why would I not want to share with somebody who is less fortunate? And, actually I guess in my heart, I feel like it was (REDACTED)'s gift. I just feel like you should share. It's a warm feeling to know that you made life easier for somebody. And I have nieces and nephews and so did (REDACTED) and he set up trusts for them years ago. And I figure they have that and we'll have it until the money runs out. I don't plan on giving them another thing. Let them do

for themselves. They do well enough with their trusts so ... and they've had that already for fifteen years.

Dan: You said something interesting. You said it's a warm feeling whenever you share with others and you make those kinds of contributions.

Subject #3: You kind of feel like ok.

Dan: It makes you feel good about what you can do.

Subject #3: Yeah, yeah. And just like when you go and see what buildings these people are working from and what they do to help people. It just is a good feeling to be part of it. I have a scholarship at every college, maybe just one at most of them...

... But, I was coming out of the show and some little old lady, I have trouble calling someone that when I'm a little old lady too, but she tapped me and said I have cancer and I said well I hope you are being cared for. So, this whole group, some of them knew that I have given money to the cancer institute downtown, and this old lady said, "Do you know if that (Subject #3 name) is still alive?" And we are all in a crowd coming out of auditorium and were waiting to leave. And I said yes she is. And she said, "Well she must be stupid giving her money away before she's dead." And I said, "Well I am (Subject #3 Name) and I've done a lot of stupid things but I decided to give it away now so I can see who benefits and I can feel good about it. Once I'm dead they'll give it to anybody they think they can make an impression but I'm doing it while I'm alive." After we got outside I think it embarrassed some people. She was so loud and ____ to me. And I said, "I bet tomorrow when she's with her friends she say you won't believe what I said yesterday."

Dan: So when you think about making gifts, you make a contribution to a college or to a health organization or a youth organization and you get to see the results of it you meet the kids or you meet the people in charge. It makes you feel good.

Subject #3: It does. It's like if I wouldn't have helped, it wouldn't even be here. And then I forget about it.

Dan: Ok, so let me give you a couple of hypotheticals. Think of ten friends that you have and think about how many of those ten friends would have the same instinct to help others as you do.

Subject #3: I think people with families have a different feeling about giving money away. They want it for their children. Most of my friends feel that way. If I didn't have children they would say...like they are making up for what I do...they don't do because of their children. And, I can understand that. Because if you struggled to make a lot of money and you have, say, four or five kids you wouldn't want them to struggle that much. So that's the reason I think for that.

Dan: So do you think most people that you can think of think primarily of first helping their children or grandchildren.

Subject #3: Yeah, to see that they get to school and college and start a business. They feel better about that. And I can understand that, I would feel the same way.

Dan: Which makes sense if you think about dogs or monkeys or whatever. They are going to think about their kids and raising their kids.

Subject #3: Yeah, that's right.

Dan: That makes sense.

Subject #3: And I think that's a big thing ... I have some friends who are very generous with families. And, that's a different story but most of my friends are glad to help their families in their business or start a business. And I am sure I would be that same way too.

Dan: So you think humans have a tendency to think first about their children or grandchildren and then if that is not something they have to worry about then they think about caring for others.

Subject #3: Yeah. Or they might have one special thing like their college that they give to something big and still not cut the kids out of anything. But just for ordinary people I think would pass your money to your children. I would feel that way, anyway.

Dan: Would it make a difference to you Subject #3 if ... let's just imagine a situation where you were deciding to make a gift to a hospital but they

weren't allowed to put your name on it. Say the government passed a law and you couldn't do that. Would that make a difference?

Subject #3: No, it wouldn't. As long as in my heart I know. But actually most places that I give they want to put the name because they say well if (Subject #3 Name) can do it you know they want to match it.

Dan: Yeah.

Subject #3: And I think that's funny but that doesn't ... that doesn't seem to move me. I never cared. So when they say that ... maybe they just make it up. But almost every place will mention naming to me. So, I've gotten so, sure, ok. So, it's sort of humbling in a way but they always assure me it means something to other people but I'm sure it doesn't because it doesn't mean anything to me.

Dan: So Subject #3 if you had to make an argument that people are either born with this idea to help other people or they learn it from what happens in their lives either from their parents or from church or whatever, which do you think it would be. If you had to pick one or the other.

Subject #3: I think it would be what you see around you that ... you could ... if you had somebody that you felt you could make life better for, that that would be worth supporting, or if you find out what you could do to make their life better, most people would do it, and you wouldn't have to have a big thank you or anything. That's the way I feel about it.

Dan: Can you image you being happy just like your late husband's mother, just holding on to the money and not sharing it?

Subject #3: No that isn't who I am... ... it's like a fellow came up to me oh maybe a month ago and he said... oh, I don't know what, I was written up for some building donation, and he said, "My God, I lived in Red Lion all my life, and I never knew the Barshinger's had any money at all." And I said, "They don't any more. I have it." And I thought that was a smart answer.

Appendix D

Subject #4 and Subject #5, a married couple

Subject #4 is a white male, 65-80 years old

Subject #4 was born and his lived his life in central Pennsylvania, a second generation family business executive.

Subject #5 is a white female, 65-80 years old

Subject #5 moved to the region from New England and married Subject #4 approximately ten years ago.

As a couple, the subjects have made more than \$10 million in gifts.

Dan: I know you have been generous to many difference charities. Talk a little bit about your first exposure to caring for others through charitable gifts as a kid.

Subject #4: So in the case of Subject #5, in her vocation that is more of the health care, but specifically nursing, that is a caring profession. To take care of people and you have to be good at it and want to do it...you have to like people and want to take care of them. It's like our granddaughter...she is unbelievably caring. That's just the way she is. I can say she got it from her grandmother because she didn't get it from her parents. And (REDACTED relative), totally opposite from her sister which is interesting ... you are talking about two people who are from the same family ... her sister wants to be a policeman or a detective or forensic person or something in law enforcement, which is totally different. Now I don't know, I can't say is she as caring as (REDACTED), probably not as much.

Subject #5: I just want to kind of give a little history of my own. At the time when I graduated from high school there were only three things for women ... being a secretary, a nurse or a teacher. Now we are talking, Dan, back in the sixties. And that was it, there weren't all these other degrees for women to get into. I came from a relatively poor community. We were blue collar. Mother and father when they both retired they were making \$14,000 a year back in 1966 or something. But my father was an electrician and he ... we couldn't give financially but if there was somebody in the church that they were building a new house and they needed the house wired, my father would do this at no cost. (Subject #4: he gave service) He gave services. And my mother did work for a doctor but it was my dad that I remember was doing things for others. But my father was a very difficult man. He was very hard man ... he'd been through World War II and was There's a long story there (Subject #4:

he was traumatized – he was in combat). He was on the US Ticonderoga that was kamikazeed and he was always just an extremely nervous man. But then we would go as a family, the four of us my brother, my mom and dad to a place called the Colonial Club in, I still remember, it was in Worcester, Massachusetts once a year for like this fancy dinner ... that's all that we could do was once a year. And, there was an organ player – that was part of where my father wanted to get the organ. But, my father was always a very generous tipper. Ok, I don't know if it's genetic or if it's a lot of what you are exposed to. Because with my mother ... I helped out ... she worked for a doctor in practice and I would go and help her. But I remember a lot more of my father helping out. It was difficult because many times he was taken advantage of. I think we have all been in that position.

But anyway, to get back to me ... there was never a question in my mind of what I wanted to be from as early as I can remember I wanted to be a nurse. And, that's how my career started. Subject #4, yours was a little bit different. You had a generous dad who got involved with the college early on and actually as being financially philanthropic for me ... If anybody needed anything and I was working, even though I really couldn't afford to do it, I would help them. Whether it was their rent ... maybe one of my nurses was having a hard time I would help them in anyway ... I would give them extra hours, but even financially at times doing things I really couldn't afford to do. But it was like my heart just went out to them.

And then it was like marrying Subject #4 and going from this very blue-collared situation into a role where I am marrying a very, very wealthy man was quite a learning curve of what this was all about ... what philanthropy was about. And, we'd give a lot and a lot of different organizations almost maybe to a fault ... don't you think.

Subject #4: I think ... well you've got to realize the other part which makes us different from ... I believe ... literally strongly believe in the Carnegie quote that says "I want to give you my family as much as you need but not so much that you do nothing". And so therefore my goal was to allow my children or grandchildren, for that matter, to have opportunities. But in no way to give them enough that they do not have to work. So therefore because of that philosophy, I didn't want to maintain my family's wealth because when we die and whatever we have designated and so on, but there should be no residual trust that will go on forever. And to me, let's do it now and I don't want anything left over. Now, there is a little bit of a balance to that because who knows if you are

going to live to be 110? And who knows with our government and so on ...

There is a case I've seen a list of people contributing to charity as a percentage of a family's wealth There are some that give nothing away, even though that family is one of the richest families in the world – they are exactly the opposite of (Bill) Gates. Even though Gates because he is so wealthy he would give it away ... it goes from giving 1% to as high as 50% or so. We are more in the area of more 75 to 80%.

First of all, yes, I was mentored. My father was a generous person period. In a lot of ways my father was a very kind gentle person. But I think that your statement of what causes ... I still think it's your surroundings and part of it ... why are some people more generous or kind or ... I don't know. That's a good question. I think part of it if you're in an area where you are helping people. If you are going in an area where you are more financially or using money as capital and so on, you are going to use that capital to grow businesses. You are helping people more people to have employment, and doing a great job and things like that.

So not necessary but because of our philosophy and we have agreed on ... we don't want to give a tremendous amount of money to our children or grandchildren or whatever. Because as far as we are concerned we want to give the opportunity or education or whatever they want to do ... I think the greatest waste in the country is the number of people that go to college that never use their skills because they are from the very wealthy and they don't have to do anything and they don't.

Subject #5: I think when Subject #4 and I started to date, his philosophy was to donate mostly to colleges and libraries. I mean people that are helping themselves, because my exposure through nursing. When I was with (REDACTED) hospital, we did a community needs assessment and this was back in '92 before it was mandated. Like today the hospitals have to do it every so many years. Mandated by the IRS to maintain their 5013C. But, we did it in '92 and it was my responsibility to get people together to work on the issues that were raised and that was when I went from totally an in hospital philosophy to seeing things that were out there in the community. And, really developing programs when I was there for high risk. Whether it was high risk moms' who had just delivered ... like they were single moms like teenage pregnancy. There was a lot of teenage pregnancy back then. But also mental issues but issues with senior citizens and youth programs and just all kinds of things. So mine was just more helping those that can't always help themselves. Many times there are

things you have to do to help them so they can move forward. So our philosophies are a little bit different.

Subject #4: My idea is ... I wanted my businesses to prosper ... the more I earned, the more I could give away, the more I could do. My goal was not to maximize profits and minimize expenses. No it wanted them both to go together. Now there is a way to be competitive and there's a way to be fair ... labor was by far the biggest cost. And, now today health care is the biggest cost. So overall my philosophy was to mentor people in a way You are going to get a better and better job and get more and more financially secure. If I'm helping somebody who is helping themselves, they're working harder. They're doing more.. I've also been more helping people who are trying to help themselves. And to the maximum I can do it.

Dan: And you saw it as a kind of symbiotic relationship where if they could become better and better trained and be more effective. It not only helped them but it helped you as an employer also.

Subject #4: I think you might of heard my little thing, my triangle ... I will do the most to help and motivate my employee who in turn will work very hard, take good care of my customers and the customers will of course take good care of the company. So it's a triangle, the company does well, help the employees, who helps the customers ... it just keeps going round and round. It's a very positive cycle and so therefore, I believe that you reward those who work hard. And better themselves. And make themselves more value. That's where I really have a problem with this equality of pay. It should be an equality of opportunity.

Subject #5: Let's get back to philanthropy. I think as far as philanthropy, so much of it is about relationships and then learning about, you know, what an organization's doing. And, does it strike a chord with you. We donate to (REDACTED) Health Services and that's an organization that serves like 3,500 WIC, which is Women Infants and Children, a month. They basically help ... and that's. I mean mine has been more trying to help people.

Subject #4: And I guess that's the challenge the college has. You want to help a winner. I don't care at what level. I think the Y is very well run. It's obviously a non for profit. It helps a fair amount of the community as far as... But over the years it has been very fortunate to have good management and the Y does a good job. And so for helping them I have no problem. They are a good organization that serves the community and

they do it in a good manner. Where as some other charities ... the United Way is a cross of the good and the bad. Not that they don't try to work well, but they are more of helping everybody. And I am saying no we would rather use the rifle than shotgun. And that's the challenge the college has, it has got to convey to its family which is faculty, students, donors, community and so on, that it's got big challenges. But yet it's got to convey that it can meet those challenges. It's a very fine line. Especially the faculty, I think that's those most difficult.

Dan: You have to be honest about the challenges, but you have to portray that you've got a good chance at success if you keep with your plan.

(Miscellaneous discussions about colleges and finance. Ending on a question of whether charity was nature or nurture.)

Subject #4: I think it is nurture... the way Subject #5 was brought up who saw her father who gave. I don't care how he gave, he gave. He was a generous person of limited means. My father gave, he gave relative to his means which was substantial. But also our company. Our employees gave. So it was sort of that's what you do. Yeah the Judeo-Christian ethics ...

Subject #5: I think there is a feeling you get ... like, one of the biggest things that we would get into arguments about and we still do is tipping. When we first started going together, he was so damn cheap, really Subject #4 you were, and we go to a hotel and we would have to drag our stuff in and not let anybody

Subject #4: You are so liberal dear so therefore

Subject #5: Well, I just look at it like these are people that are helping you and they don't make much money.

Subject #4: No you are wrong dear. Right now one of the highest paid professions is waitstaff in a very good restaurant. I believe tipping is a relative thing.

Subject #5: Well, anyway we

Subject #4: I believe that if you are going to a restaurant that's costing \$100 per person, you are going to percentage wise tip very low. If I'm going to the diner, by the way we really had a good lunch at the Quentin

Diner today. It was under \$10, we were going to tip 25% because it's so low, they still do the same work.

Subject #5: We don't agree on tipping.

Subject #4: I look upon it as what would you provide and what did you get. And not this automatic formula that everybody gets 15% or 20% or whatever.

Subject #5: Yeah, but some of the things you were ridiculous.

Subject #4: I'm not saying I wasn't bad.

Subject #5: It was embarrassing.

Dan: (Segue to conversation about observations of support among other species) Like bats, they go out hunting at night ... the ones that are not successful get fed by the ones that are successful.

Subject #5: Isn't that interesting

Dan: And, we may not all be so good that we would help the Samaritan by putting him up in a hotel. But do we all have something in us that says we should help that person. Do we act on that urge or not. Do we have it in us that we should.

Subject #4: I think that is varies upon the individual.

Dan: You don't think that people see that helpless person along the road and not be affected to the point of helping.

Subject #5: See I think you gotta help.

Subject #4: I read a book once about the effect the first time you shot somebody ... like in WWII when you could see the person you were shooting ... you threw up ... a lot of soldiers; the second one you were upset but not as much; by the time you killed the fifth person, you were fine.... so you learn the reaction. Your natural instinct was not to kill. I don't know that ... but killing animals now there you have a total disparity. I think squirrels should be could killed, period. Rats should be killed, not chipmunks, I like chipmunks.

Dan: So it sounds like you believe it might be human nature to not want to kill another human being. We might be hard wired to not want to do that.

Subject #4: I think as a general statement, yeah I think that's true.

Dan: So you believe we might have some kind of quality that says we don't want to kill another human, but you are not sure that we have quality that says I care about that other human being as an extension of my community.

Subject #4: But that's animals. Except for a very few exceptions, very few animals kill for pleasure. They kill to eat. I forget, I think a polar bear might be one that kills just to kill. And there are a few others that do that but 90% or more.

Subject #5: I do think there is , for me, there is a visceral response. If I feel like I am really helping somebody then I feel really good about it. And, I mean I basically try to help everyone.

Subject #4: No you are an extremely kind person, you are. Was it genetic or was it because what you saw or just somehow ... I mean can you really explain it. Again, I go back two our granddaughters. They are totally different and neither of them are like their parents, period. ...

Subject #5: No as I was saying Dan, I really do have a visceral response if I feel like I've helped somebody. Whether that was like a genetic thing ... I don't know. It's not euphoria, but it's just a like I said it just a visceral reaction. I feel if I've done something

Subject #4: Well one question, if you help somebody and then they let you down because they squander what you give them

Subject #5: Oh that's what happened to me. It was very disappointing ... there was a young

Subject #4: But you helped them again.

Subject #5: No, no. I did help this one young woman that lived in the very poor section of (REDACTED) around WalMart. And this was when I was at the hospital and she had had two little girls from different fathers and she was pregnant with a third. And, she couldn't make her rent

payment and I was in no position to be doing what I did. But, I did help her and one of the things I said to her is don't get pregnant again. Ok, because if you do I'm done. You've already going to have three and she had the third, she had a third girl. And I would go at Christmas time and bring presents for the girls and at Thanksgiving I got the whatever ... she was (REDACTED background information). But then she got pregnant again and also I began to notice ... it was really dumb ... I was giving her the money ... that she was getting all this gold jewelry. And that was the end of it. You know because I knew ... I felt bad for the children but she was still their mother and so I had to cut that whole thing right off because she was just taking advantage and it wasn't going where I thought it should go. At the time I really did want to help that family and those little girls. So what was your question?

Subject #4: Well no, I knew that story ... that's what I was thinking of ...

Subject #5: Ok and here's another example. There was a charity here in town and it's not being run by the same person now. It was the Heart Association and the woman, at that time, was in charge and she would come to me for a donation and one year it was about childhood obesity. And we donated. And then you wouldn't hear anything until the following year just before the Heart Ball and that was one that I shut off because to me it's about relationships. You don't just expect ... you don't have no contact with me all years. You know even a phone call. Like this is where the money went or something like that. And that was one that I just stopped you know having any relationship with. It takes awhile with me but once I hit a wall ... you know I'm being taken advantage of that's it.

Subject #4: Well no I think that's it's very critical to feel your money is not being wasted. For me as a business person giving is an investment. Invested in something else ... my return is what that person is going to do whether it's an institution or an individual or whatever the project.

Subject #5: Oh, you know what I want to share with you. I want to share with Dan

Subject #4: If it's not being shared wisely ... I really have problems giving to a building at (REDACTED) because they insist on paying the most ridiculous ... unions, unions, unions, and they cost 1/3 more construction than anyone else and that really bothers me. I would rather help you know if somebody with their school but this giving for a building I am very much turned off by that because they waste it as far as I ... they just don't use their money wisely. But the time when we built the swimming pool in

that area, the gym, that was unbelievable. ... so it was a fantastic investment. We go out money's worth. So giving or working it's the same thing.

Dan: Well, let me propose a question to you ... think about, not necessarily you, but ten friends that you have and I imagine you travel in a circle where you know whether those other ten friends are also generous to the charities of their choice, probably. Think about just a collection of ten of them. And imagine a scenario where there is no tax deductibility for charitable support and you're not allowed to provide recognition for charitable support. How many of those ten would stop giving.

Subject #4: Now there you've got two different things. Number one I don't think

Subject #5: I'm looking for a quote that I want to share with you

Subject #4: I don't think you give it for a tax deduction especially if it's substantial because there are tax laws ... more and more complicated ... myself I don't for the tax deduction ... my way I've got a lot accrued that it's ... the odds of me getting any tax advantage are very slim. But no recognition at all, that's hard ... now some people that give substantial gifts that are anonymous ... not too many as you well know.

Dan: I spoke to a person in another interview that said if you have faith the highest level of giving is to be sure you don't receive any recognition for your contribution. And he said that's the kind of thing that I'm going to shoot for. I want to be able to get to a point where I receive no recognition for my contribution and (Subject #5: and it's not necessary) totally selfless. And I want to do it because I think it's the right thing to do and I don't want anybody else to know about it.

Subject #5: Here's our family quote "Money can be a tool, a test or a testimony, as a tool it can help us realize our dreams as a test wealth can reveal our true character through the manner in which we spend or acquire it and it bares testimony to our core values by the role it plays in our life."

Dan: Can you email that to me.

Subject #5: I sure can.

Dan: That's really nice.

Subject #5: Let me write it down because to try to find it...I'll write it down for you Dan.

Dan: Or text it to me or whatever.

Dan: So, I'm going to go back to my question because I don't think I got a good answer to it. Think about 10 of your friends. You can even imagine ... go through them in your own mind and say ... if this person when they gave away money nobody was allowed to know about it they would stop giving or if nobody else could know about it would they stop giving ... of those 10 five of them would or zero would. They would give because it's just the right thing to do. There is no pressure, there is no reward and they feeling giving is only intrinsic.

Subject #4: You know, I don't know that I know our friends that well and their giving. I can't really answer that. Can you Subject #5?

Subject #5: You know, that's really tough because I think ... I'm just trying to think. I think we've got friends that probably wouldn't give if they were not going to be recognized.

Subject #4: Well, do you think any would give without any recognition.

Subject #5: I think so. We've done it without recognition.

Subject #4: I don't think really given without recognition.

Subject #5: Yes we have.

Subject #5: We've done stuff nobody knows Subject #4.

Subject #4: Mostly very small things.

Subject #5: It doesn't matter. We've still given

Subject #4: Well that's true

Subject #5: We are getting away from Dan's question. I think we do have friends that do give, but I think they also want the recognition. The one's that I can think of off the top of my head.

Subject #4: But I think that if somebody felt like I think that people that give to Wounded Warriors there's no recognition, I would say ... I don't think so and a lot of people give to it. I think it depends on the type of thing ... giving to the college whether the students are getting help, a building's being built ... this is a very tangible ... it's still a substance ... where in the case of Wounded Warriors ...

Subject #5: But that's a nationally ... I mean you can It's more the local recognition like with the college, with Lebanon Family Health Services ... I mean Wounded Warriors you can send \$25 a month ... you know that's different ... I think that's different.

Subject #4: I send them a fair amount of money

Subject #5: Yeah but it's still different. It's not that personal ... you are getting that mail and then you turn around and you donate.

Subject #4: But in this case I went to see the founder ... and do I occasionally give things in the mail ... more and more I try to check on the internet ...

Dan: So since we can agree that tax deductibility may have an impact for some people, can we still feel like using philanthropy for a proxy for altruism, giving something without anything in receipt ... any expectation of receipt. Is that a fair way to think about measuring altruism.

Subject #5: I think it is

Subject #4: There's no question ... I would think that giving smaller amounts ... recognition you don't expect or don't really ... it's like when you give to the Special Olympics they've got to send you something ... I don't need you to send me anything ... just use the money wisely don't send me whatever ... which indirectly is recognition. To me what they are saying ... what your threshold is ... if you give them 50 bucks ... it mean this thing has to cost something ... that ... it just seems that's not a wise ... I'm just giving because ... even if I was giving a reasonable amount and then again ... I would think that ... it's going to affect ... if you don't think you are getting a deduction ... psychologically you are going to give

a little bit less. Some people ... maybe not all people. Recognition is still you like the good feeling ...

Subject #5: It's nice

Dan: You do it because you believe in the mission. When you get recognized for it, it reinforces

Subject #5: It reinforces

Subject #4: I would almost say recognition is less important than being sure the money is being used where I expect it to be used. Indirectly recognition at times gives you that because

Dan: It gives you the reassurance

Subject #4: In theory you could say a room that is named after you ... but that isn't the part of the building that you literally built ... no you didn't Aren't you finding now that more people are giving to the endowment which is surprising to me and less for buildings?

Dan: It kind of goes back and forth. Actually when the stock market goes up people think about endowment because they know that it makes a difference. And that's where we are over the last couple of years. We've had a good ride and people can see that performance has been better. It kind of depends. But, you have both been very generous with your time. If we meet on the street and you say I've been thinking about this and this is what I really believe ... I believe that there's absolutely nothing to the idea that we have an altruistic gene or ...

Subject #5: You know it's very interesting

Subject #4: I think it is interesting because people of so different backgrounds do different things.

Dan: Right. So I guess what I'm saying is if you grew up in Africa and in Europe or Australia or the United States or Canada or Mexico or Argentina. When you were born and when you were two years old or four years old or six years old and something and you had the propensity or the ability to help and knowing that they are not going to be able to ... you are doing it because you just think it is the right thing to do ... does that happen or are ...

Subject #5: I honestly feel that I would do that.

Dan: Regardless of your upbringing

(Long story about a runaway dog, a neighbor finding the dog and returning it and wanting no reward.)

Dan: That's altruism ... so he did that because ... and he does it expecting no reward and feeling as though there is no possible future benefit to him. That's altruism and if it exists in the animal kingdom ... I guess that I am coming around to the idea that, does that tendency exist in humans and do we have a genetic disposition for it?

Subject #5: I think.

Dan: It's more than just, "The strong will survive and the weak will fall by the wayside."

Subject #4: I am going to say it's a majority.

Subject #5: But genetically it's like you have some genes and other genes you don't ... mutations or whatever.

Subject #4: But you are back to whether this is innate? If somebody is brought up in a very positive religious environment which tends to mean you and giving and kind and that ... as opposed to somebody who is born in the reverse of that, very negative very hate society ... and then again some people are brought up and some turn out very different.

Subject #5: And that's where it could be something in their genetic makeup.

Subject #4: Yeah, there could be.

Dan: It could be and I would submit and possibly we might all have a tendency towards that but nurture influences it

Subject #5: That's right...your environment. I think it's your environment ...You know that as you learn more about need and you are in an environment that is like here ... you know that people do give that that

can change ... if you already have the genetic tendency that enhances it. But it can also be a deterrent if you are in

Dan: Right so maybe we have a genetic tendency or genetic inclination but nurture influences that as much as anything else.

Subject #5: Absolutely

Subject #4: When you look at the evolution of man ... man was very much a survivor ... man was also a cannibal ... and it was totally the dominant of the strong ... first of all slavery ... that is the way it is ... we conquered you; you are now a slave ... that's it ... your life was to your master, period. Or so there wasn't a gene in that group ... I'm superior and you are inferior and your job is to serve me ... this was the culture of the age for a long period of time. But there was a whole 1,000 years ... that's the way it was It wasn't a matter of being generous, being kind ... you were born into it ...

Subject #5: I think it's a very interesting premise and it's like I said to you there is no question in my mind that I was going to be a nurse and going and volunteering at the office where my mother worked and then seeing what my father did. But it was just in me ... there was no question that's what I wanted. My father wanted me to be a teacher ... we couldn't afford to go to college at that point and I was in Rhode Island and could go through Rhode Island hospital. It was a three year program and between scholarships and everything, a three year program there cost \$500. And you lived there, you were the staff to the hospital but when we graduated we were ready. The kids today ... they are not ready.

Subject #4: The percentage of people giving is going down, isn't it?

Dan: It is.

Works Cited

- Andrews, Candice. *Good Nature Travel* <http://goodnature.natbab.com/is-animal-altruism-real/>. 5 February 2013. Web Page. 30 March 2017.
- Berns, Gregory. *How Dogs Love Us*. Seattle, WA: Lake Union Publishing, 2013. Kindle Book.
- British Psychological Research Journal. *Students With More Autistic Traits Make Fewer Altruistic Choices*. 1 September 2014. Web Page. 29 April 2017.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1871. Kindle Book.
- Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976. Book.
- Gazzaniga, Michael S. *Human, the Science Behind What Makes Us Unique*. New York: HarperCollins, 2008. Kindle Book.
- Grandin, Temple and Mark J Deesing. <http://www.grandin.com/references/cattle.during.handling.html>. Web Page. 30 April 2017.
- Harmen, Oren. *The Price of Altruism*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2010. Kindle Book.
- Jensen, K, et al. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7ae1/8a597d5f3fab0445f378874d5aef15c82444.pdf>. 17 January 2006. pdf. 30 March 2017.
- Koenig, Walter. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Walter_Koenig/publication/222451031_Reciprocal_Altruism_in_Birds_A_Critical_Review/links/56e08cdc08aec4b333d0fd3.pdf. 15 June 1987. *researchgate.net*. pdf. 29 April 2017.
- Nagel, Thomas. *The Possibility of Altruism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970. Kindle Book.
- Prince, Russ Alan and Karen Maru File. *Seven Faces of Philanthropy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994. Kindle Book.
- ScienceDaily. *"Activation Of Brain Region Predicts Altruism."*. 22 January 2007. Web Page. 30 March 2017.
- Scientifique, Centre National De La Recherche. www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2006/04/060404201741.htm. 5 April 2006. PDF. 30 March 2017.
- Thomas, Steven. <https://autismworldseyeviewsite.wordpress.com/2015/12/15/autism-empathy-altruism-what-we-dont-know/>. 15 December 20015. Web Page. 29 April 2017.

