Bridging Our Divisions

A Call for Dialogue

Transcript

“By listening to and engaging in dialogue, there is no need to compromise values.”
Announcer: You're listening to the heart of giving podcast with Art Taylor powered by BBB, give.org. Here we explore the motivations that form the basis of giving and service, we inspire generosity and celebrate the transformative effects that giving and service have on the human spirit and on community. The conversations featured on the podcast also uncover giving strategies that educate and provide tools to help listeners make impactful gifts of both their time and money. We hope you enjoy this episode.
Art: Welcome to the heart of giving podcast powered by BBB. give.org. Give.org is the nation standards based charity rating service. And you're a one-stop source for information on giving and reports on the most asked about charities. I'm Art Taylor, your host, and with me today is David Eisner. David serves as the CEO at convergence. Convergence is an organization which brings together leaders who span the divides to build trust and find consensus solutions to some of the world's most intractable policy challenges. David has the distinction of working in three different presidential Administrations. He worked for President Bush as the Senate confirmed CEO for the Corporation for National and Community Service - and that agency also oversees AmeriCorps. He also served as an executive with the America On Line and Time Warner organizations, and he was the CEO of the National Constitution Center in Philadelphia, where he was appointed by President Clinton. And he was also the Chair of Allforgood.org, which is the digital platform for President Obama's signature service initiative, Serve.gov. Welcome David.

David: Thank you, Art. It's terrific to be here.
Art: So David, what I like to do in the beginning of these podcasts is help our listeners get to know our guest by just asking a simple question. What was it about your early upbringing in your life that sort of shaped you for this life of service that you've had. David: That's a terrific question. Art, I grew up as a transplanted New Yorker. My parents moved from New York to Santa Barbara, California when I was three. And one of my earliest memories is when I was swimming in the pool in our backyard and my parents brought a school of people with emotional and intellectual disabilities to come swim in the pool. I was maybe five and I was helping some of them feel comfortable standing in the water. And I was bringing cookies to them as some of the students were getting out of the pool. I was playing host. And then I had this incredible experience where one young man was holding me so tightly as I was helping him float. And I've recalled this for a long time, this sense of how much it meant to him to be able to float in this pool and how much joy he took out of it and how my simply being there by his side mattered.
And throughout my youth and young adulthood, I found myself looking for opportunities where I could feel of use to a person in that kind of way. And that naturally led me to find many different service opportunities that really carried me into my adult life.

Art: Fascinating. What was some of the first things you did maybe as a professional that links you with service and giving?

David: You know, when I got to Washington DC after college and I had thought, of course, that I was going to be the gift to the Administration at the time. And that was not true. I ended up getting a job on Capitol Hill, which was really rough work. And although I know that intellectually, I felt like I was of service to the country, it didn't, it. It felt a lot more like throwing elbows around than it felt like service. And I joined a hotline. Young people won't even remember what hotlines were, but if this was a called fact hotline, families and children and trouble, and mostly women who were dealing with issues of domestic abuse or who were contemplating suicide would call the hotline and the trained people
answering the phones - we would try to provide resources for them in the community. And we had a whole room filled with index cards on which all of these resources were written down. And I found that the friendships that I made and the colleagues that I met coming together, all of us trying to make the lives of the callers better. Those became some of my closest colleagues in Washington. And I quickly realized that people that really spent time caring for other people or the people that I wanted to be spending my time with the way from work.
Art: Yeah. That’s a great story. We hear that so much about people who find the time and need to give back, ultimately getting something powerful in return. And clearly in your case, it was two things, I guess, this warmth that you got and knowing that you were giving something back to people, but also a group of friends and a sense of who you were as a person and what you needed to do in life. So terrific story. And you’ve had some really important roles to play in our charitable landscape and in our government landscape, as I mentioned, you worked for three different presidents. I remember meeting you though probably about, I don’t want to say 20, 19 years ago, or so maybe coming up on 20 years ago when you were connected with AOL and this new budding thing called network for good, right. How did that whole thing come about David?
David: It was really fascinating. You know, looking back, it all feels like everything makes a lot of sense and it's easier to figure out the linear progression, but at the time we were in the middle of the internet coming alive and trying to understand what that meant for society. And we went through this, those of us that America online or AOL, we went through this really challenging moment where we realized that our fondest wishes for how the internet was going to change people's lives weren't necessarily going to come true. We strongly believed that by communicating digitally and with this new media, people would have equal access to everything from doctors to teachers that we would democratize information about investing. We would be breaking down barriers that were barriers of knowledge that were preventing some people from having access to the same resources that other people had, but it became clear that this wasn't going to happen in and of itself.
David Eisner

David: You know, technology could either work to be another divide that separated the haves from the have-nots, or it could be a bridge that bridged the differences between those who had, and those who had not. And we realized that we had an important role to play in making sure that the civil society was able to use technology in order to improve people's lives and communities across the country. And when we say civil society, we met nonprofits. But what we were looking at was a world in which e-commerce was taking off more and more businesses were learning to sell things online more and more consumers were going online to purchase things. But our nonprofit infrastructure nonprofits were not keeping up. The first thing that we were focused on was trying to figure out how nonprofits could take contributions online. And so we developed this donate now button and really created NetworkforGood as an organization, a nonprofit vehicle that existed to distribute, donate now buttons for free to nonprofits around the United States
And we found that this was a really powerful model and that this enabled a lot of nonprofits that had not yet connected with the internet or with technology to be able to use the internet, to meet new donors and to receive contributions online. And I have to say, since I've left AOL and NetworkforGood, the organization has just continued to thrive and today provides amazing opportunities and services to America.

Art: Yeah. I know Bill Stratman very well, and he's done terrific work with that organization and I'll have to get him on this podcast one day to just talk about all the great things going on at NetworkforGood. You also spent some time at this newly formed thing way back when called the Corporation for National and Community Service. Yes. What was that all about? And we know now about AmeriCorps and so forth, but how did you get connected with that?
David: Well, it's so interesting when I was at America online after 9/11, I spent the time along with others in the corporate sector and especially in the technology sector, helping to do our part in one of the things that we were doing after 9/11 was supporting the administration's creation of Freedom Corps. One of the things that Freedom Corps did was it allowed legitimate nonprofits that were using the dollars to support victims of 9/11.

It helped internet users see who those nonprofits were, and it helps sort through and avoid the organizations that were trying to scam people after 9/11 to give contributions to organizations that were not legitimate nonprofits. And as a result of that, I got to know several of the people in the Bush administration who were doing this work, and they had a few needs inside the corporation for national and community service, which ran AmeriCorps, especially trying to recover a financial challenge, where they had spent a certain amount of money that Congress hadn't given them.
David: And that created all sorts of legal challenges. And it slowed down some of the important work that they were trying to do. And the white house reached out and said, would I go in to help straighten up what was happening at AmeriCorps and try to have the service or arm of the United States, live up to its promise in this really important moment. And I said, yes, I'd be delighted to go in. And my wife and I decided that I'd spend 18 months doing that work, but I have to say I absolutely fell in love when I got to AmeriCorps and met literally thousands of young Americans who were taking a year of their lives to serve who were basically putting their idealism to work, to make the country better, to solve problems. I realized this was going to be my passion and what I wanted to spend my life doing. I stayed in the, in the administration for six years. And after that, I moved from the corporate sector into the nonprofit sector, which is where I am today.

Art: Do you see young people today having the same eagerness to serve society as you did when you were at AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National Service?
David: I do see young Americans all the time. In fact, I'm proud to say that my daughter, just this week started as an AmeriCorps member in New York, working on early childhood development. Wow, fantastic. Unfortunately, part of the reason she did it is because her job working in the theater district and on Broadway disappeared with the pandemic, but she wanted to take the time to be of service. So she's now an AmeriCorps member.

Art : That's wonderful. I guess the, as they say, the Apple doesn't fall far from the tree.

David: I'll tell my... I'll tell Sam that you called her an Apple.

Art : Let her know that it was all in love and admiration. Well, you also spent some time at this thing called the National Constitution Center in my hometown, Philadelphia. What was your role there and tell me about the Constitution Center. Is it still around, what's it doing?
David: I was CEO of the national constitution center and what a privilege. It's an amazing, it's an amazing institution that sits at the intersection of American history and America's future. This is really our through line that allows us to understand the aspirations around which we were formed and to continue the path of trying and struggling and fighting to live up to those aspirations. And it's, by the way, also a gorgeous, gorgeous place with a beautiful theater, amazing interactive exhibits. And whether you're a student or an older person going there, it can't help, but be educational and inspiring.

Art: Yeah. And then you did some work with all for good.org, which is related to serve.gov, President Obama's signature initiative. What does that mean?
David: So all for good.org was a, or is a, an open source database that brings all of the service opportunities from so many terrific organizations from idealists to United way to volunteer match. There’re so many terrific organizations that are connecting Americans that want to serve with organizations that need their service. And all for good was a platform that brought all of those data feeds into one place. It's now being promoted by Points of Light. And it was used by the Obama white house to populate serve.gov so that the President, when he would ask people to serve, could point them to serve.gov where people would be able to see all of the opportunities that were coming through all of these wonderful matching organizations.

Art: Terrific. Well, now you're at Convergence. And, what a link between jobs, when you think about the national constitution center and what it stands for, the ideals that you just mentioned, and the work that we try to do at Convergence. First, I'd ask you to just tell our listeners a little bit about Convergence what's its objective, what's its mission. What's it trying to do?
David: Art convergence, very simply believes that we can solve our toughest issues as a society if we're able to be in trusting dialogue with each other. And we look around now and it's pretty evident that having trusting dialogue with people we disagree with is actually really difficult, but Convergence has done this amazing thing that I can't take credit for. My predecessor and the founder of Convergence is Rob Fersh. And he came up with this methodology that allows us to identify an issue that is stuck because of deep political or ideological or identity-based or sectoral differences, and allows us to bring together leaders who have deep differences of opinion who often aren't even able to speak with each other because they see each other as enemies sometimes instead of as just opponents and over a period of time, sometimes as long as a year or a year and a half, build a dialogue that succeeds in creating trust and helping find common ground and ultimately allowing the participants to find innovative, practical consensus solutions to address issues.
David: As a couple of examples, one dialogue that's happening now is related to economic recovery and America's workers, working to bring opportunities for displaced workers, as a result of the pandemic, and find pathways for them to have fulfilling jobs that sustain them and their families. And another example would be a convergence dialogue that we had on reforming the Federal budget process, where we brought people together from different parties, different perspectives, different economic outlooks, and they likewise were able to build trust, find common ground and come up with consensus recommendations that actually could be used in Congress and have been moved forward by a select committee in Congress.

Art: Two great examples. I want to just ask you to go back to that first one in particular, because it would seem that it's an issue around which most people would agree. It's a great thing if we can get people back to work, what are some of the, I guess, divergent positions that people have relative to that, that your people had to come together to figure out?
David: Well, in that case, it would be mostly sectorial differences. So imagine the challenge of a large say fast food company, trying to identify the right way to be supporting their workers at the same time that they're having the conversation that would include worker unions, or that would include representatives of disadvantaged communities. And you'd immediately get to questions around fairness of salary, of what kinds of benefits are being offered, what is the appropriate role of a company in providing support to an employee. These are interests that often are struggling against each other and are wrestling for, for their perspective to prevail, but in a situation like we're currently in where there's such a challenging crisis for dislocated workers, these leaders were willing to come together recognizing that they don't see things the same way, but trying with open hearts to find opportunities to agree so that they could, they could be creating pathways for workers and their families to find stability.

Art: Well, I can certainly see where the tension is in, in that instance. How do you make this happen? Is there something special that you do or that we do at Convergence that makes it all possible, then these results about?
David: Well, we, we talk about our methodology and we have a really deep one and we speak about a secret sauce. But the true secret is that regardless of the perspective that you bring or the sector that you represent, or the political party that you're affiliated with, people like to connect with each other and they want to feel understood and they want to feel valued. And when we bring people together and focus on their common humanity, their individual stories help each, I was going to say each side, but actually they're one of the things we've learned is that those sides are not the right way. There's more of a continuation. Everybody has different experiences. And when you help people understand each other, from the perspective of what their life experiences are, what perspectives they bring, all of a sudden it doesn't make people disagree any less. It's simply enables them to have a meaningful dialogue when they're able to hear and understand each other. And when people feel understood and they feel that the other person actually is listening and is able to acknowledge their story that opens the gateway to opportunities to then find common ground and then to work together to innovate solutions.
Art: David, we had a pretty, I would say shocking event take place at our nation's Capitol a few weeks ago. And I think a lot of people would say that the work of Convergence is probably more needed now than any time since maybe the civil war. Yet it's probably also the most difficult time for an organization like Convergence to succeed. Do you see that those to be truths? Or how would you address me on those two thoughts?

David: Art I would completely agree that, first of all, we haven't had a need for Americans to come together as urgently or with the stakes as high, since the Civil War at the same time, it has never been more challenging or at risk we're in a position now where I actually hear every day people argue why it doesn't make sense to be coming together, trying to overcome our differences, trying to have dialogue. Sometimes people are saying that that doesn't make sense because in order to reach out to the other side, we have to compromise our values. Sometimes we hear that if we reach out to the other side, it means that we're having to give up on a position, or it means that the social justice agenda will be slowed down.
If we have to reach out and include people who may disagree with us. We also, hear the argument that coming together, can't be done, that it's not going to be effective.

David: And finally, and most distressingly, I see the idea of coming together and having dialogue often just sort of dismissed as fatuous, as kumbaya, as being nice. And the fact is that it's not just nice, it's absolutely necessary. And the fact is also that by listening to and engaging in dialogue with another person, there is no need to compromise values or to give up on an important agenda or to change your mind, or to signal that you agree with the other person. All it requires is the ability to listen and to understand, and to bring Goodwill. And in recognizing that somebody can disagree with you very, very passionately, even disagree to the extent that you can't possibly fathom where they're coming from and yet we can make the choice that we're going to listen and try to understand each other. And if we don't do that, it's very hard to see how we can escape the cycle of violence.
Art: My, my, my. Well, you, you, you mentioned that word violence, and I would suggest to you that it's likely or possible I'll say possible that unless we do find a way to communicate and come together, that there will be more violence. And yet for both of you and I am sure many others, that would be the worst possible outcome for our Nation and for people everywhere at this time. So what do we do, David? How do we deal with this divide that we have? How do we get people to the table? How do we even know who the right people are? So to speak, to come together and begin having these kinds of conversations in a productive and meaningful way.

David: One of the really interesting things that's happened are in the last five years that I was completely unaware of until recently, is that we've gone from having maybe a couple dozen organizations in the United States five years ago, who had somewhere in their mission, that they were about bringing Americans together across their divides to now having well into over 350 such organizations. And they operate in so many different ways. Convergence focuses on leaders with a goal of identifying policy level solutions.
Other organizations operate at a local level, and they bring people together to build greater social cohesion and to allow people to co-exist as neighbors.

Some organizations bring people together to add a local level, to focus on issues where they find that neighbors who think because of what politicians tell them that they're miles apart on, for example, issues around immigration or issues around education are able to find that actually that's not so true.

David: They agree with each other on 80% of the issues that they care about. And my sense is that we shouldn't be trying to figure out who needs to come together. We need to really normalize the process where it's just part of, of how we work as a society, whether we're students, whether we're professionals and in businesses, whether we're in the nonprofit space, or if we do policy coming together to work together, to problem, solve together, to understand each other, that's all of our jobs. And it's actually a joy to do because being in community and being connected with other people is one of the great parts of being human.
Art: Well, I want to ask you two questions about that. First, what do you think might be the role for the nonprofit sector to play in normalizing that behavior? And secondly, what are some of the biggest challenges in front of us to create this normalized process? What are some of the barriers that we're dealing with right now?

David: Well, I think that the nonprofit sector has an opportunity to play a very powerful leadership role. There is very little trust in society for our democratic institutions. As I think everybody knows whether it's Congress or our universities, our politicians, there's huge amounts of distrust and the nonprofit sector offers opportunities for providing guidance and providing a voice that actually says we have a pathway forward, and it's a pathway forward of acting of coming together of acting together. The nonprofit sector is actually really good at that when they attend to it. There are some challenges with that, frankly, right now, because within the nonprofit sector, I think there's a lot of ambivalence around.
Does it make sense for Americans to come together at a time when there are social justice issues. For example, on the agenda. My hope would be that the nonprofit sector would coalesce and supporting the idea that Americans can come together regardless of ideology, regardless of party.

David: and that listening to and understanding each other as people and not allowing the fact that we are opponents in some ways to turn us into enemies. I would think that should be one of the great causes of the nonprofit sector and of nonprofit leaders. Regarding the question of what's standing in the way there are barriers having to do with politics. We know that whether it's the way that we vote, the way that districts are created, some of the ways that our parties operate, some of the ways that money works, all tends to be forcing our political dialogue toward the extremes. And the further we see that dialogue moving to the extremes, the more we find that our citizens become polarized, basically almost at the request of our politicians who are asking them for their support and that polarization has become toxic.
And it's a toxic polarization that we need to address, not just by coming together as I've been talking about, but also by focusing intentionally on the kind of democracy that we want.

Art: I noticed, David, that when it comes to polarization, it seems that the polls are gaining strength, meaning that in our country, we've always had a fairly robust middle that we would all eventually find our way to and ultimately get things done. But increasingly it seems that the polls are getting more attention than the middle. Is there anything we can do about that and what does it mean if, if we can't?

David: It's a really good question. I think that there's two possibilities. One possibility is that we can return a little bit more attention to the center, which is actually where most Americans remain. Even as the polls continue to get louder, more organized and more effective. We really need our center to become less demoralized and disheartened because it's the center that is where the hope is. I also think that there's the possibility that we need to focus on understanding that just because
One of the things that I was most interested in watching last year was the success of the house select committee on modernization of Congress. And that was a committee that came up with many different recommendations. Many of them were adopted by Congress, about 16 of their recommendations were about bipartisan collaboration.

David: And it was fascinating to me that that committee was not made up only of centrists in Congress that included both among the Democrats and among the participants who were closer to what you would call the, a harder side of their parties, the hard right, or the, or the hard left. And yet they were part of this very powerful bipartisan collaboration and they shared and voted for recommendations about bi-partisan collaboration. And so I think we need to be careful not to assume that because somebody is not in the center, that that means that they’re not open to, to collaboration.
Art: Very well said. It makes me think also of this notion of activists. And to me, it conjures, people who are working somewhat outside of institutions who do tend to get a fair amount of attention because they're not necessarily tied to any institutions, but then they're also institutions made up of people who do have rules and objectives and therefore limitations and may move slower in getting things done. How do these two begin to play together more?

I mean, I gather that activists want to see things happen today, but then they're institutions that have been working maybe for generations to try to make change and make sustainable change. And so they get frustrated with the activist to some extent, and I think about even civil rights organizations, and we're certainly in the middle of a great conversation and debate about the importance of diversity, equity and inclusion in the nation. And you have institutions of all sorts now trying to figure out, you know, what is our path forward in this area? How do we create a more just society over time? And yet you have activists who are expecting change right away. How do we make those, two play together better? Is there a way?
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David: I'm not sure Art. It's a really good question. I sometimes think that there are certain tensions that actually create productive dynamics. And my sense is that this tension that exists in so many ways in our society between the folks that live in the future and are intent on bringing people to their vision of the future and the folks that have sort of consolidated the status quo to be as helpful and efficient as they can make it. There's always going to be deep tension between the two. And frankly we need both. We can't as a society simply march along to each visionary that calls us. And we also can't just stay firmly planted in the status quo without regard for the arc of our intellectual and moral and social growth. So my sense is that the tension between those is really productive. The question is how to return to where we can maximize that tension.

And when you have the status quo organizations calling the visionaries extremists or branding them with political brands or labeling them otherwise, or when the visionaries are demeaning, the larger, more
established institutions, you create an environment where actually society doesn't get to benefit from the really remarkable, potentially productive tension.

And instead, they're sort of forced to pick hard choices and it's those choices that get people into a more polarized space.

Art: So David, you have a daughter who is obviously getting her career started. And I know as a parent myself, one of the things I think about a lot is what world are we leaving for them to take over and create a new generation? And I would just like to get your sense of how you see things five, seven, 10 years from now, should we be optimistic, or should we be concerned or is that a false choice?
David: All right. That's a great question. And, and I personally, right now, I'm very concerned. I feel like we are at a terrible crossroads. We've begun to see beginnings of violence. We've begun to see that this tension that's coming from the toxic polarization is breaking things, making relationships unsustainable. We're starting to hear questions about what does 20 years look like? Will we see States succeeding? Are we looking at another form of a 21st century civil war? And my sense is that we should be able to be optimistic. We have the capacity to get past this. We just need to summon the will.

And what makes me worried is that we have not yet summoned the will. And what makes me optimistic is that we have a capacity and we've focused in on the challenge. And this discussion is right now, the most important discussion happening in the United States. And it's getting the attention it deserves. We're having a meaningful, very public dialogue about whether Americans are going to put the energy into understanding and learning about each other. And we're debating in a very big and public way, what our path forward is going to be.
I think that's enormously powerful. It gives me optimism, but I have to say, I'm also very fearful about this moment.

Art: Well, David, great thought there, but let me just ask you as we conclude this interview, if we got this dialogue, right, what are we looking at in 12 months?

David: That's a great question. Art. I think that if we have this right within 12 months, we're going to see actual engagement at the local state and national level where people are engaging in meaningful discussions about the issues of our time with people that we never agreed with that are not in our bubble. This word bubble - that we're all living in communities and engaging with people that generally tend to think like we do, we will all be finding ways to break through that. And the surprises and the delights that we will discover as nation and getting to meet people so different from us will be a part of the national dialogue a year from now if we'll begin to get this conversation right.
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Art: Well from your mouth to all of our ears. David, I want to thank you for joining me on the heart of giving podcast. I very rarely ask a person what they think will happen in a year because my futurist friends always tell me it's a lot easier to know what's going to happen in five years than it is to know what's going to happen in a year, given how messy things can be. And certainly, things are messy right now, but you've given us a bold sort of a statement that challenges us, I believe, to make it so, and for the sake of our nation and for the sake of the world, really, I believe we need to make it so.

Art: So again, thank you for joining us on a Heart of Giving Podcast. This is Art Taylor and hope you'll listen to our next episode. You can find us on all major podcast platforms.
Announcer: You've just listened to the Heart of Giving Podcast, with Art Taylor. Be sure to tune in next time for a brand-new episode. To listen to our other interviews, visit heartgiving.podbean.com. Subscribe to our show on major podcast platforms. Send your comments and ideas to Nona@thusmarket.com. The thoughts opinions expressed on this podcast are the views and opinions of the guests, not those of the BBB Wise Giving Alliance or program affiliates. This podcast is for information and educational purposes only and is copyrighted with all rights reserved. This podcast is protected by Podbeans, terms of service.
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BBB Wise Giving Alliance (BBB’s Give.org) is a standards-based charity evaluator that seeks to verify the trustworthiness of publicly-soliciting charities by completing rigorous evaluations based on 20 BBB Standards for Charity Accountability.

**BBB Standards for Charity Accountability** address four areas of charity accountability: governance, results reporting, finances, and truthful transparent communications.

There is no charge to charities for the accountability assessment and the resulting reports are freely accessible on Give.org.

BBB Wise Giving Alliance along with its predecessor organizations have been reporting on charities for more than 100 years.
In addition to charity reports, BBB Wise Giving Alliance produces:

**Publications**

- Wise Giving Guide magazine three times a year,
- a weekly Wise Giving Wednesday blog,
- an annual Give.org Donor Trust Survey

**BBB Accredited Charities**

Charities that are found to meet all 20 BBB Charity Standards are called BBB Accredited Charities.

**BBB Accredited Charity Seal**

BBB Accredited Charities have the **option** of signing a license and paying a sliding scale fee for the use of a BBB Accredited Charity Seal.
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