

executive jobs that mirror my experience. (Those wanting competent government needn't worry. I have no current plans to enter the public arena.)

It annoys me how many people presenting themselves as candidates for high office have an interest in running for any position they can get elected to, with no thought of what their skills are, or whether they'd be better at administration or strategic thought. When considering candidates for an executive job, we shouldn't think that serving in a legislative position prepares that person for the totally different responsibilities of the other. Or vice versa. In the real (commercial) world, where performance is the only thing that counts, these people would never be considered for promotion to positions requiring totally different talents. Only in government does anyone have the hubris to argue that serving in a lesser office and doing one thing poorly prepares you for higher responsibilities doing another.

That doesn't mean I'm not involved in elective public service. Quite the contrary. As a wealthy Democrat who has given consistently to my party, I am called repeatedly by every Democratic candidate, from those running for dog catcher on up. All want my "insightful views," all want "to tap my vast array of experiences," all feel I've got a "great deal to contribute"-and oh, by the way, all will gladly accept a significant financial contribution to their campaign fund. (And don't worry about any mandated campaign spending limits. With typical political hypocrisy of telling the voters they seek campaign reform while not cutting themselves off from the mother's milk of contributors, the politicians looking for donations can always find a vehicle that permits the transfer of your money to some entity that gets them elected.)

Do I give? Of course. Democracy only works if we support it. The alternatives are untenable, and I certainly want to leave a free, healthy country for my kids. I send checks to individual candidates I believe in. I send checks to candidates running under my party's banner, even sometimes when I don't really believe they are the best on the ballot. And I send checks to most (but not all) of the candidates my friends ask me to help.

Some find these concepts of party loyalty and "You scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" dishonest and distasteful. Why should you give to someone you think is second-rate? Why contribute to someone who's running against a candidate you're already supporting? They're wrong! Party allegiance and who's asking are both as important as the individual who's running. Having someone (even if the individual candidate's not the best) who will help your side win a majority enables the laws you support to be enacted. Helping a friend get someone elected whom you're not thrilled with may be a small price to pay when that friend will reciprocate and support your urgent favorite.

If we ask others for help, how can we not respond when they call in turn? The same is true in philanthropic fund-raising. We've got to support one another's causes. I find it infuriating when my former wife asks our old friends for help with her fund-raising and they ignore her. How dare they, considering all those years both she and I together supported their charities and political candidates? People need to understand that life, like it or not, has to be quid pro quo.

* * *

In addition to giving me a sense of public service, my family taught me about private philanthropy

when I was very young. Every year, my father received a publication listing contributors to his favorite charity. During dinner, he would look down each page of the book for familiar names and remark on the size gift made by people he knew, or the complete absence of other names from the list.

What his acquaintances gave certainly influenced my father in deciding on contributions for the following year. Peer pressure: Its impact in the philanthropic world is hard to overstate. People are very conscious of their place in any pecking order. Contributor lists, grouped by amount donated, very often get donors to stretch to the next highest level. When soliciting for donations, always ask for more than you think you'll receive. You may be wrong and get it. The potential contributors will be flattered that you thought they could give that much. And they certainly will give more than they previously planned, when confronted with the bigger target. We are all followers. I gave one large gift to Harvard-and a few months later, someone else donated three times that amount for a similar purpose, citing my gift as the impetus for their generosity.

When asked for a major contribution, if I'm interested in the cause, my first question to the solicitor is, "What did the organization's board members and you personally give?" If you and they don't support the cause, maybe it doesn't deserve my help. Not everyone can give large amounts, but a gift significant to the trustees' and requester's personal circumstances is a prerequisite to getting me interested. Conversely, when I ask others for donations, I always start the conversation by describing my company's support. Those I'm asking have a right to know, and I'm proud of what we do.

Asking other folks for money is difficult and distasteful. But unpleasant as it is, you have two choices: Don't ask and don't help as much as you can, or ask and maximize assistance to your favorite causes. Do you care enough to swallow your pride, summon up your courage, commit your resources, and take the time to pick up the phone? Those who do follow through don't necessarily find it easier than those who can't bear to make the call-they just care more about helping.

Many people of average means give generously, but it is from the rich, in fact, that philanthropic organizations get a disproportionate percentage of their funding. Those decrying the disparity between the haves and have-nots, and those in government desirous of redistributing wealth, should take note. The Carnegie, Mellon, Rockefeller, and Duke fortunes were largely given back to society by their makers and heirs, creating institutions that have had much more lasting impact than the politicians would ever have delivered by taking that same money through income and inheritance taxes and spending it on "public works." The original fortune builder, and one or two of their successor generations, may have lived well, but unlike their envious critics, most contributed more than they took. The world (and America) is much better off because of them.

Are today's wealthy as generous? The Forbes 400 list (better to be on it than not) has both stupid misers and brilliant generous benefactors scattered throughout its numbers. So does any catalog of Americans. In 1989, there were 1.3 million American millionaires; today, there are probably three times that number. I'd rather bring my kids up here in the United States than anywhere else; America really is the land of opportunity and of helping each other privately. Whether through IPOs, promotions, or new substantive businesses, whether as a result of investing in stocks, commodities, or real estate, the amount of value we've created in our country is truly extraordinary, and the

willingness to share success is unique. Think other places are fairer, more egalitarian, more generous, offering a better life to average persons (particularly for those traditionally discriminated against)? Get serious. When people vote with their feet, they always come in this direction.

And Americans give wealth away in record amounts to help others. Every philanthropic organization I know has record receipts. The number of such institutions is also skyrocketing. We may have more than others-but we give more help to those who have less. Where else are there as many privately funded universities, museums, symphonies, hospitals, churches, and so on?

* * *

Consider any very lucky individual here in the United States. Once they make a fortune, the real question is, what's it for? That sounds ridiculous to the average "working stiff " daydreaming about the lottery, but after you've accumulated a certain amount of wealth, you've got a serious problem. You can only eat so many meals, have so much domestic help, travel to so many places, and live in so many rooms. You can only sleep in one bed at a time.

The reality of great wealth is that you can't spend it and you can't take it with you. All you can do is give it to other individuals (with large gift or inheritance taxes to pay), or give it to philanthropic organizations (usually with large income tax credits to receive). The issues left to your discretion are only to whom, how much, and when to give.

So, after you've gotten used to living like a king, what do you do? First, forget worrying over taxes. More people do more stupid things trying to avoid the inevitable than they can count. Our country gave you the opportunity-now pay back your share and get on with it. Second, don't spoil your family. After you've worked for a lifetime, your legacy shouldn't be strife, anguish, and heartbreak, particularly for those you love. Leave them enough to have a crutch in hard times, a boost in good ones, and fond remembrances for the rest of their lives. Third, be selfish! Buy yourself enormous pleasure. Give most of your wealth to charity!

How much should you carve out first for your loved ones? Do you really want to eliminate the need for them to work as hard as you did? Do you really want your children to be like those who thought themselves your betters while you struggled? Letting them have too much money is really a lot worse than letting them have too little. I've watched family after family destroyed by excessive distributions to descendants, and by family patriarchs' and matriarchs' attempts to be able to control others' behavior from the grave. With wealth comes power. With power comes the ability to damage. Gifts and inheritances influence those you love most. Inheriting too much money at one time destroys initiative, distorts reality, and breeds arrogance. When the money runs out-as it always does-those left bereft of cash can't cope. And having money with "strings attached" often creates unintended and perverse distortions in behavior. No one can visualize the future and what will be needed.

If you want to help those you love in an intelligent fashion, pass on some of your money to them while you're alive and can still teach your values and actually see the money's effect. After you're gone, have your bequests parceled out in small amounts so your heirs' lifestyles are improved gradually, at different stages of their growth, perhaps even giving them a second chance following a

few mistakes.

And treat all your heirs the same. Time after time, families are ripped apart by unequal bequests to siblings. There's always an excuse for excess and favoritism (different skills, maturity levels, ages, sexes, interests, etc.). Better to burn your cash. Children have no God-given right to an inheritance (although inheritance laws often do guarantee something to spouses), and if a fortune pits sister against brother, or causes self-destructive behavior, having given your hard-earned wealth to them turns out to have been the worst thing you could have done.

As to giving to grandchildren, few realize just how far removed two generations really are from each other. To memorialize one's name or minimize taxes, people in their wills include relatives who are little more than strangers and who will never remember their benefactors anyway. How stupid! Many of the recipients even eventually change their names to better fit the new society their inheritance buys. So much for immortality.

My solution is to create trusts for my children and a foundation for philanthropy. The trusts will ensure my offspring a helping hand to start their own lives, and a crutch should they run into problems. They'll have to work to support themselves and their families, but I'll be providing the best education and a grubstake to start them off. Later in life, should they need assistance, I, my executors, or the trusts' administrators will always be there to help in an emergency.

The real financial legacy I'm leaving my kids is much more powerful. They will be the key trustees of our family's foundation and, as such, will possess great influence. For the rest of their lives, along with their mother and a handful of my closest friends, they'll distribute large grants to worthy institutions and creative individuals needing support. In their hands will be the ability to channel cultural development, further scientific and medical research, shape the political process, mold our youth, and support their religious organizations.

Every so often, they'll get together and approve grants, set investment policy, and administer the foundation. Both sisters will have to work together and with their mother, something that will keep the family from splintering. Perhaps the conversation will go, "What would Daddy have done?" or "Daddy would have gotten a kick out of such and such." They might choose to sustain some charity I supported when I was alive. But within a few broad guidelines I've set in creating the foundation, they'll spend their time picking the worthy causes they think best. (An occasional remembrance of their father wouldn't be so bad either.)

And they'll work on the foundation's board with my friends, to whom I'm not bequeathing any money. Most have done well in their own careers and don't need it; all would be embarrassed to accept it. They are already philanthropically minded (if they weren't, they probably wouldn't be my friends) and will know how to counsel my daughters in selecting among hundreds of worthy requests. And they'll get the satisfaction and recognition they deserve, along with a periodic reminder of our friendship.

*

*

*

You and I today (and my foundation later) can pick from an endless list of philanthropic causes to

support. We can further our religious beliefs; educate our youth; help prevent early death, blindness, and misery around the world. We can participate in finding a cure for diseases that might later strike our descendants; enhance and enrich our culture by supporting artists, musicians, and museums; beautify our environment; or give opportunity to those needing a break.

In every case, our influence and memory will continue long after our physical presence is removed. And if we make the gifts (or at least the commitments) when we're still around, we can get the greatest satisfaction available for cash today, watching the process of helping others unfold. Having our names on a plaque, on a scholarship, on a research grant, or on a list of generous donors who make possible the furtherance of a philanthropic organization's goals rewards us as long as we live. It puts everyone else-our entire community, our country, and even the whole world-in our debt. What greater satisfaction could we possibly get than watching ourselves do great things for humanity? Not only great things, but things we, not someone else, think should be done.

Both Johns Hopkins University and Yale University had benefactors who experienced this firsthand. Zanvyl Krieger, a Baltimore lawyer with a great feeling for humanity, had planned to leave the magnificent sum of \$50 million to Hopkins after his death. Then, in 1992, he asked himself, on second thought, "Why wait?" Why let another generation go without an education? Why let some cure for a disease be discovered after more have died? So he gave the money then, rather than leave it in his will. Were the adulation, recognition, respect, and pleasure he's been receiving over the past few years worth it? He'd say it was the smartest thing he ever did. "Should have done it even earlier."

Lee Bass had a different experience, a less pleasant one, but another reason to make gifts when you are alive rather than as a bequest. He gave \$20 million to Yale for a particular program. For a variety of reasons, they could never get it going. So he took his money back (and will, no doubt, give it away to some other equally worthwhile cause, but one where his wishes are satisfied). Had he done it by bequest, he'd have had no second chance.

Even if you don't have great wealth, you can make a difference. Small gifts add up and do great things collectively. Also, from a less altruistic point of view, one's success in business and society is often influenced by the contacts, respect, and satisfaction one's largesse generates. Giving something away often leads to receiving back much more later. Perhaps tax avoidance, deciding how much to leave the kids, and similar high-income problems aren't your concerns. Maybe they will be later. But you can still become part of the future with your generosity, and remain a positive catalyst in others' lives long after your own is concluded.

Private philanthropy is really an American tradition-one of our unique contributions to humanity, and one of the reasons for our country's great success. It is here in the United States that basic research is funded by those willing to expand the realm of human knowledge without a commercial return. It is here that the diversity of charitable programs initiated without governmental central planning produces the unexpected breakthroughs. It is here that funding for the unusual, the unlikely, the "cutting edge," is available so that there's something for everyone.

America's generosity is like that of no other place in the world. For all the cynics' carping, helping others is valued in the United States as much as success in the arts, in the home, or in commerce.

From the great "robber barons" before World War I to today's philanthropic giants (Annenberg, Bass, Getty, Hunt, Huntsman, Lauder, Packard, Tisch, and so on), those who achieve much for themselves are generally those who give the rest of us the most.

Philanthropy dominates the social lives of the wealthy in big U.S. cities. Rather than purely selfish entertainment, much of the evening get-together functions (dinners, dances, and boat trips) these people attend are fund-raising events. Even sporting activities are used to benefit worthwhile causes rather than just be selfish pleasures. The style section of our city newspapers chronicles which celebrities attend which philanthropic dinners each night; the most celebrated are honorees there, partially for their past achievements, but also for their current fund-raising abilities. Executives and socialites solicit each other for their favorite organizations. They attend events where they bestow small tokens of appreciation on one another after suitably flattering speeches. Fun evenings for fine causes.

Unfortunately, philanthropic circles are a more limited group in every city than they should be. The same names are on the donor lists each time. Where are the others? Where are the athletes who benefited from scholarships and then made great fortunes without helping their alma maters? Or the entertainment community that, with a few notable exceptions, responds only to the media crisis of the moment in the environment, social welfare, and health fields? With a donated evening of their time, they could help so many on an ongoing basis. Athletes and entertainers make great livings off the public. They owe something back. There are too few Bill Cosbys, Paul Newmans, Larry Johnsons, and Andrea Jaegers who do great things for others. We must get others involved. There's so much still to do, so many we could help.

I've always respected those who try to change the world for the better rather than just complain about it. Some devote their time, some their money. Some focus on philanthropy, some on government. Take the politically active millionaires like Steve Forbes, for example. While many are at the opposite end of the political spectrum from me, I greatly admire those who put their own money, time, and reputations where their hearts and mouths are. Against all advice, Steve has spent a portion of his to run for office, subjecting himself and his family to the scrutiny of the voters through the press, running the physical risks of being in the public eye, and trying to help with no motive other than to change the world (presumably he doesn't need the political job for income). That takes guts and generosity and dedication. We need more like him: people who don't just complain, people who do something about it!

The same in philanthropy. In New York, those like Peter Grauer, Henry Kravis, Morris Offit, Jack and Lewis Rudin, Dan Tully, and Dave Komansky, who do so much for local philanthropic causes, donating their money, getting others to give, contributing their wisdom, doing the work (all while devoting themselves to their families and running their own businesses). In every other American city, there's a similar list. Those of us who don't participate are lazy and selfish by comparison-and shortsighted. We're depriving ourselves of the greatest pleasure life offers, the chance to make a better world.

*

*

*

Today, much philanthropy is corporate. Helping others is good for business. Companies give to

improve their community, change the economic environment, influence public opinion, reciprocate favors, accommodate clients, curry political favors, and gain access. They donate money to charities and cultural organizations directly, or by matching employees' gifts. Businesses give merchandise to groups that redistribute it to the needy. They contribute secondhand equipment for charities to use. They lend their people or encourage their employees to donate their own time.

I'm on the board of directors of the Central Park Conservancy. CPC raises private funds to renovate and maintain the wonderful famous green space two blocks from our New York office and close to the homes of hundreds of our employees. The city doesn't have the resources to maintain the park, but our company's ability to attract good people depends on maintaining a positive and inviting environment. Not only do I use it, but Central Park is where many of our other employees exercise, relax, and congregate. Bloomberg (along with the most generous Dick Gilder, who donated \$17 million toward the park's restoration) donates moneys and hosts fund-raising events for CPC. Because CPC renovates the park, the city's better off, we get better workers, and our company prospers. All companies should do the same. We should support similar local causes in every city where we have a branch. It's good for business because it's good for people.

Good business is also providing summer jobs to students. Bloomberg employs close to two hundred summer interns each year. They all get paid the same amount, ten dollars an hour-a lot for them, and, in all fairness, not a lot for us. We try hard to make their experience for the few months they work with us as meaningful as possible. Young people get to see what our company and the business world are like. In a few years, we'll be in competition with other firms for these same kids or their friends. Hopefully, based on their familiarity with Bloomberg, they'll choose us.

We give some of these summer job openings to philanthropic organizations to auction off as a fund-raiser ("What am I bid for an internship at Bloomberg for your child?"). We hire the sons and daughters of employees, customers, and suppliers for a few months. We do them a favor that is repaid in loyalty or enhanced relationships with our company. And many of our summer jobs go to kids from less wealthy families where the parents have no "contacts" to exploit. With these, we expand our identification and awareness in communities where we normally wouldn't attract full-time applicants. The kids spread the good word that helps us later in recruiting. And we've had a chance to identify students we want for permanent employment after they graduate.

One of our difficulties in getting the most productive workforce is attracting the broad spectrum of candidates we need across gender, religious, and racial lines. Having a diverse workforce is required by law in the United States. Having a diverse workforce is also required by capitalism in the marketplace. It increases the likelihood that the next great idea will be born here, not at some other company.

Getting the best and brightest of each group to apply for jobs at Bloomberg sometimes is a challenge. Often, they don't know who we are or what we do, don't think they could get the job with us, or don't even consider business as a career. So we have our own customized, self-serving affirmative-action recruitment program. We advertise in newspapers and magazines likely to be read by our target groups. We interview at the schools they attend. We go to trade and job fairs where they network.

Some of our target groups are in great demand by our competitors as well. We've got to find a reason for them to choose us. To attract them, we lease our terminals to college libraries for student use at half price. (We used to charge nothing, until we had over one thousand free terminals at schools. Now, by charging a little, we can help more schools and still not create a great burden on any one of them or on us.) The kids use our product for research, and when we come to interview, they are more likely to be interested in signing up to see our representative. We even have a program in which we provide free terminals at forty-one schools participating in the United Negro College Fund. Those schools tend to be small, have minuscule budgets, and lack a group of wealthy alumni to defray even our reduced college-rate charges. Their students generally haven't had exposure to commerce, to Bloomberg, or to the functions we perform. Nor do most companies stop by these schools' placement offices. Nevertheless, the next geniuses may be matriculated there-and we want them!

We support a number of other local, cultural, and educational organizations for similar reasons. Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts and The Jewish Museum, on both of whose boards I serve, enrich our city. Another organization, Prep for Prep, sends the brightest minority kids to private schools they could not otherwise afford to attend. It's a great cause helping our society. Along with New York philanthropists Leon Black, Marty Lipton, and John Vogelstein, we get a chance to change the lives of so many deserving kids. Letting them in on the American dream is one of the most satisfying things I can do-and one of the best for our company. Once again, I give my time on their boards, and donate my own and the company's funds to further their objectives. We get paid back by having a better society to live in, better employees, and great satisfaction. (My participation on the U.S. Ski Team Educational Foundation Board is strictly for personal reasons. It's a kick, given how much I like to ski. Philanthropy can be fun, too.)

*

*

*

My greatest love, however, is helping educational organizations. My work with the Academy of Finance helps prepare high school students across the country to thrive in the commercial world after graduation. I give money and serve on the board of my daughters' prep school. It's a great school and tuition never covers the real costs, particularly for scholarship students whose parents can't pay the full charge. I'm also on the board of the Institute for Advanced Study, at Princeton, New Jersey, a think tank for postdoctoral students working on the more theoretical problems in the social and natural sciences. Who knows what great advances will come from its members? (Albert Einstein was the Institute's first faculty member.)

My primary activity, apart from my family and the company, though, is at The Johns Hopkins University. I serve as chairman of its board of trustees (attempting to follow Morris Offit, who singlehandedly changed the history of this great institution), an activity that takes me to its Baltimore headquarters, on average, one day a week. It is hard to imagine anything else I could do that would be as challenging, as rewarding, and as much fun.

Hopkins has three primary missions: educating our young people, those who will lead us in the future; researching to discover, invent, and create that which will shape our lives and prevent, eradicate, and cure diseases and infirmities that cause such misery around the world; and lastly, helping the military defend the liberties that we so often take for granted in America.

Johns Hopkins helps the places where it has campuses: Maryland; Washington, DC; China; and Italy. More than that, Hopkins helps the world; education, knowledge, and culture go worldwide. So when I donate my money (Johns Hopkins is the primary beneficiary of my philanthropic gifts), when I donate my time, when I give the little insight I have, I make a global contribution to society. When the next Johns Hopkins researcher, diplomat, or writer wins a Nobel Prize, I'll share in it in spirit. He or she couldn't have done it without my participation. It'll be my prize, too. Just as much, it will also be the prize of every one of the hundreds of thousands of donors of cash and time to the various Johns Hopkins institutions.

As a citizen of the world (and a lucky one at that), I have a responsibility to improve other lives. I do it with my money, expertise, and time (wealth, wisdom, and work-the three contributions one can make). And I have tried to do it in the way I think does the most good. Years ago, in honor of my mother's seventy-fifth birthday, I endowed a professorship in the study of art history at Hopkins. It's something she's interested in and the school needed. To this day, she gets great pleasure knowing the Charlotte Bloomberg Professor is teaching, researching, and enhancing our culture. Currently, my mother, my sister, and I annually award four grants to people contributing to Jewish causes, another of my mother's great loves. The Charlotte Bloomberg Awards and the yearly awards ceremony are something she looks forward to each winter. You can see it in her eyes as she helps to select the winners and bestows the honorarium.

I've endowed a professorship/fellowship at Harvard University to study and research philanthropic and volunteer policies and practices. It's named in honor of my late father, and while he's not around to see it work, his wife, children, and grandchildren all are. Every two years, this "chair" passes from one school at Harvard to another (Divinity, Law, Government, the College, and of course, my alma mater, Business). And so, every twenty-four months, a new person will study, teach, research, and write from a new perspective about my interest, philanthropy. Will they make great contributions to society? You bet. Will there be great leverage to continue the work I love by teaching many? For sure. Will my family and I get enjoyment, satisfaction, admiration? Absolutely.

*

*

*

The role of individuals in philanthropy and public service in America is clear: We must help or our successors will suffer-and they could be the descendants we care so much about. Those opposed to private contributions, who argue that they eliminate the rightful role of government, miss two points. First, the government can't do everything. Second, the government doesn't do everything well. People should support personally what they think society needs.

The role of companies in philanthropic endeavors and public service is somewhat different. Management generally has a legal responsibility to maximize the assets of the stockholders. Nowhere is there relief from that objective (nor, given the potential for abuse, should there be). Activities not furthering that cause are generally prohibited. Just because management thinks something's worthwhile from society's point of view, they can't (or shouldn't) give away the stockholders' assets. Companies have an obligation to distribute dividends and let the individual shareholders do what they see fit. Likewise in the conduct of their affairs. If it doesn't further the corporate purpose, it's outlawed.

Still, when helping others helps the company, it couldn't be more in the stockholders' interests or more appropriate as a corporate activity. In our organization, I'm repeatedly solicited by every worthwhile cause. When it's for my school, my religion, my personal enjoyment, the donation is from Michael R. Bloomberg. However, when the solicitor's a client, or the company's employees get direct benefit, or when a contribution specifically helps our business, Bloomberg L.P. makes the gift. Personal interests, I take care of; business ones, all the investors in the company contribute.

Private companies, like individuals, enjoy greater freedom than public corporations to do what they think is right. We refused to enter the South African market during apartheid. We adopted this policy before many U.S. municipalities required it for their suppliers. Later, when F.W. de Klerk started dismantling the racist practices in South Africa, we led again by opening our business there to encourage continued progress along those lines, even though U.S. policies still requested restraint at the time. Sometimes, you just have to do what you think is best for society, even when it's not popular or profitable.

Still, even what private companies can do is limited. Resources, both time and money, are never adequate to do everything. Like many other companies with a feeling of community service, we employ a full-time person, Patti Harris, whose sole job is to decide which philanthropic activities are appropriate for our company and to ensure we get our money's worth when we donate time, money, and jobs. One of Patti's questions is, When does helping others help us? Another is, How much can we afford to do, given a never-ending call for assistance? A third is based on compassion-sometimes we've just got to do it anyway.

We give to charities our clients support as a way of saying thank you for their patronage. We make donations to organizations that improve our brand recognition and image. We assist worthwhile causes that improve the environment our employees enjoy. We join with others where the relationship, the contacts, and the mutual experiences will be useful to our company later in our commercial activities.

Not only does Patti commit our dollars, she also follows, influences, and directs how our gifts are used, ensuring our objectives are met. And often, smaller charities without large professional staffs need our help and advice as much as our money. She can assist with their fund-raising, publicity, and government relations. Further, she proactively searches for innovative ways that the company, our employees, and I can help others. (One such project involving all is our school-painting activity. Through the support of "Publicolor," a New York-based nonprofit, our company buys paint and brushes. Our staff donates their time on weekends to apply color to the walls of an inner-city school building. Together, we transform the learning environment of thousands of kids studying in previously dismal surroundings. Instantly, sweat and cash produce something good you can see.)

We want to be known as a company that not only takes care of our employees, but is also generous to our community. It all helps the bottom line. Companies that don't understand that don't do as well as they could.

Give something back and you'll wind up with more!

Afterword

The question I know you've been pondering is: Why did he write this book? After all, it has taken Matt Winkler and me a lot of time we could have spent elsewhere. We're running a risk, putting down on paper something we can't easily retract. If the reviewers pan it, we'll be thoroughly embarrassed. If the book sells fewer copies than the Pope's, I'll be labeled a literary failure forever (and Kelly MacGown, who has edited and typed Matt's and my revisions so competently and tirelessly, will shoot us both).

The actual writing of this volume has certainly been a humbling experience. I've always been impressed by my friends who fulfill their family obligations, run their own companies, and simultaneously write screenplays, "op-ed" pieces, and serious books. Their literary abilities and self-discipline are vastly superior to mine. They are Renaissance people and I'm a mere dilettante. Rewriting page after page, again and again, has been a challenge. If it wasn't for many friends' constant encouragement and support, I'd never have finished. Of course, they bear no responsibility for the quality. They just pushed me to continue with whatever I could do and for better or worse, this is what I'm capable of writing.

Matt and our agent, Arthur Klebanoff, mapped out the book's structure and forced me to actually put pen to paper. Then, taking Matt's scribbblings and mine and combining them into prose when I'm used to communicating verbally took forever.

Myles Thompson, of John Wiley & Sons, Inc., began it with a call to our marketing guru, Elisabeth DeMarse, soliciting our interest. My initial instinct was absolutely not! On a risk/reward basis, what's in it for us? In fact, most friends I mentioned it to said the same thing. Which is probably why I decided to go ahead. Stubborn isn't a word I'd use to describe myself; pigheaded is more appropriate. To a contrarian like me, constant advice not to do something almost always starts me quickly down the risky, unpopular path.

Then, there's the desire to see one's name in print. I claim immunity to the ego gratification a self-promoting book provides. After all, with the success of our company, my name on the door worldwide, myself as the company's spokesperson, you'd think I'd be blasé about publicity by now. But the truth is, recognition is heady stuff, and receiving even insincere adulation is a kick.

Let's not forget the business reason to have bookstores globally displaying our logo. Name recognition improves access for our salespeople. Building a widely recognized brand and a favorable image in consumers' minds takes decades and costs zillions. Every bit of publicity helps; you never know which imprint makes the difference. With radio, television, Internet access, and magazines competing for the public's attention, the old adage, "As long as they spell your name right," applies more than ever.

Another thought was more prophylactic. If we don't, someone else will. Having a rogue writer out there taking journalistic liberties to commercialize the truth is dangerous. Glasses can be half empty as well as the reverse. I'd just as soon get in our best shot first.

In the end, though, there was only one compelling reason to go ahead. I wanted to say something. I

have strong beliefs as to how young people should prepare themselves for the future. I think I know how to inspire groups to work together, particularly where technology and complexity are introduced by competitive pressures. I know what's great about my country and how I can make it even better. And while many don't contribute to society what they should, I'm sure I can convince them to do so, to share their knowledge, to spread around their wealth, to be more compassionate, and to assist others.

I wanted to help, explain, and change, rather than just complain. If I didn't do my part, then I'm no better than those I accuse of living mediocre, hypocritical, or selfish lives. I have something to say. This was my opportunity. Why shouldn't I have taken it?