Taking Social Entrepreneurship Seriously

J. Gregory Dees

A cursory look at world affairs should convince any thinking and caring person, regardless of political ideology, that we have considerable room for improvement. Despite the tremendous strides in the quality of life that humankind has made in the past two centuries, many persistent problems remain and new ones have emerged. Rapid economic growth and various experiments with activist governments have not been sufficient to lift a huge portion of the world population out of poverty. Curable and preventable diseases still cause tremendous suffering and claim many lives, particularly among the poor. Access to education and the quality of education vary widely across the globe, even within some developed countries. Slavery and human trafficking are more serious and widespread than most of us care to admit. Violence and conflict abound on personal, tribal, national, regional, and global levels. The earth is warming, polar icecaps are melting, and biodiversity is declining at an unusually high rate, raising serious questions about the impact on future generations, regardless of the cause. The list could go on and on. We may not all agree on our visions for an ideal world, but we can generally agree that the gap between reality and our notions of the ideal is still enormous.

One potentially promising strategy for improvement is to encourage and support social entrepreneurs, individuals, and organizations that bring to social problems the same kind of determination, creativity, and resourcefulness that we find among business entrepreneurs. One prime example is the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize winner Muhammad Yunus, who founded the highly successful Grameen Bank in Bangladesh to provide credit to the poor to help them move out of poverty. Two of the 2006 MacArthur Fellowship winners were also leading social entrepreneurs. Victoria Hale founded the Institute for OneWorld Health, a nonprofit pharmaceutical company that develops safe, effective, affordable medicines for developing coun-

tries, and Jim Fruchterman is a Silicon Valley engineer who created Benetech to craft technological solutions to social needs, ranging from literacy to human rights and landmine detection.

The concept of "social entrepreneurship" emerged in the 1980s from the work of Bill Drayton at Ashoka, funding social innovators around the world, and Ed Skloot at New Ventures, helping nonprofits explore new sources of income. It has come into its own in the last decade, capturing the imaginations of many thoughtful observers. For instance, David Gergen, Harvard professor and former advisor to four U.S. presidents, has described social entrepreneurs as the "new engines of reform." Numerous universities, including Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, New York University, Oxford, and Duke have launched centers or major initiatives in this arena. The World Economic Forum has openly embraced social entrepreneurship, and the Forum's founders, Klaus and Hilde Schwab, have created their own Foundation for Social Entrepreneurship. Jeffrey Skoll, eBay's first president, has devoted his foundation to "investing in, connecting, and celebrating social entrepreneurs." Actor and director Robert Redford hosted a Public Broadcasting series in 2005 on the "New Heroes," supported by the Skoll Foundation, to profile successful social entrepreneurs. Major media outlets from the *New York Times* to the *Economist* have run feature articles on this trend. The Manhattan Institute, with which Husock is affiliated, gives an annual Social Entrepreneurship Award. The embrace of this concept cuts across political and national boundaries, with activities and interest cropping up around the world.

Is this attention and excitement warranted? Does social entrepreneurship have the potential to create sustainable and scalable impact in arenas where government efforts have been ineffective? After studying this activity for over a decade, I am convinced that social entrepreneurs, operating outside of the constraints of

government, significantly enhance our ability to find and implement effective solutions to social problems. Of course, the real test of any thesis of this sort lies in action and results. My goal in these pages is to convince readers that we should take social entrepreneurship seriously and make the necessary investment of resources, time, and energy to give this idea a serious and sustained test.

Government as Problem Solver

To put the current interest in social entrepreneurship in perspective, it is useful to think about human history as a series of experiments in social organization—from family, clan, and tribal structures to the elaborate governmental, corporate, and social structures of today. These experiments can be seen as a response to the question: How should we organize ourselves, publicly and privately, to move closer to the ideals of a good society? This article is not the place to trace the evolution of different forms of social organization, but it is helpful to look back briefly at a particular turning point in late eighteenth-century Europe that had ripple effects around the world.

The major social problem of the day was poverty. Some leading political thinkers, such as Thomas Paine and the Marquis de Condorcet, recognized the ineffectiveness of charity and, in the spirit of the Enlightenment, proposed more scientific and secular state-based alternatives. Charity was largely grounded in the practice of alms giving, typically organized by the church. The term comes from the Latin *caritas*, referring to a sentiment, compassion for others, which was not always a reliable or effective platform for action. It allowed givers to demonstrate their virtue, but charity at best provided temporary relief for the poor. This relief did not always reach all those that could benefit from it, and many feared it exacerbated the very problem at which it was directed, creating dependency and undermining the industriousness of the poor. According to historian Gareth Stedman Jones, in his book *An End to Poverty*, Paine, Condorcet, and their fellow travelers offered a secular and rational alternative. A republican state could take a scientific approach to administer aid to the poor in a more rigorous, fair, and effective way. Though their particular schemes were not immediately implemented, these thinkers planted the seeds for social democracy and the welfare state.

The Enlightenment positioned government as the main actor in resolving social problems that were not addressed by economic development. Building on the seventeenth-century scientific revolution, and with Newtonian mechanics as the paradigm, it made sense for the state to take on the central role in engineering a solution to poverty. Of course, this shift away from religious, sentimental approaches to poverty was taken to new heights in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries by Karl Marx and his followers. Over the course of the past two centuries, the world has witnessed a variety of experiments in government-based efforts to tackle poverty, as well as other social and environmental problems. Over this period, a mixed religious and secular civil society continued to evolve and play a complementary role, but the hope for social problem solving has largely been on government.

While this focus on government as social problem solver led to some notable successes, such as increased access to education and health care for many, the experience also revealed the limits of government as the vehicle for social problem solving. It has become clear that large-scale, top-down government programs have serious drawbacks. No clear principles of "social mechanics" have emerged to guide central planning. Even physical science has moved beyond the billiard-ball world of Newtonian mechanics. Communism, socialism, and the welfare state have been subjected to the same kind of criticism that was leveled against the charity of old. They, too, run the risk of creating dependency, perhaps even more so because of the sense of entitlement they can create.

Government service delivery, including in the relatively successful arenas of education and health care, has been criticized as bureaucratic, ineffective, wasteful, too political, and antithetical to innovation. Because of the risks of fraud, waste, and abuse of power, bureaucracy became the dominant organizing method for government agencies. This is not an organizing mode that is conducive to creative problem solving. In hindsight, these shortcomings are not surprising given the incentives and decision mechanism common to governmental organizations. Government alone is clearly not the answer. After two centuries of aggressive experimentation with different forms of government, we have learned, at the very least, that government is a tool that is effective for some kinds of social interventions but not as effective for others. We do not need to enter the ideological debates about the appropriate role and size of government to recognize the potential value of bringing private initiative, ingenuity, and resources to the table.

Through various government efforts to solve social problems, we have learned that with all our scientific knowledge and rational planning, we still do not know in advance what will work effectively. Thus, progress in the social sphere depends on a process of innovation and experimentation akin to entrepreneurship in the business world. When the Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter formulated his theory of economic development, he saw entrepreneurs playing a central role. They drove development by "carrying out new combinations." They could modify existing products or services, develop new ones, improve production and marketing processes, find new sources or supply, take existing products into new markets, or create new forms of organization. In so doing, as he later put it, they "reform or revolutionize the pattern of production." And they shift resources into areas of higher yield and productivity, to paraphrase J. B. Say, the eighteenth-century French economist who popularized the term "entrepreneur." To be sure, large firms engage in incremental innovations, but as Carl Schramm and Robert Litan of the Kauffman Foundation recently put it, "Radical breakthroughs tend to be disproportionately developed and brought to market by a single individual or new firm." Social entrepreneurs are needed to play the same innovating role with regard to social needs and problems.

Social and business entrepreneurs uncover or create new opportunities through a process of exploration, innovation, experimentation, and resource mobilization. This is an active, messy, highly decentralized learning process. Decentralization is critical because finding what works depends on having the right knowledge, being able to envision new combinations, and having the freedom to test ideas through action. The necessary knowledge cannot easily be centralized; much of it is local and dispersed among the population. As a result, some people will see opportunities and conceive of promising new combinations that others could not envision. Because of the creative nature of this process, centralizing social problem solving makes about as much sense as centralizing art production. Finally, since independent entrepreneurs must mobilize resources to continue to pursue their visions, they have to persuade financiers who are putting their money behind the idea and talented employees who are devoting their time and skills that this venture is worthwhile. This selection process provides a discipline, albeit imperfect, that helps narrow the funnel to those ideas that have

better chances of working. When it works well, this decentralized process allows bad ideas to fall by the wayside, encourages lessons to be learned, and provides an incentive for continuous improvement of the more promising ones.

This entrepreneurial process is similar to the path of natural selection, involving a continuous cycle of differentiation, selection, and expansion. Just as high levels of biodiversity (differentiation) characterize a vibrant ecosystem, high levels of entrepreneurship characterize a vibrant economy and high levels of social entrepreneurship should come to characterize a healthy society. No "solution" is likely to bring us to an ideal state and keep us there forever. Society will change over time just as ecosystems change. New challenges will arise as we make progress on the old ones. Thus, the need for this independent innovation process has no foreseeable end.

Why can't government agencies do this? When compared to government agencies, independent social entrepreneurs have several distinct advantages. They have greater freedom of action and can usually move more quickly than public officials. They can explore a wider range of alternatives, largely because they are not as constrained by bureaucratic rules, legislative mandates, political considerations, and a fixed budget. Social entrepreneurs can tailor their efforts to different communities or markets in ways that would be difficult for government programs. Moreover, independent social entrepreneurs have access to private resources, while private contributions to government are relatively rare. Thus, social entrepreneurs are able to attract voluntary gifts of money, time, and in-kind donations, leveraging public money devoted to the same problem with philanthropy, social investment, or earned income from their business ventures.

The reliance on independent social entrepreneurs also provides society with greater opportunities to learn with less risk. Government programs usually represent relatively large bets on fairly standardized interventions with commitments to a certain course of action that can be very hard to modify once announced. As economists Douglas North and Robert Thomas observed, "government solutions entail the additional cost of being stuck with the decision in the future—that is, withdrawal costs are higher than those related to voluntary organizations." With social entrepreneurs we have more and smaller bets on varied efforts to tackle the same social problem. When we have high levels

of uncertainly about the best approach, diversification and experimentation increase the opportunities for learning and success. Diversification of activity has the added benefit of reducing the costs of failure during this learning process. If some of the small bets fail, the impact will be far less than the failure of a large-scale government program. To the extent that these experiments are privately funded, this learning process does not come at great public expense.

Furthermore, some social innovations are unlikely to be very effective if they are carried out by governmental organizations. The private nature of social ventures can be a distinct advantage. Consider Planned Parenthood, Alcoholics Anonymous, the Sierra Club, Habitat for Humanity, or community foundations. Could these work as well as branches of government? It seems unlikely. Boy and Girl Scouts would certainly take on a very different connotation if the government ran these programs. A rape crisis center might be effective in large part because it is run and staffed by volunteers who have been victims of rape themselves. Would victims of rape trust the center as much if it were government run? Additionally, in some cases, it is important to work across governmental levels and jurisdictional boundaries. The Nobel Prize winning organization, *Medecins Sans Frontieres* (Doctors Without Borders) captures this notion in its very name. It is much harder for government agencies to work effectively across boundaries. Since many social and environmental issues cut across these boundaries, it makes sense for the organizations tackling them to be organized accordingly. Thus, many innovative approaches to social problems are not only best started outside government, they are best kept outside government.

Social entrepreneurs have an important role to play, whether it is to complement or supplant government efforts. They are better positioned to innovate and experiment than government agencies. They have flexibility in how they serve their missions that should allow them to be more efficient and effective. They increase our chances of learning, and they bring private resources to the table. Unfortunately, until recently, they were not taken as seriously as they should be as an important driver of social progress. People tended to focus on government and markets as the main social forces, treating the "third sector" as marginal, rather than as a potential major engine for progress. Yet, independent social entrepreneurs have the potential to play the same role in addressing social needs that

business entrepreneurs play in what economic Nobel Laureate Edmund Phelps calls "dynamic capitalism." Social entrepreneurship engages the problem-solving skills and local knowledge of many individuals and organizations in search of innovative solutions. As a result, it has some powerful advantages over centralized policy analysis and planning.

Charity and Problem-Solving

The recent rise of interest in social entrepreneurship is definitely not a case of the pendulum swinging away from government, back to charity, as much as some political commentators, such as Marvin Olasky, might like to see. Today's social entrepreneurs do not see themselves as engaged in "charity" in the traditional, alms-giving sense. They recognize its limits and weaknesses, as did the Enlightenment critics. Muhammad Yunus makes the point forcefully: "When we want to help the poor, we usually offer them charity. Most often we use charity to avoid recognizing the problem and finding a solution for it. Charity becomes a way to shrug off our responsibility. Charity is no solution to poverty. Charity only perpetuates poverty by taking the initiative away from the poor. Charity allows us to go ahead with our own lives without worrying about those of the poor. It appeases our consciences."

Other social entrepreneurs may not object as strongly to charity. However, even those who acknowledge a need for temporary relief tend to view their own work as fundamentally different. They aim to create sustainable improvements and are willing to draw on self-interest, as well as compassion to do it.

Social entrepreneurship represents another step in the continuing reinvention of the "third sector" over the past one hundred and fifty years. The Enlightenment brought not only a shift in political philosophy it also changed private charitable institutions. Many of them embraced the new rationality leading to the rise of what historian Gertrude Himmelfarb calls "scientific charity." This shift generated a relative boom of new organizations in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The movement included new religious charities with more "scientific" approaches, the creation of secular charitable institutions, professionally run philanthropic foundations, and the establishment of new helping professions, such as social work. The Salvation Army, YMCA, Boys and Girls Clubs, and many prominent third-sector organizations and major foundations trace their roots to this era.

Leading social entrepreneurs today are most aptly described as pragmatists. They are focused on achieving sustainable results and will use whatever tools are most likely to work. They embrace innovation, value effective management, and are open to a wide range of operational and business models. They are willing to adapt ideas and tools from business when these will help. They are even willing to use for-profit forms of organization or hybrid structures that include for-profit and nonprofit elements. When it is possible, social entrepreneurs will happily craft market-based solutions that rely only on self-interest, allowing scarce philanthropic or government resources to flow to areas that genuinely need subsidy. If they can find an overlooked market opportunity that also improves social conditions, they will gladly pursue it. Yunus's Grameen Bank is legally a for-profit institution owned by its borrowers and is now financially self-sustaining.

Recognizing that for-profit or hybrid organizations may have an important role in creating better social conditions, some new philanthropists are disregarding old sector boundaries. When Silicon Valley venture capitalists Brook Byers and John Doerr started the New Schools Venture Fund, they decided to use it to fund both nonprofit and for-profit ventures that have the potential to create major improvements in K-12 education. Recently, the giant Internet search company Google decided that instead of creating the typical nonprofit company foundation, it would create its philanthropic arm as a for-profit capable of investing in nonprofit or for-profit ventures with a social purpose, such as more fuel-efficient vehicles. The lines between for-profit and nonprofit are breaking down as social entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial philanthropists look for new ways to tackle a range of social issues from alternative energy to improvements in health care.

Today's social entrepreneurs are building on the tradition of Ben Franklin. When Franklin saw opportunities to improve life for his fellow citizens in Philadelphia, he pursued them in whatever form seemed most sensible. He created for-profit printing and publishing businesses to keep citizens informed, a voluntary firefighting association to protect the homes of members, a subscription-based lending library, and a philanthropically supported academy that became the University of Pennsylvania, just to mention a few examples. For each entrepreneurial venture Franklin adopted an economic, operating, and legal structure that was suitable given the circumstances. Social entrepreneurs operating today embrace this legacy of pragmatic private initiatives to improve social conditions. They do not see themselves as "charities" or even as "nonprofits," though they often use that legal form of organization. They are entrepreneurs who move comfortably across sector boundaries in search of the best ways to achieve sustainable impact.

A Supportive Infrastructure

The current boom in social entrepreneurship exists despite a relatively poor understanding of this work. Those who take it up often lack the resources and infrastructure they need to succeed at a significant scale. They are swimming against the current of cultural assumptions and biases. As a society, we have not openly embraced social entrepreneurship, do not appreciate the crucial differences between social entrepreneurship and charity, and have not yet constructed the kinds of cultural and institutional mechanisms social entrepreneurs need to be effective. Though today's social entrepreneurs represent a break from sentimental, alms-giving charity, their work is still inhibited by the old norms and assumptions of alms-giving charity that permeate the sector. Even social entrepreneurs who feel they can adopt a for-profit legal form do not find the kind of support they need to blend social and financial objectives. If we want to capitalize on this current wave of interest and test the potential of social entrepreneurship, we need to create an environment conducive to success. We need to support social entrepreneurs with a more efficient and robust infrastructure, appropriate public policy, and a change in the culture of the social sector.

The relatively efficient and effective markets that we know today evolved over centuries as appropriate institutions, public policies, and cultural values were developed. On the infrastructure side, capitalism grew with the increase in wholesale markets and fairs, bourses, banking instruments, insurance for trade voyages, and the like. Today we have very sophisticated financial markets, business schools engaged in both education and research, and many supportive associations for business organizations. The investment in developing this infrastructure has been tremendous. We need similar institutions to develop and make available to social entrepreneurs appropriate funding, talent, knowledge, and social capital. We also need to modify our current institutions to align them more with the requirements of social entrepreneurship, making significant changes in philanthropy, other financial services, research,

and educational programs. Fortunately, a number of thoughtful players in this sector are working hard to develop new institutions.

On the policy side, capitalism relied upon clear property rights, systems for enforcing contracts, and a variety of supportive investments by governments. For social entrepreneurship to flourish, we need public policies that recognize and deliberately harness its potential. These policies should free social entrepreneurs to innovate and experiment, manage the risk of this experimentation, encourage private investors to support this activity, and allow those involved to reap appropriate rewards for their success. Even though Grameen Bank is a private initiative, it is owned in small part by the government of Bangladesh, and it required special legislation so that it could take savings deposits and operate as a formal financial institution. Without these deposits it would not have been able to grow nearly as rapidly. As social entrepreneurs experiment with new business models, we may need new legal forms of organization, such as the "community interest company" category recently created in the United Kingdom. As philanthropists and other financial backers experiment with the best ways to use their resources to support social entrepreneurs, we may need changes in the legal structures and rules for doing that kind of investing as well.

Capitalism required a culture that allowed for trust and a comfort with transactions beyond family and tribal boundaries, as well as a culture in which profit making is morally acceptable. Similarly, in the social sector, we need a culture that honors and taps into the altruistic impulses that have fueled charity in the past, but directs those impulses toward impact and performance. We need a culture that accepts failure as essential for learning and that honors effectiveness and efficiency as much as the culture of charity honors sacrifice. We also need a culture that does not make it shameful to earn a decent living serving social purposes. Building the right supports will not be easy, but it is essential if this approach is to achieve its potential.

Challenges to Moving Forward

By making social entrepreneurs a recognized, strategic element in the process by which we improve social conditions, we have the potential to make headway in arenas that have remained vexing. The worldwide potential for mobilizing socially entrepreneurial behavior, if we were to make a deliberate effort to promote it, is enormous. However, this idea is relatively new, is still

experimental, and it may not work as well as proponents (including myself) expect it to, just as activist governments did not work as well as many expected it to. Several issues could be raised, but three stand out as especially important: social impact assessment, the selection-investment processes, and scalability.

Entrepreneurship works well in business because markets tend to reinforce value creation both for customers and for investors. Businesses that do not create sufficient value for these two groups usually whither and fail. The test is whether customers will pay enough to cover the costs of production and to generate an attractive return for investors. An attractive return is one that is comparable to or better than those generated by alternative investments of similar risk. Businesses with strong track records and indications of future potential can grow relatively rapidly because of the size of the financial markets and the ability of these markets to respond quickly. These measures are definitely not foolproof. Even seasoned business investors make serious mistakes. However, customer and financial markets work reasonably well to identify, select, and scale firms that are creating the most customer and investor value. The same cannot be said of social entrepreneurship.

Social impact is difficult to measure in a reliable, timely, and cost-effective fashion—especially for the most ambitious social ventures. How and when do we know that someone has been moved out of poverty in a sustainable way or that a strategy will slow global warming? Signs, symptoms, and leading indicators often must be used to provide clues to whether an intervention is having its intended impact. Many innovations that sound logical and promising fail in practice or produce unintended harms that offset the gains. Even with micro-finance, the innovation for which Yunus won the Nobel Peace Prize, attempts to demonstrate its impact in a rigorous and systematic way have produced mixed and sometimes confusing results. The stories of impact on individuals and their families are plenty and powerful, but methods for systematic evaluation have been a subject of debate. Even when the intended impact can be assessed reliably, it may be difficult to attribute causation without very well controlled studies that are costly and complicated. Children who participate in a voluntary after-school tutoring program may have better graduation rates than their classmates, but this could be driven by other factors, such as educated and motivated parents. Even when causation can be established, comparisons across organizations can be

very difficult unless they have a very similar mission, strategy, operating environment, and target population. Even among domestic educational interventions, how do we compare Teach for America, the Gates Foundation's U.S. Libraries initiative, and Edison Schools? This does not mean the situation is hopeless. Innovators are working on this challenge and making some headway, but we need to develop better ways to identify the most promising innovations, sort out the failures, and learn from these experiments. In the meantime, we must operate with greater uncertainly, making our best judgments in light of imperfect data.

Even if we can find methods to measure impact more accurately, we need natural selection processes that direct resources and support to the most promising innovations and away from the failed experiments. Current mechanisms in the social sector are highly imperfect, for at least two reasons. First, performance evaluation is not highly valued in the culture of charity. Charity is about compassion, sacrifice, and temporary relief. It is easy to see if you get food to a hungry person. Your motivations are between you and your God or conscience. Why invest in performance assessment? Better for the money to go for programs. This culture is crumbling, especially among major foundations and new philanthropists, but it still holds more sway than we recognize. The second reason selection is weak is that "investors" in the social sector, particularly philanthropists, are motivated by more than social impact. They allocate their capital for emotive and expressive reasons as well. Some want to thank the hospice that cared for their loved one, not reward the best hospice in the country. Others choose to support Green Peace instead of the Nature Conservancy, not because of a dispassionate assessment of which organization is doing a better job, but because they identify with the ideology and confrontational tactics of Green Peace. Still others want to support a needy organization, rather than one that seems to be doing well, even if the latter could create more impact dollar for dollar. As things stand, effective and efficient organizations may not be rewarded with additional resources, while ineffective and inefficient ones may thrive because they have a moving story to tell. Resource flows still depend more on sentiment, popular causes, personal charisma, and marketing skills than on social value creation. We need to move toward selection and investment processes that better align personal satisfaction of resource providers with the potential for impact.

Social entrepreneurs often find it very hard to scale. When they do scale, the process is usually very slow, particularly when viewed relative to the size and growth of the problems being addressed. Even Habitat for Humanity, one of the greatest growth stories of the social sector, cannot keep up with the need for housing in its target population. This is partly because the infrastructure, policy, and culture needed to support the growth has been lacking. It is also partly because private resources devoted to the social sector have been relatively small compared to the problems being addressed and poorly allocated. The oft-touted intergenerational transfer of wealth that we are experiencing in the United States may help, but this infusion of capital could represent a one-time boom, rather than a sustainable solution. To reduce the need for outside funding, many social entrepreneurs are experimenting with earned income strategies. Developing new business models may help, but even profitable businesses often must tap into outside markets for growth capital. Social ventures tend to have smaller pools to tap into. While many people are at work on innovations in the private funding markets for social entrepreneurs, it is still not clear whether the amount of private capital available will be sufficient and appropriately directed to scale the most promising innovations, raising the question of government involvement.

Government-supported programs can scale rather rapidly, when the political will and funding are present. This is because government has the power to coerce compliance and mobilize resources through taxation. But how do we avoid the problems associated with government programs? We need to learn from prior efforts to combine social entrepreneurship with government support to see how this might be done most effectively. What can we learn from charter school legislation, which opened the door to more education entrepreneurs by providing access to public funding? What can we learn from the rapid spread of hospices throughout the United States after Medicare agreed to reimburse for hospice care? Even some of the paradigms of independent social entrepreneurship, such as Teach for America and Habitat for Humanity, rely on some government funding. In his essay on "The Age of Social Transformation," Peter Drucker envisioned a society in which "Many social sector organizations will become partners with government" through voucher programs. He noted that these organizations would also be competitors with government, concluding, "The relationship between the two has yet to be

worked out—and there is practically no precedent for it." Working this out may be essential to assure the scalability of effective social innovations.

Social entrepreneurship is a promising development that may lead into a new era in which we more effectively harness private initiative, ingenuity, and resources to improve social and environmental conditions. We need to provide the right support and we need to address fundamental questions.

FURTHER READINGS

Bornstein, David. 2004. *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurship and the Power of New Ideas.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Dees, J. Gregory, and Beth Battle Anderson. "Sector Bending: Blurring the Lines between Nonprofit and For-Profit." *Soci-*

ety 40, 4, May/June 2003. Reprinted in Peter Frumkin and Jonathan B. Imber (eds.), *In Search of the Nonprofit Sector.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2004.

Mosher-Williams, Rachel, ed. 2006. *Research on Social Entrepreneurship: Understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field,* ARNOVA Occasional Paper Series, vol. 1, no. 3.

Nichols, Alex. 2006. *Social Entrepreneurship: New Paradigms of Sustainable Social Change.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Yunus, Muhammad. 1999. *Banker to the Poor: Micro-Lending and the Battle Against World Poverty.* New York: PublicAffairs.

J. Gregory Dees is adjunct professor and faculty director of the Center for the Advancement of Social Entrepreneurship at Duke University's Fuqua School of Business. He is co-author of Enterprising Nonprofits and Strategic Tools for Social Entrepreneurs.

Transaction and *Society* take this occasion to sadly acknowledge the loss of a great American statesman, lifelong friend and passionate collaborator.

JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK

BORN: NOVEMBER 19TH, 1926 IN NORMAN, OKLAHOMA
DIED: DECEMBER 7TH, 2006 IN BETHESDA, MARYLAND

"It may be said that no comparable period in human history has seen as much violence, mayhem and murder, or heard as much talk of morality and human rights. The relationship between hostile violent deeds and sweeping moral claims is as close in our times as the relationship between the fact of tyranny and the rhetoric of freedom, or the fact of war and the discourse of peace."

—JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK, "Human Rights and Foreign Policy," in *Legitimacy and Force: Political and Moral Dimensions* (Volume One, page 145).

Author of
Legitimacy and Force

Volume One: *Political and Moral Dimensions*
(ISBN: 978-0-88738-099-0)

Volume Two: *National and International Dimensions*
(ISBN: 978-0-88738-100-3)

TRANSACTION PUBLISHERS
RUTGERS—THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY 08903