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Philanthropy and Collective Sharing

Dr. Dezhi Lu

Chairperson of Huamin Charity Foundation, Beijing, China

Today I will present my thoughts on philanthropy as collective sharing. I will first examine the nature of philanthropy, and its relationship with the concept of ownership. In society, philanthropy is born together with private property. There is no need for philanthropy under a system of full public ownership. According to Marxist and Socialist theory, philanthropy is unnecessary and irrelevant in both primitive and communist societies. The outputs of primitive society were very limited; all could share in the fruits of the hunt. In communist society, philanthropy is also unnecessary. The government actively meets all needs. If disabled individuals need crutches or wheelchairs, the government provides them. In light of this, I feel philanthropy springs from a society of private ownership, and develops alongside advancing property rights and norms.

Second, I would like to speak about the relationship between philanthropy, communism, and collective sharing. Private and public ownership can coexist in society. The key question is how to conceptualize and deal with public property. Should government take a voluntary or a mandatory approach? The development of public property is related to the concept of communism. Plato’s Utopia describes a communal society whose members share wives and children—a situation that most would find ridiculous in the modern world. Later philosophers, such as Saint-Simon and Owen, omitted this idea of shared wives and children in their conceptualization of communism. Marx further advanced communist theories. However, in many ways communism is incompatible with human nature; it often leads to widespread property loss and stunted social development. Why, then, did Marx propose such a system? I believe Marx’s idea of communism is a counter to the imperfect system of private property. The latter system can lead to vast inequalities between rich and poor. Marxism lends a voice to the poor. It explains that when the rich ignore this voice, revolution can ensue. When this occurs, the rich lose all of their property, which is redistributed to others. In this way, Marxism contains the idea of philanthropy as collective sharing.
To effectively achieve collective sharing, some propose a “three pronged approach” to redistribution. First, income distribution takes place through the unfettered mechanisms of the labor market. Second, redistribution takes place through tax and financial policies. Finally, a second wave of redistribution occurs through philanthropy. Philanthropy is the culmination of this three pronged approach, as it achieves the ideal of collective sharing. The three modes of wealth distribution share one important characteristic: institutionalization. The key difference is that market-based income distribution and redistributive policies are imposed by the government; philanthropic redistribution is voluntary.

I feel that modern philanthropy is the new “revolution,” so to speak, among the wealthy. There are two types of revolution: traditional and contemporary. A traditional revolution involves the poor protecting themselves, and fighting against the mandates of the ruling classes for redistribution of property. The fight is ultimately centered on property and wealth. However, contemporary revolution is exacted by the wealthy—I call this type the “Bill Gates” revolution. This revolution involves a willing redistribution of wealth by the privileged. Those who do not engage in philanthropy risk becoming targets of traditional revolution. Therefore, contemporary revolution is a fight for life, rather than money. However, the lack of appropriate policies and regulations compromise this contemporary form of revolution.

I would like to highlight some of the important differences between traditional and contemporary revolution. First, the targets are certainly different; while traditional revolution is a fight against others, contemporary revolution is a fight with ourselves. Second, the methods and motives behind these two forms of revolution are different; one is a fight for money, while the other asks for lives. Finally, the impacts are different: one leads to the overthrow of the ruling class; the other leads society forward, towards harmonious development. Although these two revolutions are quite different, under some conditions, they might be integrated. The rich can easily become the targets of revolution if they don’t fundamentally change their attitudes and behaviors.
It is not easy to become revolutionaries in the modern era. Here, I want to emphasize three points: first, passion leads to wealth. This is the premise of revolution. If you are unable to create wealth, you cannot share wealth. Second, it is important to maintain a strong sense of mission and moral character. Without a mission, and without ethical boundaries, you will unlikely be willing to share your wealth. Ultimately, this can lead to traditional revolution. Third, society needs us to be actively involved in philanthropy. Personally, I believe the most effective way to engage in philanthropy is by creating family charitable foundations.

Last, I would like to highlight the importance of theory. A revolution must be armed with a theoretical weapon, which in my opinion is the Spirit of Capital. I have discussed the core content and framework of the Spirit of Capital on many occasions. Today, given our time constraints, I will not go into detail. In essence, the Spirit of Capital involves both creating and sharing wealth. In my opinion, this represents an important new perspective for the development of philanthropy.

We can use the Spirit of Capital to fundamentally develop capital, and the development of capital can lead to the development of humanity. Philanthropy is collective sharing. If we do not share, we risk traditional revolution. Contemporary revolution involves targeting yourself; for this reason, it is harder in some ways. Modern revolutionaries must be able to create wealth, adopt social responsibility, and embody strong moral character. If a society breeds more of these types of revolutionaries, it will have a promising future. These revolutionaries are outstanding philanthropists because they understand one truth: philanthropy is collective sharing.

Translated by Juliann H. Vikse and Chien-Chung Huang. Huamin Research Center, Rutgers University.
慈善就是共享

卢德之博士
华民基金会理事长，北京，中国

我今天讲一个题目，叫慈善就是共享，这是从慈善的本质谈慈善。首先，我想讲一讲，慈善与私有制的关系。慈善是与人类社会私有制相伴而生，因为人类发展到有了私有财产后，就出现了私产的多、少、没有之分。在完全的公有体制下，是不需慈善的。如果按照马克思主义、科学社会主义理论观点，原始社会和共产主义社会都不需要慈善。原始社会物质财富非常有限，打一头野猪，大家一人一份分了，吃了就是，不需要慈善。到了共产主义社会，也不需要慈善。你说你是残疾人，少一根拐杖，发给你即是。少一辆轮椅，给你搬过来即可。这个时候不需要财产，是按需分配了，要多少给多少，那要什么慈善呢！所以，我认为慈善一定是私有制的产物，它只有在私产得到不断发展的前提下，慈善才会得到相应的同步发展。

我想谈谈慈善与共产、共享的关系。因为财产有私产和公产之分。私产和公产之分，无论在哪种社会形态下都是可能存在的财产结构。关键是这个公产是怎么产生的呢？是大家自愿交出来的，还是通过一种强制的方式扎堆的呢？这就出现了一种公产形成的方式问题，也出现了共产这个概念。柏拉图的《理想国》里面不仅共产还共妻、共子。当然，这是非常荒谬的。所以后来的思想家们，不论是圣西门还是欧文都再也没有说过共妻和共子的事了，只讲共产。马克思则把这样的一个学说由理想变成了现实。但是，共产不符合人的本性的。共产导致的结果是使社会财富的流失或者发展不好。那么，为什么马克思提出共产呢？马克思提出共产是对不完善私产制度的一种否定。私产制度不完善的时候，导致社会出现极大的贫富差距。在这个时候，马克思代表大多数没有财富的人们要求改变这个社会现实。但是，若财富拥有者不自觉，不愿
意与穷人一起共享财富，大家只有革命，把你的产共掉，然后再重新分配。所以，马克思主义“共产”理论实际是对当时资本主义不合理私产分配制度的批判。所以说，马克思主义“共产”理论蕴含着丰富的现代慈善思想——即共享！

为了实现这样一种共享，人们提出了一个所谓“三次分配”的理论。第一次分配通过劳资分配，第二次分配则通过税收财政分配，第三次分配就是通过慈善。而慈善体现的正是三次分配的终极价值——共享！这三次分配有共同点，其共同点是以制度化为前提；其不同点，第一次分配带有强制性，而第三次分配更多的是强调自愿性。

第二，我认为现代慈善对富人来说是一种新型的“革命”。我把革命分成两类，一种是传统革命，一种是新型的“革命”。传统革命是穷人革命。这个革命主要是为了保存自己，革别人的命。所以，在我看来，这种革命是要钱不要命的，为了财富的再次分配，他是不要命的。当然这种革命，有的人是为自己革命，有些人是为天下人革命。但总的来说，还是穷人革命，剥夺剥夺者。而新型的“革命”是富人革命，我把它喻为“比尔盖茨式”革命。这种革命主要是革自己的命，革财富的命，所以这种革命是要命不要钱的革命。这种革命，革命对象是自己。按理说，这样的革命不会遇上问题，但是现在我们真遇上了，现在富人做慈善的环境真的有问题啊！相应的政策法规不到位，管理也有不少问题！但我们不能因为问题的存在就不革命了。因为我们不进行这样的革命，也许有一天我们真的可能没命了！所以必须革命！下面，我们再来对传统革命和新型革命作个比较。第一，革命对象不同。过去的革命是革别人的命，现在的革命是革自己的命。第二，革命方法与革命动机不同。一个是要钱不要命，一个是要命不要钱。第三，革命的效果当然也不同。一个是一个阶级推翻或代替另一个阶级；新型革命则是使社会朝着一个正确的方向不断向前推进和发展，使得社会和谐、社会共享。尽管这两种革命有这么多不同，但在一定条件下，他们可能会互相转化。你今天如果不革
自己的命，明天很有可能别人就会革你的命。要做一个 “新时代革命者” 是不容易的。我这里强调三点：第一，必须要有创造财富的神圣激情。这是一个革命资格的问题。不创造财富，拿什么本钱革命，你得交出钱啊。第二，必须要有强烈的社会使命感和优秀的道德品质。这是一个新时代革命者的气质问题。有这个气魄还得要有这个品质。因为，虽然有了做新时代 “革命者” 的资格，但没有这样一个社会使命感和崇高的道德品质，那你这个钱还是拿不出，你舍不得嘛！舍不得的时候，长此以往，那最后不交钱就只能交命啊！第三，必须要积极投入新的革命实践中。我积极主张富人们应投入到伟大的革命实践中，这就是慈善事业。我特别要强调，富人从事慈善事业，最有效、最科学的一种方式就是打造家族式慈善基金会。

第三，要有革命的理论武器。当年革命的时候，共产党人找到了《共产党宣言》、《资本论》这样的先进武器。那么新时代的革命也需要武器啊！我找到的革命理论武器就是——资本精神！至于资本精神是什么？它核心内涵、作用、理论思想源流、范式设计等等我已在多个场合讲过。今天在这里，由于时间有限，我就不细讲了！那么这里我需要强调一点，资本精神是既包括挣钱也包括花钱，在我看来，它是一种新时代的“财富观”。

最后，我想做一个总的概括：第一，以资本精神引导资本发展。资本精神是理论武器，资本发展是结果。但资本的发展说到底是人的发展，社会的发展。第二，慈善就是共享，不共享就可能被共产。新时代的革命者是要革自己的命，革自己的命比革别人的命更难！新时代的革命者必须是社会财富的创造者，社会责任的勇于担当者，崇高道德的坚定守望者！这样的“革命者”越多，社会也就越有希望。这样的革命者当然也会成为出色的慈善人，因为他们懂得一个“善”理：慈善就是共享！
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Dr. Lu’s essay "Philanthropy and Collective Sharing" offers a remarkable and sophisticated framework for the role that philanthropy plays in modern society. He takes the concept of philanthropy well beyond the traditional notion of generosity to place it in a political and historical context as one of three ways -- along with the market and policy -- to achieve "collective sharing." Even more important, he challenges us to recognize that philanthropy can be seen as a new kind of revolution, an internal process that begins with self-reflection and results in voluntary acts of philanthropy. This concept of a moral revolution that each wealth-holder should undertake is a clear, powerful and inspiring call to action.

卢博士的文章《慈善就是共享》，就慈善事业在现代社会中的作用，提供了一个卓越且精细的框架。他超越以传统观念上的慷慨来阐释慈善的概念，而是将慈善放在政治与历史的背景下讨论，并认为慈善是和经济市场和公共政策一起达到“共享”。更重要的是，他挑战我们的思想，使我们意识到，慈善行为可以被视为一种新的革命，一种由自我反省开始到将慈善作为自愿行为的内在过程。这种关于每一个财富拥有者都应该承担道德改革的观点，是一次清晰、有力和鼓舞人心的行动号召。
Dr. Lu’s essay “Philanthropy and Collective Sharing” is an interesting and insightful piece. Although his discussion focuses on the changing role of philanthropy in China and its relationship to the ultimate goal of achieving “promising futures” for all; it also reminds us of the role philanthropy can play in our changing society. Although, the roles of government and NGOs are distinctly different in the United States, the role of philanthropy, at least theoretically, is very similar - to serve as vehicle that advances our efforts to achieve “promising futures” when more traditional approaches are not successful.

Allison Blake, PhD
Commissioner
NJ Department of Children and Families

爱里森·布雷克博士
厅长
新泽西州儿童及家庭事务厅
Dr. Lu’s article covers a wide range of concepts and ideas about the development of philanthropy in the China Mainland context. Essentially, the central theme of the paper is about ‘collective sharing’. Firstly, Dr. Lu attempts to argue the two types of philanthropy, both public and private, are the major development of philanthropy world-wide. He also mentioned that there are three prolonged approaches or mechanism, namely the market mechanism of labor; taxation and; philanthropy which is regarded as the third and emergent way for wealth re-distribution. I think this is a new idea because the tradition way is merely the charity, rather than philanthropy. By adopting the social origin perspective, I think such an idea is a reflection of the socio-economic development in Mainland China nowadays. Secondly, he also captures such latest development of philanthropy and new foundation as ‘revolution’. In fact, the foundation ordinance in China was first introduced in 2004 and currently there are also provincial or regional regulations in different cities such as Wuhan, Guangzhou, and Shanghai. All these new regional regulations are evidences of the revolution. By comparing these regulations in details, we can easily understand the underpinning these government policies. Thirdly, he also subdivides two types of revolution, namely the traditional one and the contemporary one. I particularly find this attribution is very interesting as the target, methods and the impact are very much different (according to Dr. Lu). He further attributes the contemporary revolution is due to the ethical and moral concerns of the privileged rich people and aiming at fighting for the life (which is much more than corporate social responsibility). In a nutshell, I find the underpinning logic and argument of Dr. Lu’s masterpiece deeply provides the philosophical basis of involving rich people in the philanthropy, particularly when the development is at the crossroad.
卢博士的文章涵盖了慈善事业在中国大陆发展的许多概念和想法。从根本上讲，本文的中心主题是“共享”。首先，卢博士试图讲解两种慈善——公共和私人慈善，它们是全世界慈善的主要发展方向。他还提到，有三种长期的方法或机制来进行财富重分配，也就是劳动市场机制、税收、与被视为第三种及新生的分配方式——慈善。我认为这是一个新的想法，因为传统的观念仅仅是做善事，而不是慈善。从社会根源的角度审视，我认为这样的想法反映了当下中国大陆社会经济的发展。其次，他也抓住了当今慈善事业和新基金会的最新进展是一种“革命”的表现。实际上，中国在2004年首次推出了基金会条例，目前在武汉、广州、上海等城市，也有一些省级和区域性的法规。所有这些新的区域性法规都是这场革命的证明。通过比较这些法规，我们可以很容易地理解政府政策的基础。最后，他还将革命分为两种类型，即传统和当代。我觉得这种对目标的归类是很有趣的，根据卢博士的看法，这两种革命不管在标的、方法和影响上，都是不同的。他进一步解释说，当代革命是由于特权和有钱人在伦理道德问题的担忧以及为他们的生活奋斗（这远超过企业的社会责任）。总之，我觉得卢博士杰出的逻辑和论据已经深深地为富人从事慈善提供了哲学基础，特别是当下正处于发展的十字路口。
Dr. Lu’s comments speak to the need for those who are wealthy to engage in the “revolutionary” practice of voluntarily helping others who are less fortunate. He also recognizes the role philanthropy can play in promoting a more harmonious society. The importance of sharing wealth is a value that is universally cited in the moral teachings of every culture. Dr. Lu has become a pioneer in China, promoting and practicing the virtue of philanthropy. It is a great benefit for him to also share his views with the community of leaders and citizens committed to the well-being of every member of our global society.

卢博士的评论谈到了在帮助穷人这个富有“革命”性质的实践中，有必要让富人自发的参与进来。他也意识到慈善事业可以起到促进社会和谐的作用，在所有的文化道德教育中都强调了共享财富的重要性。卢博士已经成为推动、开展中国慈善事业的先锋。对致力于全世界各民族康荣的公益社团领导和民众分享他的观点无疑是很有益的。
Dr. Lu is a visionary leader who has made strong contributions to the advancement of Chinese philanthropy. This work contains his insightful reflections on philanthropy in China, and helps us to understand its dynamics, developments, and possible future directions. His writing reflects a breadth of first-hand experience, as well as a strong theoretical foundation. Dr. Lu has presented his compelling outlook on the nature of charity and its relationship with modern conceptualizations of ownership. In doing so, he has helped to shape our modern approach to philanthropy in an increasingly globalized world.

Richard L. Edwards, Ph.D.
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Chancellor, New Brunswick
Rutgers University
I enjoyed reading the thoughtful short essay, "Philanthropy and Collective Sharing" by Dr. Dezhi Lu. It reminded me of the important role philanthropy has played in the US and intensified my interest in the development of philanthropy in China.

Irwin Garfinkel, Ph.D.

Mitchell I. Ginsberg
Professor of Contemporary
Urban Problems

School of Social Work
Columbia University
Dr. Lu Dezhi has offered a thoughtful analysis of the role of contemporary philanthropy in societies that rely on free markets for some or all economic production and private property as an incentive for risk-taking and innovation. Philanthropy, the product of free markets and private property, is a necessary source of capital for the common good. Dr. Lu suggests this can produce revolutionary results. I share his confidence in the power of philanthropy that is strategic in its goals and well managed in practice.

Stephen Heintz
President
Rockefeller Brothers Fund

卢德之博士提出了现代慈善事业在依靠一些或全部自由市场的经济生产以及以私有财产作为冒险和创新动机的社会中的作用的深刻分析。慈善是自由市场和私有财产的产物，是为共同利益的必要且最重要的来源。卢博士表示，这可以产生革命的效果。我赞同他对慈善力量的信心，慈善力量在其目标和良好管理的实践上是具有战略意义的。
Dr. Dezhi Lu article goes straight to the heart of the philosophy of philanthropy. And he puts it in an easy to understand context for those who have been raised in a society that is now both familiar with communist and capitalist thought. In a communist society, where the collective is paramount, paradoxically the individual has little need to think much about the welfare of his fellow man since that is the task of the state. But as Dr. Lu points out, when private ownership gives excess wealth to an individual, a "new revolution" takes place, and a Spirit of Capital directs that individual to willingly share his/her wealth in a socially responsible way.

卢德之博士的文章直击慈善理念的核心。他采用平易近人的文字将此传播给生长于一个既熟悉共产主义又熟悉资本主义思想的社会中的人们。在共产主义社会中，集体是最重要的。与此相对，个人不需要考虑太多他们同胞的福祉，因为这是国家的责任。但是正如卢博士所言，当私人所有制赋予个人多余的财富，一个“新的革命”从而诞生。资本精神倡导个人自愿的以一种具有社会责任感的方式分享他们的财富。
Dr. Dezhi Lu, in his article “Philanthropy and Collective Sharing”, highlighted that philanthropy can achieve the ideal of collective sharing, philanthropic redistribution is voluntary, and maintaining a strong sense of mission and moral character is most important for benefactors to have the willingness to share their wealth. Thus, in Dr. Lu’s concern, the actual purpose of “philanthropy as collective sharing” is to work for tackling the causes of poverty and many other social problems, which in turn are able to improve the quality of life for all citizens. Consequently, I believe firmly that Dr. Lu will sides with the concept that philanthropy attempts to solve those social problems at the root causes whereas charity underscores relieving the pains of social problems. Moreover, Dr. Lu mentioned that contemporary revolution concerning philanthropy is practiced by the wealthy, especially the type of the “Bill Gates Revolution”, in promoting the ideal of the willingness by the privileged to distribute wealth. This is a real expression of the modern philanthropy that the diversity and dynamism of the third sector or the nonprofit sector has played a significant role of impressive contribution to philanthropy. This is also why “foundations” are often named the leading benefactors in promoting organized philanthropy, which are capable of reinventing themselves in regular to cure emergent social problems.

Yu-Yuan Kuan, Ph.D.
Professor
National Chung Cheng University
卢德之博士，在他的《慈善就是共享》文章中，强调慈善是实现集体共享的理念，慈善再分配是志愿性的，以及维持强烈的使命感和道德品质对于慈善家自愿共享他们财富至关重要。因此，卢博士认为“慈善就是集体共享”的实际目标是致力于解决导致贫困和其他社会问题的因素，从而提高所有公民的生活品质。因此，我坚信卢博士将支持慈善是在试图从根本上解决这些问题，而慈善是在强调缓解社会问题带来的痛苦的观点。此外，卢博士提到当代慈善革命是由富人发起的，特别是类似“比尔·盖茨式的革命”，并推动高社会地位并有雄厚财力者自愿地进行财富再分配的理念。这是对于现代慈善特征的真实表达。因为在现代慈善中，具有多样性和活力的第三部门或非盈利部门在对慈善事业的贡献中扮演了非常重要的角色。此即说明为什么不基金会总是被视为是主要的捐款人，以此推动有组织的慈善活动。有组织的慈善有能力在日常应对突发社会问题中重塑自身。
Dr. Lu Dezhi is one of the pioneers of modern philanthropy in China, not just as a generous practitioner but also as a conceptualizer. He touches on a basic dilemma of modernization – how to stimulate economic growth and wealth-creation while ameliorating and correcting inequities that are so often a part of the growth process. His insightful essay on “Philanthropy and Collective Sharing” points out that the operation of markets can redistribute wealth as can appropriate public taxing and spending policies. But philanthropy is an essential third avenue toward the collective sharing of wealth.

Dr. Lu argues that philanthropists are revolutionaries, voluntarily sharing their wealth. To do so, they must have the passion to create wealth in the first place as well as a sense of a social mission. They also must have a theory, which he calls the “Spirit of Capital,” to stimulate both the creation and the sharing of wealth. In this remarkably succinct but comprehensive essay, he also points out that the lack of supportive policies, regulations and infrastructure for philanthropy can jeopardize its effective operation and compromise the moral revolution he advocates. Through his support for and work with the China-US Strategic Philanthropy Partnership, he is seeking to strengthen the policy and institutional support base for philanthropy.

Dr. Lu refers to the revolution by those who have created wealth and are willing to share it as a “Bill Gates” revolution. In doing so, he not only honors Mr. Gates as a social revolutionary, but also makes it clear that the revolution knows no ethnic or national boundaries. His is a call for an international revolution to create a more prosperous and just society for the world as a whole.
卢德之博士是中国现代慈善事业的先驱之一。他不仅仅是一位慷慨的实践者，还是一位理念家。他注意到现代化的一项基本困境——如何在刺激经济增长和创造财富的同时，改善和纠正常常由于发展造成的不公平。他在其有深刻见解的《慈善就是共享》一文中指出，市场的操作可以同合理的公共税收和支出政策一样进行财富的再分配。但是慈善事业是通往财富集体共享的第三条重要道路。

卢博士认为，慈善家也是革命家，他们自愿分享自己的财富。要做到这一点，他们首先需要有创造财富的激情以及社会使命感。他们还必须具备一种理念，他称之为“资本精神”，以刺激财富的创造和共享。在这篇言简意赅的文章中，他还指出，缺乏政策、法规和基础设施的支持可能危及慈善的运作并削弱他所提倡的道德革命。通过支持并参与“中美战略慈善伙伴关系”的工作，他正努力寻求加强慈善发展的支持性政策与体制基础。

卢博士所指的革命，是那些已经创造了财富并愿意共享财富的人们的“比尔·盖茨式”的革命。他这么说，不仅推崇盖茨先生作为社会革命者的贡献，同时也清楚的表示这种革命是不分种族和国界的。他呼吁一场国际性的革命，从而能在全球范围内创造出一个更加繁荣和公正的社会。
Modern philanthropy has emerged as a part of the reforms in China that have released the vitalities of the private sector. Dr. Dezhi Lu has been at the forefront of thinking about the role of philanthropy in contemporary China. This piece addresses what he sees as the revolution of the willing redistribution of wealth by the privileged. He stresses the need for moral character. For anyone interested in the thinking of major philanthropists in China and their thinking on giving more broadly, this piece is compelling reading.
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Director of Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

安东尼·赛奇博士
阿什民主治理和创新研究中心主任
肯尼迪政治学院
哈佛大学
Dr. Dezhi Lu proposes Modern Philanthropy as the new “revolution” through which those who have become wealthy willingly distribute some of their assets to those who might otherwise stage another type of revolution. He goes on to say that this Modern Philanthropy must be guided by a philosophy or a “theory” which in his case is the “Spirit of Capital”- an ethical framework he has developed and described in previous writings. He says that “Modern revolutionaries must be able to create wealth, adopt social responsibility, and embody strong moral character.”

Dr. Lu’s prescription for the Modern Revolutionary is, in my view, necessary but not sufficient to achieve his aim of preventing traditional revolution. Modern Revolutionaries must also through their philanthropy provide ladders of opportunity that allow individuals with needs to be able to climb the ladder from poverty to economic and social well-being. While Dr. Lu has not stated this explicitly in his article, his actions through the work of the Huamin Charity Foundation have demonstrated this principle. Modern Philanthropy must not only help correct the acute economic inequality that can result from a private ownership society it must also help correct the chronic inequality of opportunity that prevents people from escaping from economic and social circumstances that trap them in a culture of poverty. This is the only way to avoid the type of destructive revolution that pits the “have-nots” against the “haves” to the benefit of no one.
卢德之博士提出现代慈善作为一种新型“革命”，通过它那些已经富裕的人自愿将自己的一部分财产捐献给那些可能导致另一种革命的人。他继而提出这种现代慈善必须基于一种哲学或“理论”的指导，他认为即是“资本精神”——一个已经在之前的著作中阐述和发展了的伦理框架。他指出“现代革命者必须可以创造财富，有社会责任感，并体现出强烈的道德特质。”

卢博士为现代革命所开出的处方，在我看来，是必要的，但对于达到他设定的避免传统革命这一目标还不够。现代的革命者还必须通过他们的慈善项目为有需要的个人提供可以从贫困到经济社会富足的机会的阶梯。尽管卢博士并没有在他的文章中提出这一点，但是他通过华民慈善基金会所做工作已经证明了这一原则。现代慈善不仅要帮助解决产生于私有制社会的严重社会不平等，还必须帮助纠正长期性机会的不平等，它也必须帮助纠正慢性不平等的机会，让人们从贫困经济和社会环境所造成的贫困文化陷阱里逃脱出来。这才是唯一避免“穷人”和“富人”之间的对谁都无益的破坏性革命的途径。
Dr. Dezhi Lu’s thoughts on “Philanthropy and Collective Sharing” are both reflective and thought provoking. His discussion of a “three pronged approach” to the re-distribution of wealth in society identifies those elements of activity in the business, government and philanthropic communities that influence systemic reform for the common good of society. These approaches need not act in an exclusive manner. Philanthropy, due to its unfettered flexibility to strategically invest in socio-economical causes, can play a catalytic role in moving the agenda of its partners in government and the business sector by partnering with those sectors to achieve mutual goals.

卢德之博士关于“慈善就是共享”的观点既具反思性，又发人深省。他关于社会财富重新分配的“三管齐下”的讨论，指出了影响社会公共利益服务的系统变革的要件，即商业、政府和慈善社群。这些方法并不相互排斥。慈善，由于其在策略投资社会经济领域无限制的灵活性，可以在推动其与政府和商业领域合作并达到共赢中发挥催化作用。
Dr. Lu views philanthropy as a modern “revolution.” That philanthropy achieves wealth redistribution in the three-pronged approach is an intriguing premise. Peter Buffett recently presented a very different view of global philanthropy in the New York Times on “The Charitable-Industrial Complex.” I would love to see the two debate their positions. The paper stimulates other questions including the role of the not-for-profit sector, and whether philanthropy can be thought of as a form of revolution. This paper is thoughtful, and will stimulate important discussion about philanthropy in contemporary China and in a global context.

Lynn Videka
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Noting that income inequality is a driver of societal instability and revolution, Dr. Dezhi Lu builds on classic historical thought to frame philanthropy as one of three critical ingredients (along with an unfettered labor market and tax and financial policies) of an enlightened society to help redistribute income, narrow the gulf between rich and poor, and further harmonious progress. Dr. Dezhi Lu proceeds to define philanthropy as collective sharing. He points out that it is the new revolution with a theoretical underpinning he describes as the Spirit of Capital. His profound and insightful remarks provide a framework to understand a Chinese cultural view of philanthropy that resonates globally and integrates humanitarian concerns with societal stability and progress. Dr. Lu’s remarks and his own work reflect a significant contribution to philanthropy on an international basis.

卢德之博士指出所得不平等是导致社会不稳定和革命的因素，他在这一经典历史认识的基础上，提出慈善是文明社会促进收入分配，缩小贫富差距，推动和谐社会发展进程的三大关键因素之一（其他两项为自由劳动力市场和税收及财政政策）。卢德之博士将慈善进一步定义为一种集体共享。他指出这是一个以资本精神为基础的新兴革命。他以深刻而精辟的语言提供了一个分析基于中国文化，与世界主流观点共鸣，并将人道主义关怀与社会稳定及发展相结合的慈善观点的框架。卢博士的论述及他本人所做的工作对全球的慈善发展有着突出的贡献。