Let's say that there are 4 global ketchup producers that each occupy 25% of the market: Heinz (H), America's Choice (A), Del Monte (D), and 365 (T). Let's say consumers do not differentiate between them very much. The value of all outstanding shares are $300 million for each of the ketchup companies.

In come a number of charitable investors who are interested in reducing global poverty and believe GiveDirectly is a great way to fight global poverty. So, they pool together $50 million to do a leveraged buyout of one of the ketchup producers. They go to H, and given that H realizes that he has a buyer interested in buying out the company, H demands a premium valuing the company at $350 million. However, the set of investors leak this information to A, D, and T, who are each worried that a Guiding Producer in their sector, given the lower differentiation in their sector, could dramatically reduce their value, thus starting a reverse bidding war, ending in the investors being able to acquire D for $200 mil.

Thus, the investors do a leveraged buyout supplying 25% of the funds for the acquisition, with a debt of $150 million. Post-acquisition, they advertise heavily that when you buy ketchup from D instead of H, A, or T, you help lift the extreme poor out of poverty. Given that the other competitors cannot favorably differentiate themselves, D comes to occupy 90% of the ketchup sector within 1.5 years, and the outstanding shares are valued at $1.2 billion. The investors borrow $480 million (40%) to pay off the $150 million from the leveraged buyout and direct $330 million to GiveDirectly. Over the next decade, they direct a portion of D's profits to paying off the $480 million debt. So, within 1.5 years, from $50 mil in charitable investment, they were able to get $330 million to GiveDirectly (over 6x investment). Furthermore, they have continuing income to support GiveDirectly, and an enormous asset they can use to support GiveDirectly. Furthermore, given the Efficient Market Hypothesis, once this has happened a few times, the market will be able to more quickly identify the value of the company, allowing for even faster valuation increase, shortening the time that charity funding would have to wait. Ideally, what we need to establish is that G(d) > d, where d is a quantity of direct donation to a charity and G(d) is funding which proceeds from the capitalization of a Guiding Producer with the quantity of investment d. Once we show that, in a given context, G(d) > d, billions should be available from the philanthropic sector.