Harmonizing Sentiments: Philanthropy and the American Political Imagination

Presented by Michael S. Joyce

President & CEO
Americans for Community and Faith-Centered Enterprise

March 28, 2003

Waldemar A. Nielsen Issues in Philanthropy Seminar Series
Georgetown University

Center for Public & Nonprofit Leadership
3240 Prospect Street, NW, Lower Level
Washington, DC 20007
P: (202) 687-0500 / F: (202) 687-0580
http://cpnl.georgetown.edu

It is a signal honor to be here today to take part in the Waldemar Nielsen Issues in Philanthropy Seminar Series. It is also an interesting time to be in the nation's capital. Our character as a nation is being sorely tested. But that character is also on display for all the world to see. As we gather here today, hundreds of journalists embedded with coalition forces are reporting from the field of battle with minimal restrictions. As what may be the largest humanitarian operation in history goes forward, expansive plans for the post war reconstruction of Iraq are underway. Whatever you think about the conflict over Iraq and the war against terrorism, there is something profoundly moving about living in this free country, this *transparent* great power.

This transparency is unprecedented, I think. We Americans debate, march in protest, editorialize, vote on policy, hold a national election, vote again – and that's just the last six months. You can make a case that no other nation that has inherited the mantle of great power has ever functioned in such an open and deliberative way. Ours does, and all too often, we take it for granted.

We take some other things for granted as well. The man for whom this lecture series is named, Wally Nielsen, was a figure in one of the most impressive philanthropic projects in history, the Marshall Plan. The United States helped the ravaged countries of post-war Europe to their feet. Powerful as we were, unscathed as our industrial infrastructure was, we did not exploit this opportunity for empire building. University of Virginia historian Stephen A. Schuker has described the role of the United States in the Marshall Plan as "the crucial margin that made European self-help possible."[1]

I like that formulation, and not just because it is a balanced response to the ongoing debate about how significant the Marshall Plan really was to European recovery and its implications for current circumstances. I like it because it is a clear statement about what constitutes effective assistance to others, whether foreign or domestic, global or local. Providing "the crucial margin that makes self-help possible" is the fundamental idea that has driven the philanthropies with which I have been associated. Against the toxic idea of dependency it brings the tonic of human empowerment.

If I leave you with anything of value today it will be a better understanding of the profoundly American and profoundly spiritual nature of this idea. The American founders wrote documents that soared with an appreciation of the divine origin of the human endowment, but they simultaneously designed a plan for government built on a system of checks and balances meant to thwart many a human impulse. Did they hold self-contradictory views?

In an 1825 letter to Henry Lee, Thomas Jefferson wrote that in crafting the Declaration of Independence with its "self-evident truths," he merely sought to give expression to "the harmonizing sentiments" of the day, setting forth "the common sense of the subject." What he wrote, he said, was simply "an expression of the American mind."[2] The American historian Wilfred McClay recently put it this way:

> *The Declaration was mainly a press release to the world which attempted to put into words what most Americans already believed and embodied in their way of life.*[3]

This press release to the world was a message to history itself. It established an azimuth for human equality that lifted our gaze upward. The American experiment was to be a new laboratory for equality and freedom, but it was neither the false equality of the commune nor the jaded freedom of the bordello. Its promise combined idealism and realism – both comprehension of the God-given nobility of human beings and recognition that human imperfectibility makes all utopias impossible. We were bequeathed a republic, as Benjamin Franklin soberly put it, if we could "keep it."

To the extent that the self-evident truths were grounded in human nature and universal in scope, the American experiment was easy to understand, but difficult to sustain, owing to persistent human frailties and passions.

Recognition of this non-contradictory contradiction is central to an understanding of the grant making strategy of the foundations that I was associated with over the past quarter century. Our ideas formed our methods: owing to the limitations of human nature, we understood our capacity to change the world was very much restricted. If the "fire in the minds of men," the idea of ordered liberty, is to burn with a steady flame, it can only do so when it is fueled by a political imagination whose chief elements are properly mixed, and, make no mistake, the mixture must include freedom and virtue, prudence and limits. The notion of "political imagination" comes from Irving Kristol's observation:

> *It is ideas that establish and define in men's minds the categories of the politically possible and the politically impossible, the desirable and the undesirable, the tolerable and the intolerable. And, what is more ultimately real, politically, than the structure of man's political imagination?*[4]

Here again is Kristol:

> *The truth is that ideas are all important. The massive and seemingly solid institutions of any society – the economic institutions, the political institutions, and the religious institutions are always at the mercy of the ideas in the heads of the people who populate these institutions. The leverage of ideas is so immense that a slight change in the intellectual climate can and will – perhaps slowly but nevertheless inexorably -- twist a familiar institution into an unrecognizable shape.*[5]

It is no accident that the mode of philanthropy we rediscovered at the John M. Olin and Bradley Foundations came after decades of such twisting of familiar institutions.[6] Much of this twisting was not only unintentional, but also the result of the best of intentions. I speak particularly of the War on Poverty. The Great Society came in tandem with a twisting toward which I cannot be as charitable – the great revolution in personal and sexual mores that has wreaked havoc on the two great private, civic, institutions of society: church and family.

The Great Society drew its moral force from a simple, formulaic proposition: that in our abundant society the political imagination could no longer tolerate a significant percentage of the American people living in economically and socially squalid conditions.

What the architects of the welfare state did not imagine was that the application of its bandages would freeze the wounds as they were rather than heal them. The presence of physical poverty would be unintentionally transformed into a *culture* of poverty. Housing projects might be built and food provided, but neither homes nor meals would be established. People who were not working would be, in effect, paid not to work or to seek work. Add to this the cultural combustibles of the sexual revolution and you had, as we still have, a formula for family breakdown whose real poverty must be measured in terms economics alone can only suggest.

A few days ago, God took Daniel Patrick Moynihan from our midst. He was in every way a towering figure. He left behind a treasury of insight and infrastructure both concrete and intellectual. His influence on public life will be treasured for generations. One of his most acute observations was that the political assumptions underlying "The War on Poverty" constituted "maximum feasible misunderstanding." As the consequences of such misunderstandings became increasingly apparent, many policy intellectuals began to rethink the premises of the Great Society.

At Olin and later at Bradley, our overarching purpose was to use philanthropy to support a war of ideas to defend and help recover the political imagination of the founders: the self-evident truth, that rights and worth are a legacy of the creator – not the result of some endless revaluing of values. We attempted to demonstrate that these principles are as valid today as they were in 1776 and 1787; that they have not been repealed by events or by the presence of more sophisticated ideas or sweeping policy programs. We sought to champion the "bourgeois virtues" embodied in the "harmonizing sentiments" of the American political imagination: to take humans as they actually are and always have been – neither gods nor beasts – capable of virtue and

enlightenment yet also of sin and selfishness. We meant to make Nietzsche spin in his grave, like a top. And, as for his intellectual progeny, well, we were firm in our resolve to meet them in the full light of the free marketplace of ideas.

The John M. Olin Foundation and The Bradley Foundation provided consistent, long-term support for the core institutions of the conservative intellectual infrastructure. Grantees included most of mainstream conservatism's policy research institutes, journals, scholars, academic programs, media and cultural initiatives covering both foreign and domestic policy.

Whereas John M. Olin's mandate more naturally oriented that Foundation's programs toward intellectual activity without regard to place, Bradley's deep family and company roots in Milwaukee caused it to focus much of its program in that city, most prominently on the issue of parental choice in education. Since the mid-1980's it has been a centerpiece of the Foundation's reform agenda.

Starting in 1993, the Foundation began to distill the lessons from school choice into a theoretical concept which it labeled "The New Citizenship," and to search for areas beyond school choice where the conception might also apply. This led us into welfare reform and civic renewal through faith based initiatives.

We understood and acted upon the principle that when the self-interest of people is rightly understood and encouraged, they are naturally inclined toward family, community and religion – where virtue is most effectively nurtured. There was no genius in this exercise, only intuition and a little reflection. T.S. Eliot put the process well in one of his "Four Quartets" – "Little Giddings" – where he remarked that "the end of the journey will be to arrive at the place from where you started, and see it for the first time."

As I implied earlier, the work of Olin and Bradley can and should be seen as philanthropy that provides the "crucial margin that makes self-help possible." Crucial margins are not glorious things. But they are necessary things. In the scheme of a lifetime, the man fallen among robbers who was aided by the Good Samaritan probably owed much more to the love of others – his parents, his neighbors, his rabbi – than he did to the man who interrupted his own journey to assist him with garments and lodging. That man helped put his neighbor back on his feet -- and went on his way. That is a portrait of philanthropy from a very great authority on the subject. It is philanthropy that aids but does not own the person helped.

At Bradley in particular, we came upon not just a traveler, but entire communities that had been allowed to sink into the ditch. We did not have to look far for neighborhoods that epitomized the whole. We did not need to think globally. Our globe instead was this quintessentially American and spiritual idea: human beings have innate worth and can only flourish in conditions of freedom where the connection between resources, opportunities and consequences is intimate. Given the chance to choose what is better for themselves and best for their children and their communities, they will, more often than not, choose wisely.

We pursued this idea systematically, and I will describe that effort in a moment, but let me begin with an illustration. On August 30, 1995, I had the privilege of speaking from the pulpit of Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God in Christ – the largest African American congregation in Milwaukee. If you think that public policy is a dry-as-dust matter of distributing social assets or rewarding allies, you ought to have been at my side that evening. The city was in turmoil, parents were distraught, and the *New York Times* was watching. One week earlier, the Wisconsin Supreme Court had issued an injunction against the Milwaukee school choice program, denying thousands of poor families an alternative to the city's failing public schools just days before the beginning of the school year.

I am an Irish Catholic from Cleveland with a white-collar resume and an academic streak, but on that summer night in Milwaukee we were, all of us, just citizens and parents, united in the recognition that these roles are our highest callings. I came to Holy Redeemer to announce

that the Bradley Foundation was awarding $1 million to the emergency fund of Parents Advancing Values in Education. Forty percent of the low-income parents at Holy Redeemer had children affected by the sudden loss of school vouchers. The Bradley Foundation was but one partner among many in an effort to privately fund these parents' choices for their children. Let me state quite clearly, because it goes to the heart of the harmonizing sentiments that are my theme today, that we were no more important a partner that night than the more than 300 donors, who spontaneously sent gifts and hope to replace what, so abruptly, the Wisconsin Supreme Court had taken away.

The *New York Times'* editorial page looked at Milwaukee and saw an issue of church-state relations. But a *Times'* reporter who was there saw something else. He saw Joanne Curran, a divorced mother of four who only wanted her daughter to continue attending kindergarten at All Saints School. "I don't think they're teaching the kids in the public schools," Mrs. Curran said. "I don't think there's enough discipline, and I want religion in the school. I want to stay here [at All Saints] as long as it takes." Sedgwick Daniels, pastor of Holy Redeemer, weighed the week's events and concluded, as I did, that the legal setback in Madison was actually an emotional victory for parental school choice.

One critic of the Milwaukee program, a local professor, illustrates the difference in *ideas* that separates advocates and opponents of vouchers, and fundamentally turns out not to be a difference over the meaning and intent of the First Amendment. The professor called vouchers a "hoax being perpetrated on poor children of color, who are being used to shift money to the Catholic schools, who are the biggest beneficiaries." This professor's opinion represents the dominant philosophy of many on the left. He saw a conspiracy instead of a family. He could not conceive that Joanne Curran's judgment about what is best for her six-year-old daughter could be correct and worthy of respect. Her right to spend her education dollars at the school of her choice was illegitimate to him not because her daughter might receive religious instruction but because she was not competent to recognize the difference between a hoax and a hope.

We felt otherwise. It is one and the same idea that spurred our decision to engage in this short-term rescue mission in 1995 and our much longer-term mission to promote the revival of civic institutions and a new citizenship: individuals coming together in communities as proud, self-governing, personally responsible citizens, capable of running their own lives and affairs, freed from the paternalistic oversight and interference of bureaucratic elites.

The setback that drew me to Holy Redeemer was but one of many on the road to parental school choice – there will no doubt be more – but it demonstrates the patience of the approach we took and the abiding faith in the possibilities of active citizenship, even in the poorest communities, that under girded our giving philosophy.

Each issue we engaged evinced this core principle of belief in the capacity of the people for self-governance, but we knew that ideas that can meaningfully change public policy undergo seasons of development. Susan Mitchell, an education policy analyst who regards empowerment of parents in education as essential, has described Bradley's mode of operation well. We knew, she says, that "every movement goes through several phases. With school choice, there's been a political war, then a legal war, and finally a regulatory war. Some of these are ongoing. The people at the foundation understand that this is a long-term effort that requires involvement at every stage."[7] The only addition I would make to her account is that these phases are often repeating, with each step fought anew across the intellectual, political, legal, and regulatory plains.

Because it is ideas that matter, our efforts almost invariably began with the seeds of intellectual argument. Ours was an act of discovery, not of creation. We certainly believed in finding and funding the best conservative scholars to make the case in journals, magazines, and books. But we also sought out liberal individuals or institutions willing to rethink the assumptions of their enterprises when the unintended consequences of the policies they advocated became apparent. Often the "conservative" message we strove to advance came from the pen of a liberal having second thoughts. The '60s and '70s were dizzying

decades in which top-down bureaucratic programs were enacted by the dozens, and it was only a matter of time before honest, left-leaning scholars began to measure their vision against the vectors of change they had unleashed.

For Bradley that meant an opening gambit in school choice that came with one of our smallest grants in this area, a $75,000 stipend that helped John Chubb and Terry Moe write their ground-shifting 1990 book *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools.* The *Chicago Tribune* rightly observed that this book "rocked the education world," with its scholarly and compelling plea for education reform through school choice. It helped in no small degree that *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* was published by the Brookings Institution, one of America's stiff-upper-lip think tanks. I well recall that one of the turning points in galvanizing leaders of the minority community in Milwaukee for parental school choice was a debate featuring Chubb and Moe in 1989. Old Right conservatives might have held this debate over cigars at Milwaukee's University Club. This one was held at the Milwaukee Area Technical College, and it served to underscore the significance of African American and Latino activism for parental school choice that persists to this day.

There is no respect like grudging respect from a political opponent, because an idea must have special force to pull against the tugs of prejudice and ideology. David Callahan wrote in *The Nation* that we at Bradley were "a small-time player [that] annually gives out less money than the Ford Foundation gives out in a month." Despite this, he wrote, Bradley became "a major force in the world of conservative policy research and ideas." Left-wing authors Jean Stefancic and Richard Delgado put it this way in their book *No Mercy:* conservative foundations "seem to have a gift for thematic coherence"; as a result, they "use resources more precisely, concentrate [their] efforts on a few targets at a time, and make various campaigns reinforce and dovetail with one another."

We were as the title of Sally Covington's study for the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy put it: Moving A Public Policy Agenda. People for the American Way attributed our success to this: "conservative foundations have overt political and ideological agendas and invest comprehensively to promote a given issue on every front." Covington came closer to accuracy when she wrote, "These foundations bring a clarity of vision and strong political intention to their grant making."

These are high compliments. As the 68th largest foundation in the country in terms of annual giving at the time, we had little room at Bradley but to choose a handful of targets. It is more accurate to say perhaps that these targets chose us. Once you have recognized the simple truth, as Tocqueville underscored time and again, that the American experiment rests on a specific appraisal of the individual's capacity, policies, programs and projects that convert citizens into clients and free men and women into victims of circum-stance exceed the undesirable and become the intolerable.

In a 1994 interview, Wally Nielsen was asked to comment on the purported success attributed to our efforts. Nielsen said that the liberal, progressive foundations "don't have a really sharp political program that they are seriously pursuing. They are kind of bumbling along. But, the neo-conservatives are much more consciously, purposefully, and in a focused way trying to advance their ideas."[8]

I agree with Wally that while purposefully advancing ideas accounted in no small part for whatever successes we enjoyed, in my opinion, it was the nature and content of the ideas themselves that was the defining factor. Because the ideas we supported were in basic harmony with the political imaginations of our fellow citizens, they did not require colossal projects to rearrange the human condition for their implementation. They did require a trust in the common sense and competence of ordinary citizens. The liberal progressive project constantly claims to exalt and champion the "little guy," but it will often not trust him with what little he has. Philanthropy faithful to the harmonizing sentiments in contrast, honors even the smallest of dreams. And we consistently advocated a public policy that nourishes these dreams where they are planted, in the soil of the human soul.

The question is on my mind, as much as anyone's, whether the insights that fueled the Olin and Bradley foundations for the past quarter century are an interlude in the long march toward statism, or whether they will endure. Olin, of course, will not endure. In an act of fidelity to its founder's intent that is practically unimaginable for a liberal institution, Olin is spending down its endowment and now intends to make its last grants and close its doors in 2005. This decision, the philanthropic equivalent of term limits, will remove from the not-overcrowded field of conservative philanthropy a leader whose grants to key conservative entities exceeds $50 million over a recent three-year period.

Olin's planned departure will, at first at least, put an even brighter spotlight on Bradley. Last year, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of vouchers in *Zelman v. Simmons Harris*. This year the Congress, with great effort, is likely to reauthorize the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, amid fairly widespread consensus that the emphasis in this legislation on work incentives and personal responsibility has been vital in encouraging millions of Americans to break the shackles of dependency and enter the mainstream economy. Bradley was present at the creation of both of these initiatives, funding scholars, underwriting conferences, subsidizing think tanks, commissioning polls, finding attorneys to defend legislative enactments, and funding objective assessments to cement these reforms into place.

Bradley can also lay claim to a prominent role in the centerpiece reform of this administration, President Bush's community- and faith-based initiative. This White House is focused not on reinventing government, but on rediscovering charity. As the President put it so well in his Inaugural Address two years ago, "Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools. Yet compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government." The Administration has forthrightly moved ahead on the intellectual, political and regulatory front to establish this initiative and to make Charitable Choice a cornerstone of national social policy. Legislation is needed to fully accomplish this goal and the next five years will be critical. In the long run, however, private philanthropy can do much more than government to advance the march of what the President has called the "armies of compassion."

Still, the pressure to return to or expand centralized, top down, statist approaches continues, however, particularly in areas where neo-conservative ideas have scarcely begun to take hold. Included on this roster are such topics as the environment, health policy, international civil society, and free labor. Just as important, the most potent enemy of civil society, social and ethical relativism, has lost little of its potency in the shaping of elite institutions, from the academy and the arts, to the media, entertainment, and the judicial system. For many conservatives, pessimism is normative: they see it as the fate of institutions, from Harvard and Princeton to Hollywood and the Ford Foundation to drift into liberalism. To adapt Flannery O'Connor's phrase, "Everything that rises must go left."

This was certainly the conclusion that animated Henry Ford II's dramatic decision to resign from the board of the Ford Foundation in 1977. Ford was then the country's largest foundation, with $2.3 billion in assets, and Henry had been a member of its board of trustees since 1943. In a calmly stated but withering letter of resignation, Ford wrote:

> *The foundation exists and thrives on the fruits of our economic system. The dividends of corporate enterprise make it all possible . . . In effect, the foundation is a creature of capitalism - a statement that, I'm sure, would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities that are the beneficiaries of the foundation's grant programs.*

Ford's resignation failed to reform Ford, but it sounded an alarm that rang in John Olin's ears and set in motion a chain of events that marked the ascendancy of a new conservative philanthropy.

The neo-conservatives whose influence emerged in the 1970s made much of the contradiction that drove Henry Ford II from the house

that his family had built. They argued that a society that lacks self-confidence to defend its principles will fall; that no system, no matter how secure it may appear, or how prosperous its economy may be, can be sustained if the ideas that fostered its creation do not remain integral to the institutions it has spawned. Irving Kristol, Michael Novak and former Secretary of the Treasury William Simon, the latter of whom assumed the leadership at Olin in the late -'70s, were in the forefront, consciously seeking to enlist American business in the war of ideas.

How fruitless an enterprise this must at first have seemed. America had survived, with deep scars, a decade in which self-loathing had become the national pastime. The radical student movement of the 1960s launched a pervasive critique of American society. Secure within ivy-covered walls, they, like the remaining trustees at Ford, used as their base the very institutions whose existence was possible only because of the system they despised. Worse, the liberal establishment proved incapable of rising to its own defense, much less to the defense of a free and enterprising society that permitted the best educated of its young people to pursue their goals, typically at someone else's expense, including the expense of young men whose SAT scores failed to earn them draft deferments.

In some respects, neo-conservatives entered the fray at a far bleaker period in our history than we inhabit now. The cultural shocks delivered at the underpinnings of American institutions came from intellectual sources that leaders in business or government were unlikely to have heard of, let alone read – Marcuse, Chomsky, Foucault, Derrida, Fannon, et al. Ideas like theirs can easily be ignored by business leaders, but if unanswered, can capture the political imaginations of the idealistic and the naïve. Bill Simon called for "a counter-intelligentsia" of those who would make a life's work of waging the war of ideas. He argued in a best selling book and in numerous articles and speeches that bad ideas surrender only to better ideas, and that waging such a war requires special skills. Simon's challenge was embraced actively by a small group of conservative and neo-conservative intellectuals and academics: If business people were unable to convince even their own children as to the morality of their enterprises, they argued, how in the world were they going to defend themselves against their elite cultural critics?

Olin and Bradley did not truly exist in their current framework when this counter-intelligentsia first crafted its response. It would be an act of enormous ingratitude on my part if I professed pessimism about our approach when the climate today for conservative philanthropy is so much more favorable. John M. Olin, and business leaders at the Allen-Bradley Company in Milwaukee, heard that call 25 years ago. Today we have the benefit of the history of the decisions they made, and of two decades of extraordinary economic expansion – despite the dot.com debacle – to furnish a whole new generation of philanthropists centered on the principles of the American founding.[9]

Do I see this happening? In many ways, yes.

First, the war of ideas has been joined, and wars of this kind do not readily subside. There are a number of independent think tanks, journals of influence, magazines and fellowships that have established their own roots and will continue to generate challenging ideas and to promote scholars who can put the best intellectual foot forward.

Second, there are a number of encouraging trends in the foundation world. For a generation of foundation officials the top down funding approach was a favored model for grant making: experts design and implement programs of service for needy clients. Many in foundation circles have come to regard such arrangements as ineffectual. Top down funding tends to produce an unwanted sclerosis of bureaucracy, monopoly and politicization. They often result in the unintended consequence of inducing a culture of passivity and dependency on the part of the intended beneficiaries. One sees numerous efforts in organized philanthropy favoring recipient driven service delivery whether through vouchers or other instruments. The new focus on encouraging passive clients to embrace active citizenship is a very welcome development in philanthropy.

Moreover, many foundations have embraced the concept of reviving civil society through support for stable organizations within communities that build social, economic and political capital. Many recognize as well that the cash entitlement philosophy that dominated welfare programs created unwelcome habits of immediate gratification. In 1986, a decade before the Welfare Reform Act, Bradley supported a working seminar at Marquette University that produced a statement on the corrosive impact of self-destructive behaviors among welfare recipients. Key Democratic administration appointees Franklin Raines, Robert Reischauer, and Alice Rivlin endorsed this statement. Few foundations can any longer avert their gaze from the nexus between bundles of these behaviors and the persistence of a culture of dependency afflicting far too many of our brothers and sisters.

Finally, more foundations are recognizing that many living in material poverty are suffering spiritual impoverishment. Some tasks of charity are so difficult that only an individual or group motivated by profound religious conviction will attempt them. President Bush's leadership has helped to fire the political imagination of private sector funders, and he has an opportunity now to fan the flame. The events of September 11, 2001 focused us all on the fragility of human life and the priority of person-to-person relationships. A number of foundations are actively encouraging faith and community-based organizations through the assembly and dissemination of information about best practices and the conduct of education and training programs, a circumstance unimaginable two decades ago.

The future of philanthropy promises to be exciting. As Henry Ford II might ruefully observe, the pre-eminence of the American economy and personal fortunes all but guarantees a continuing war of ideas over whether to preserve and enhance the system that made so many philanthropies possible. Champions of the harmonizing sentiments are active and have even established a few beachheads in the redoubts of the politically correct, particularly universities, though one must admit to a candid world that progress here is likely to remain slow.

The nation is divided on the most profound questions of political meaning. As the protests against the war in Iraq reveal, we are confronted with a new anti-Americanism at home and abroad which, as Andrew Sullivan points out is "one that simply hates American power, rather than one that posits any credible alternative." And, the "culture wars" at home persist with no resolution in sight.

For every scholar interested in extending the reform of our welfare system there is another interested in redefining the family. No institution of society is off the table in this contest between those who accept humanity as it is and those who believe the human spirit must be retooled.

We might call this a period of disharmony – but a symphony may yet emerge. For organized philanthropic foundations, there exists now a wider range of choices about the sources of the public good than there was for much of the 20th century. A race is on, and a photo finish is unlikely. Evidence is accumulating.

When the war of ideas is joined – the culture wars -- differing ideas concerning order and liberty, freedom and justice, religion and education, community and family are in open competition. For citizens in a self-governing republic, such is a generally healthy thing. Philanthropy is far too vital a thing to leave in the hands of elites remote from the works they support. Even less is philanthropy the preserve of conscious-stricken plutocrats who dabble in acts of love to salve the wounds of excess. Philanthropy is everyone's business. There is less and less room on the sidelines. You and I pass along the way to and from Samaria every day. We need but to open our eyes and see what is all around us.

Endnotes:

1. Michael J. Hogan The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947-52 (Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 17.

2. Quoted in: Harry V. Jaffa, "Are These Truths Now, or Have They Been Self-Evident?" in On Faith and Free Government, ed. Daniel C. Palm, (Lanham, MD., Rowman and Littlefield).

3. Winfred M. McClay, "America – Idea or Nation?" the Public Interest, Number 145, Fall 2001.

4. Irving Kristol, quoted in, Michael Novak On Cultivating Liberty: Reflections on Moral Ecology, ed. Brian C. Anderson (Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield, 1999).

5. Irving Kristol, "Utopianism, Ancient and Modern," Two Cheers for Capitalism, (New York: Basic Books, 1978), p. 169.

6. For a detailed discussion of these two Foundations, see: John J. Miller, Strategic Investment in Ideas, How Two Foundations Reshaped America, (Washington, D.C., the Philanthropy Roundtable, 2003).

7. For quoted material that follows, see Miller as above.

8. "Conservative Foundations and Their Activist Grantees," from Foundations in The New Era, National Center for Responsive Philanthropy September, 1995. http://www.ncrp.org/articles/jap'13.htm.

9. None of what has been described here would have been possible without the extraordinary leadership of Chairmen of these two foundations, William E. Simon at Olin, and I. Andrew "Tiny" Rader at Bradley.