— EDITED TRANSCRIPT —

HUDSON INSTITUTE's
BRADLEY CENTER FOR PHILANTHROPY AND CIVIC RENEWAL

Symposium on
VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

Wednesday, February 16, 2005
8:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.
The Ritz-Carlton, Washington, DC

Many think the key to success for conservative philanthropy is its willingness to give imaginatively and consistently, and according to a larger, coherent vision of public policy. At this symposium, a group of prominent conservative thinkers, writers, and philanthropists came together to discuss two questions: "What is the conservative vision for America today?" and "How can philanthropy best promote it?" Short texts written by some of the panelists (available online at http://pcr.hudson.org) served as a starting point for the discussion. University of Chicago Senior Lecturer and Hudson Institute Senior Fellow AMY KASS served as moderator. Keynote speaker for the luncheon discussion was PETER WEHNER, Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of Strategic Initiatives, White House.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transcript by:
Federal News Service, Washington, D.C.
Edited by Krista Shaffer, Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civic Renewal

VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

A Bradley Center Symposium

PANELISTS

Stuart Butler
Vice President, The Heritage Foundation

Linda Chavez
President, Center for Equal Opportunity

Michael Cromartie
Vice President, Ethics and Public Policy Center

Barbara Elliott
Founder and President, Center for Renewal

Pete du Pont
Board Member, Lynde & Harry Bradley Foundation

Steven Hayward
F. K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow, American Enterprise Institute

Roger Hertog
Chairman Emeritus, Manhattan Institute

Heather Higgins
President, Randolph Foundation

Peb Jackson
Executive Vice President, Saddleback Church

Robert Kagan
Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Leon Kass
Hertog Fellow, American Enterprise Institute

David Keene
Chairman, American Conservative Union

William Kristol
Editor, The Weekly Standard

Leonard Leo
Executive Vice President, The Federalist Society

Heather Mac Donald
John M. Olin Fellow, Manhattan Institute

Scott McConnell
Executive Editor, The American Conservative

Stephen Moore
President, Free Enterprise Fund

Grover Norquist
President, Americans for Tax Reform

James Piereson
Executive Director, John M. Olin Foundation

Robert Woodson, Sr.
Founder and President, National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise

VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

A Bradley Center Symposium

PANEL DISCUSSION:
What is the Conservative Vision for America Today?
8:30 – 10:00 a.m.

Introduction: William Schambra, Hudson Institute
Moderator: Amy Kass, Hudson Institute

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: Good morning. My name is Bill Schambra and I am director of the Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civic Renewal at the Hudson Institute. It's my privilege to welcome you today to our symposium entitled Philanthropy and Vision. As the name of the Center suggests, it is a proud grantee of the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, located in Milwaukee, and we're particularly honored to have with us this morning so many of the board members of the Bradley Foundation as well as their spouses and so many of the staff members who have been so important to the Center over the past two or three years.

The Center, I hope, reflects faithfully what I learned from my 10 years at the Bradley Foundation, namely that philanthropy need not discourage or ignore civic renewal, as it so often does, but rather that it can promote civic renewal by paying particular attention to the often-overlooked smaller grassroots groups that are the heart and soul of vigorous communities.

The center joins in celebrating the recipients of this year's Bradley Prizes: Ward Connerly, George Will, Robert George, and of course Heather Mac Donald, who is with us this morning as a panelist, as is Leon Kass, who was one of last year's Bradley Prize winners.

Today's symposium, entitled "Vision and Philanthropy" is, quite frankly, an experiment, and an experiment on several levels. We often hear that the key to conservatism's success in the policy world that it has the ability to get beyond a litany of isolated policy proposals and instead to offer the American people a unified, coherent vision of the public interest. This is a charge or an item of praise that we hear frequently from our friends at the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy and we're pleased to have so many of them here as well this morning.

Furthermore, we often hear that the largest conservative foundations have contributed to this success through consistent long-term support of projects furthering that coherent vision. So we thought we would put this proposition to the test: What happens when we bring together some 20 of conservatism's leading thinkers, activists and philanthropists, representing a wide range of academic disciplines and professions as well as a variety of conservative intellectual traditions, and ask them: What is this much-vaunted coherent conservative vision that we hear so much about, and how would you suggest philanthropy go about promoting it? Does, in fact, a unity

emerge from this diversity of voices? That's the first experiment whose results we will begin to witness shortly.

Lest you think that genuine discussion is unlikely under the gaze of the public and the press, I should point out that the panelists, in their writings, have already taken issue with virtually every aspect of the very premise of the conversation this morning, some noting that conservative vision is oxymoronic nonsense; some that it's way to early to talk about conservatism's success; and some that foundations have been a hindrance rather than a help to the development of healthy conservative ideas.

The second experiment today is in the format of the symposium. My mentor from AEI, Bob Goldwin, who is with us this morning, often noted that public policy conferences are typically hideously boring affairs because audiences are compelled to doze through the reading of long prepared papers, and the best part of such conferences, he often observed, is the lively and uninhibited conversation that occurs among participants outside the framework of the conference, in the hallways, in the rooms afterwards. Following his lead, our objective today is to cut to the chase, so to speak, and try to get directly to those lively conversations and to bring them into this room and out of the hallway.

A number of our panelists have prepared brief responses to the questions before us, but they will not be read aloud. They've been distributed in advance and they're available in the conference packets so that we have a solid common basis for the conversation today, but there will be no formal speeches, no formal reading. This will be a conversation, I hope, that will reach some depth and nuance because we are going to have the same panelists with us here for the next three and a half hours or so, with opportunities along the way for the audience to join in – obviously not exactly the same as the panelists. Some panelists have already told me they would be arriving late for various reasons, and some will have to leave early, but we'll have a core of folks who will be with us for the entire morning.

We're also going to dispense with long introductions of our panelists, whose biographies are also available in your packets, but we're honored and pleased to have with us today Heather Mac Donald of the Manhattan Institute; Peb Jackson of Saddleback Church – Saddleback, incidentally, is pastored by Rick Warren, who is the author of *The Purpose-Driven Life*; Michael Cromartie of the Ethics and Public Policy Center; Grover Norquist of Americans for Tax Reform; Barbara Elliott of the Center for Renewal; Bob Woodson, the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, Bob Kagan from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Jim Piereson of the John M. Olin Foundation; Linda Chavez of the Center for Equal Opportunity – she'll be joining us shortly; David Keene of the American Conservative Union; Pete du Pont of the Bradley Foundation and the National Center for Policy Analysis; Leon Kass of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and the President's Council on Bioethics; Leonard Leo of the Federalist Society; Scott McConnell of the publication, The American Conservative; Stuart Butler of the Heritage Foundation; Heather Higgins of the Randolph Foundation and the Philanthropy Roundtable; Bill Kristol, the *Weekly Standard*; Steve Hayward from AEI. Joining us shortly will be Steve Moore of the Cato Institute and the Free Enterprise Fund; and finally, Roger Hertog of Alliance Capital Management and chairman of the *New Republic*.

The part of today's proceedings that is definitely not experimental is our choice for moderator of the discussion. Amy Kass, who is our moderator, is an award-winning teacher with some 25 years of experience as a senior lecturer at the University of Chicago and is one of the most skillful seminar leaders in the land. She is editor most recently of *The Perfect Gift*, a collection of fiction and nonfiction writings designed to explore the purposes and techniques of philanthropy. We are

honored to have her as a senior scholar at Hudson, and to have her as the leader of today's discussion. And so I now turn the proceedings over to Amy Kass.

AMY KASS: Thank you very much, Bill, and thank you all for being here. Our plan for this morning is to have two separate sessions or conversations: This first will focus on the idea of the conservative vision, the second on the practice of philanthropy, or more precisely, what philanthropy should do to promote and perpetuate the conservative vision. Also, since we are already running late, let's plan to stop our conversation shortly before 10:00 and take a couple of questions from the audience before breaking at 10:15. We'll try to leave more time for questions from the audience at the end of the second session.

Reading through the short essays that were drafted for our proceedings this morning, I was especially struck by two things: First, the multiplicity of views. Looking in from the outside, as Bill Schambra has already noted, many people attribute the effectiveness and success of conservative foundations – indeed the success of conservatives generally – to a single coherent vision of the public interest that animates them: the so-called conservative vision.

To be sure, several of our panelists – judging from the short essays that they wrote in preparation for our symposium – heartily agree that this may well be the case. Indeed, one panelist went even further, suggesting that conservative foundations have been too successful, their vision of the good America too coherent. "Missing," Scott McConnell argued, "is the kind of questioning and dissident spirit that was part of conservatism in the '60s and '70s." Yet, taking my bearings from the majority of papers that were submitted, I would be hard-pressed to defend the view that all conservatives sing with one voice. I was far more struck by the multiplicity of views than by their unity, which multiplicity focused on more than strategies for foreign policy. This made me wonder whether the conservative coalition is really as "low-maintenance" as Grover Norquist would have us think, or whether its goals are really – to quote Grover again – "complimentary and self-reinforcing."

But second, and arguably even more fundamental, I was struck by the radical nature of some of the suggestions. Again, as Bill Schambra has already noted, several people expressed skepticism about the very locution "conservative vision," arguing that it is essentially an oxymoron, "bespeaking," as Steve Hayward put it, "imaginary worlds shaped by ideology and the will to power."

But consider Steve Hayward's own suggestion about what should be done: "Roll back the Progressive era." Consider, too, some of Stephen Moore's challenges: "Topple the educational blob." "Seize control of the next generation of wealth." "Create 'do tanks,' not think tanks." These suggestions, as well as those made in the same spirit by others, seem far more radical than they do conservative.

In his submission, Jim Piereson reminded us that, contrary to the image of conservatism as the doctrine of caution and gradualism, quote, "Conservatives owe many of their modern achievements to their willingness to act boldly, to break with precedent, and to take great risks with policy." And it sounds like this was not only true in the past and holding in the present, but that it is being positively advocated as a strategy for the future.

So I'm wondering, as did Jim Piereson, what it is that conservatives want to conserve. What really are you and your institutions working to conserve? Let's start with that question and then take the conversation where it goes. What really are you and your institutions working to conserve?

HEATHER HIGGINS: I got away with not having to write anything so I might as well jump in first. I think that the idea of conserving for its own sake is in fact a misnomer, that American conservatism is in fact quite different; that if we are conserving a thing it is because we revere the dead and we think that there is wisdom in lives before us and maybe lessons to be learned. Chesterton said that, "Tradition is the democracy of the dead." And so there is an inherent reluctance to move too quickly before we seriously consider what it is that we are moving beyond. But I don't think that that implies necessarily a predilection as in the European idea of a conservative to preserve and conserve for its own sake; that in fact here the animating idea, at least for me, is an idea of the nature of man, and that is a more traditional view, a view that believes that there is in fact a Supreme Being of one stripe or another that is the source of our rights, that lends credence to the idea that we are therefore all equal and that the government in fact is something over which we are sovereign rather than something which is sovereign to us.

And it is that idea and the ideas which flow from it which we are interested in conserving in all of the forms that following that through logically takes.

MS. KASS: Are you saying the idea is the nature of man – human nature – or a certain stance with respect to the deity, that is, the belief in a deity?

MS. HIGGINS: It's early – (laughter) – and I'm not doing coffee this week so – let me say that part of the conservative idea is probably that the nature of man itself cannot be changed; that man can, internally, through his own volition and through cultural influences hopefully ameliorate his behavior, but we can't create a new man. But there are certain ideas about whether man is inherently good or whether man is inherently fallen, whether we are the arbiters of good, whether we are the creators of rights, or whether rights are something that come from some external source and are permanent and immutable and negative, or whether there is something positive and creatable and selective that leads to a lot of other consequences. It changes your understanding of what, in fact, truth is, which affects science, it affects justice. And so where you start in your understanding of who we are and where we stand in the universe I think is the idea that we share, however disparate some of the end policy results might be.

BARBARA ELLIOTT: I chose Russell Kirk for a reason in preparing my essay. His 1953 book *The Conservative Mind* shaped our understanding of what conservatism is in a very significant way. He points us toward the truths that have emerged over time throughout all of Western civilization, that they are centered in essentially three bodies of ideas, the first of them being our moral convictions and that they do derive very specifically from a theistic understanding of the nature of man – we are creatures created by God – and that we have corresponding rights and duties derived from that transcendent order.

We then have a body of political convictions which ideally should be derived from that understanding but then attempt to, in the human realm, inculcate those boundaries which are not necessarily, by themselves, set by personal virtue, but the dividing line within the human soul is such that those things that are not governed internally must be governed externally, and that the political order is to simply take care of those things which, if they are violated, are truly to the detriment of the common good.

The third body of ideas is then economic convictions based on a very clear understanding of property rights and of our responsibility to use what we have in both a free and a generous way, and what I didn't put in the piece that I wrote but which also is a part of this is an understanding of the role of the private voluntary associations, the "little platoons" that Burke writes about,

voluntary associations that Tocqueville discovered here. Our understanding of conservatism then was based on these three areas, but that the most important things take place in the private realm, in the family, at home, at the community level, and that that is where virtue is transmitted, that is where people's best nature is fostered, and that a conservative vision is intended to then preserve the boundaries that are necessary but foster that private realm where civic renewal takes place, where virtue is inculcated, and that the vision that I think much of the conservative movement is devoted to is in describing those boundaries but also fostering the good that takes place within the institutions.

GROVER NORQUIST: I'm not sure if I'm agreeing or disagreeing, but I thought that what conservatives wish to conserve is the Constitution and the limitations on government that flow from that and the freedoms that people have when government is limited, and that makes us want to conserve a revolutionary tradition in American history, and that's what makes us different from the Europeans. The Europeans think they're conservative because they hate the guy on the other side of the river and they hate the guys with the wrong religion. They're trying to conserve something or other but it isn't liberty. And so sometimes when we talk to our European friends you sort of get going along fine and then all of a sudden they veer off into some sort of queen thing or something. (Laughter.)

We want to maintain, strengthen, and conserve the principles of the Constitution, not because it was written by dead people. A lot of stupid people are dead and we ought not to be listening to them. However, the guys who wrote the Constitution had something quite useful to say, whether they were still with us or not, and it's those values that we're conserving, but that's why sometimes guys on the other team, or even people who think they're on our team, misunderstand. How can we be for revolutionary change and all this unsettling stuff and be conservatives? Because we're trying to conserve the Constitution, which allows for a lot of revolutionary change.

MS. KASS: The Constitution itself allows for a lot of revolutionary change?

MR. NORQUIST: Oh, yes. Well, I mean –

MS. KASS: Revolutionary change?

MR. NORQUIST: Capitalism is itself – freedom is – people change, do all sorts of odd things that we hadn't signed off on.

DAVID KEENE: When you read the papers that were prepared beforehand and listen to the comments, it's one of those situations in which virtually everyone is correct, which goes to the observation that the conservatism that developed on this side of the ocean is a unique conservatism. It is both ideological and distrustful of certitude. It is both respectful of tradition and the views of those long dead and willing to step out, and in that sense is both traditional and radical. In a sense it follows from the American Revolution, which was both revolutionary and conservative in a sense. It was a conservative revolution.

So it's easy to pick out one or two aspects of that which constitutes the fabric of American conservatism and say, this is what it is and this is what it isn't, but in some senses it is radical and it began, correctly described in the '50s and '60s by its liberal opposition, as being a radical movement as well as a conservative moment because much of what needed – or which many people thought ought to be – conserved during that era needed in fact to be changed. Much today remains in need of change. So it's not a European conservatism, it's not just a conservatism that's based on preserving things because they are in fact there, because the dead as well as the

living can be wrong, and it encompasses a willingness to look at things based on the values that others at this table have already discussed.

And it does – I think as we go through it, it does constantly have the tension between the ideological and the practical and the experiential. Conservatives have sort of a soft-edge ideological drive. We know what that vision is that Ronald Reagan metaphorically described as the "building of the city on the hill." That's ideological.

We also know that we exist both philosophically and politically in a world in which the ideal is not always as simple to achieve as you might imagine in drawing the picture or as easily achieved in the practical world of politics. And I do think as I read through much of what was written beforehand, that we have to realize that most of us at this table and most of the people in this room exist in different worlds, with one foot in the philosophical, idea-based world of the conservative movement, if you will, and the other foot in the practical, political world. And the ways in which you approach political and philosophical questions in those two worlds, while not necessarily incompatible, are very different, and I think it requires some discipline to say what it is we're discussing when we discuss it.

HEATHER MAC DONALD: What I've come across in just reporting on the devastation wrought by the liberal hegemony is the absence of the idea of the individual and personal responsibility. I think that is the fundamental lacuna in liberal thought, which is behavior. And in liberal thought you have a jump from a social condition to outcome, and what you're never, ever allowed to say is that individuals have choices and they can make good choices or bad choices, and that those choices affect outcomes. So in a liberal, philanthropic or philosophical vision, you have a condition of rapacious capitalism, which produces poverty, and to eradicate poverty therefore you have to simply look at systemic changes and you're never allowed to say, well, this individual may be poor because she dropped out of high school and she had a child at age 15 and another one at 19.

So for me, what I've come across in just going out there and talking to people, and what I feel the conservative world is trying to rehabilitate, is the idea that one can look at individual behavior without necessarily – one shouldn't be accused of therefore being a sexist, a classist, a racist, a homophobe, you name it. We're seeing a classic example right now of this tension with an outbreak in New York City of a drug-resistant strain of AIDS. And the question is going to be, to what extent are we allowed to look at individual behavior in discussing that? I mean, AIDS has been one of the great examples where there's been largely a taboo on discussion of behavior. We've gotten rid of traditional public health measures such as contact tracing because of the vision that this is somehow the responsibility – is caused by Reagan. Reagan's military budget caused AIDS, in one analysis I've seen.

So I think for me, the insight of conservatives, again, is the individual and personal responsibility.

PETE DU PONT: That's exactly right, and let me take it back, Amy, to your original question: what are we trying to conserve? If you go back to Philadelphia in 1787 and read the debates about the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, all the arguments that went on between Benjamin Franklin and Madison and so forth, what we're trying to conserve is the individualism that the Constitution set up. Now, individualism goes across the board from social policy to economic policy to the full range.

So the simple – simple answers are always dangerous, but the simple answer is: What we're trying to conserve is individualism across the spectrum of experience.

STUART BUTLER: I have to admit that I acquired my sense of conservatism in Europe, and so Grover's helpful explanation of conservatism certainly ran counter very much to what I think of as conservatism. And I think there are two elements of it, which I just want to emphasize because I think they really are essential to the way we think about what it is we're going to preserve.

When I came to the United States, I acquired the Constitution in the sense that I didn't feel bound by that before I got here in any meaningful sense. And I think it's important to understand the American Constitution as the product of conservatism in thinking about the basis of conservatism rather than the document that tells us what conservatism is or produces conservatism. I could kind of understand it in that way, in two particular aspects. One is the notion of mutual obligation, which has come up, I think, already. As individuals we certainly have many rights and we certainly have many freedoms and should have many freedoms, and that's basic and inalienable.

But there is a notion of mutual obligation which conservatives I think understand far better than anybody else; that while one has rights and privileges and freedoms, one also has mutual obligation and mutual responsibilities. And therefore, it is appropriate to say to somebody when they're exercising their freedom within our society, there are certain things that you have an obligation to use that freedom to do, including self-improvement as well as the improvement of the wider community. And I think that's an important distinction between the way conservatives think about things and what conservatives try to preserve rather than a liberal notion of a one-way sense of rights and freedoms.

I think, secondly, the idea of community is absolutely central to the conservative notion and differs from conventional liberalism and liberalism generally in the sense that we think of ourselves as part of an organic society that does change over time. Conservatism is not saying, stop all change. I think that's a very simplistic concept of conservatism. Conservatism is, I think as Heather said, learning from the past, learning from mistakes and successes of the past, using those to gradually alter the way we do things as we try to improve society over time rather than imposing some either legalistic vision or academic vision that somehow assumes that it understands the world better than people who have come before us and people who have tried things before. That notion of community and the way in which community shapes change is absolutely essential.

Now, it is true, I think, to say that when you look at this in terms of how people, particularly in America, think about the forces from the past that should shape change, that ideas of a deity, ideas of some kind of invisible hand in all kinds of ways, moves us forward. I don't think that's essential; I don't think that's a critical requirement. It certainly is a very common and widely based requirement in our society, but I don't think it is the absolute – it's not a necessary condition for how conservatives think about things, and therefore you have whole branches of conservatives – many libertarians, for example, who don't share that view, yet in many respects they share the same view about how society changes over time by the free interaction of people working together as a free association and so on.

So I would say that those are two central things that we are seeking to preserve, that notion of mutual responsibility and obligation as individuals within our society – not saying the government should take care of this but I have a responsibility to take care of certain things, and vice-versa – and the notion of community as being an organic society that does gradually change over time. Conservatism is that process of understanding how change takes place. It's recognizing its superiority to radical ideas in the sense of those who say, let us jettison everything

that we've learned before and our forefathers, because we figured it out from fundamental kind of logical principles and therefore we can impose it on everybody else.

MS. KASS: Steve, do you want to respond to that?

STEVE HAYWARD: No, actually I was going to respond to Barbara Elliott.

MS. KASS: The learning from the past and rolling back the progressive –

MR. HAYWARD: (Chuckles.) I'll let that stand on its own.

MS. KASS: It just seems to invite direct response but, please, suit yourself.

MR. HAYWARD: I was going to do something different. The hazard with this panel is that there is just lots and lots of heated agreement, with the possible exception of Scott, who has been very polite down the table. So I thought what I might do is pick a small dispute with Barbara Elliott and then push along a little bit.

It's always struck me that Russell Kirk's conservatism was a little bit out-of-phase with the American experience, which I'm not sure he would take as a criticism, by the way, if he were here. But I think you especially see that in Kirk's attacks on the Declaration of Independence. My own view is that the fundamental argument in American politics is about the meaning of equality and the Declaration's proposition that all men are created equal. So he made this observation: If you go back to the heyday of the civil rights movement in the '50s and the '60s – especially you saw it there – to cite the Declaration of Independence was a liberal provocation. I mean, Martin Luther King talked about it in almost all of his speeches. Then suddenly it flipped around and so that today liberals very seldom invoke the Declaration of Independence and it's now considered largely a conservative provocation. You especially see this in the fights over affirmative action and the Prop. 209 and such in California.

And so Kirk was right, just as Tocqueville pointed out, that the principle of all men are created equal – the principle of equality – is problematic and always will be with liberal impulses in the modern world. But it does strike me that one thing that was left out of papers, left out of mine, was recalling the centrality of that argument in American politics. Where I think – and I think that Grover pointed this out and Stuart just now – the sort of European philosophical tradition, as helpful and valuable as it is, is, let's say, a little out-of-phase with that way of American thinking.

LEONARD LEO: A slightly different emphasis, I think, than Steve's. I think what very much drives the conservative vision is a very practical and keen understanding of individual human nature. As Heather Higgins alluded to a few minutes ago, we're obviously capable of virtue as well as of folly. And I think a question for the conservative movement is quite often, how does one capitalize on our virtuous tendencies but at the same time seek to avoid the vice that's going to harm others. And it's this question and our careful focus on human nature, I think, which causes the conservative movement to be much more focused on and attuned to structure, boundaries, constraints on power.

We talk a lot about the rule of law and about the structural Constitution – separation of powers and federalism, for example. And this of course is very different from most other revolutionary movements that have tried to place a premium on the dignity and worth of the human person: the French Revolution, preoccupation with rights that in the absence of structure were not particularly enforceable.

And so I think that we spend a lot of our time thinking about limitations on government authority that will both empower people but also constrain excess in our leadership, and I think that is what makes our movement unique, and the way in which our movement makes a unique and important contribution to our own American experiment in government.

MS. KASS: You're accusing the opposition of being against the rule of law?

MR. LEO: No, the opposition – number one, the opposition really defines the rule of law. In fact, quite often the opposition equates the rule of law with a set of rights without discussing any constraints on government power, without discussing the tension between individual freedom and personal responsibility.

I think the conservative movement has worked very hard to develop a more, frankly, practical and realistic vision of what the rule of law is and to recognize that how we define the rule of law needs to be grounded in what we know about human nature, which is that we are very imperfect and that we need constraints on our own authority.

DAVID KEENE: I'm glad that Leonard finally brought this up, because as we discuss values and tradition and capitalism – and I think that Heather talked about the core sort of inner vision even of the founders. But the one thing that has defined the development of American conservatism – and it comes in different phrases: the rule of law, limited government – has been a very healthy skepticism about the role of government and an opposition from the very beginning to the idea that the good can be achieved through the state. The American Revolution was, in large measure, about the relationship of the individual to the state. And if you read back through the writings about economics and culture and all, there is a healthy understanding among conservatives on all sides of the conservative spectrum that the enemy of what they want to do is often the state.

The basic difference between the conservative vision and the, quote, "modern liberal" vision might be taken from something that Stuart said, where he said, as we look at all these things, we find how we can work to better society. The vision of the good society, or people that are healthy and economic might be the same, but the liberal would immediately say, yes, the way we do that is through state power, and the conservative would say, that isn't going to work, not simply because of a recognition of human nature and our ideological beliefs that people ought to make decisions but because the state is always to be distrusted from the conservative standpoint.

That doesn't mean that we are anarchists, it doesn't mean that we don't see a role for government, but the defining characteristic of conservatism over the years has been a sense that when the government proposes something or when you propose to take action for good through the state, that those proposals should be looked at not cynically but very skeptically by everyone.

Freedom has never been diminished by people who sit around and say, let's take away folks' freedom. The government actions that are taken and that are promoted, mostly today by liberals but not exclusively by liberals, are always promoted, devised and written for the public good. The conservative position has been, one, they usually don't work, but even if they did work, most of them would be wrong because they diminish the very values that we are talking about and pose the greatest threat to the core values that we believe in, which are the power of the individual to make choices, good as well as bad. And I think that using some of those words – and we don't talk about the rule of law because law is somehow good or – if we were in the old Soviet Union, they had a fabric of laws. We talk about the rule of law as a way of limiting the power of the state in its dealings with individuals, and I think that that is something that is really at the

operational core of the way conservatives have always viewed their ability to protect the core values that we maintain and is really the basis of the coalition of philosophical and political values that have made the conservative movement, as strong as it's been over the last few decades.

JAMES PIERESON: Just a few points. Conservatism, I think by its nature, takes its bearings from what its opponents are up to. I think that every liberal movement of the 20th century has sought to break the shackles of the Constitution. It's outdated, it's outmoded; we have to modernize the Constitution.

And so it's been the task of conservatives to defend those fundamental principles. And conservatives, I think, have been alarmed by the breaking of the institutional barriers of the Constitution by various things, especially by judge-made law. That has been a very strong focus of conservatives. Even though the whole idea of judicial review began as something of a conservative idea, I think conservatives are concerned that the courts have gotten themselves outside the structure of the Constitution.

A second point is that liberalism in the '60s launched a cultural war on the cultural institutions of American society: religion, the family. Indeed, liberals went further and said that America itself is bad, and this has continued, and it's been that cultural war that was launched by the liberals, in my opinion, that has been the fundamental factor behind the rise of conservatism in our time.

LEON KASS: Let me follow that, if I may, because I think Jim has introduced an aspect of the discussion that hasn't gotten enough play so far and is in some of the papers. It does seem to me that concern for the protection of the Constitution is essential, and we share, around the table, the need to be skeptical of governmental solutions and the importance of limiting state power. But the question really is whether that is somehow sufficient to produce the conditions of a robust as opposed to a debased freedom of genuine individuality as opposed to mere individualism, as well as the conditions of genuinely free citizens who are self-governing and not simply free to do simply as they please. If the choice is between a certain kind of tyranny of government to regiment these things, we should be suspicious, but it shouldn't be forgotten that the founding – liberalism, in the old-fashioned sense – was limited; that is to say it was a limited government but with the expectation that other sorts of institutions would care for the question of the character and education of the souls of the citizens.

And it seems to me – I'm not sure that there's agreement around this table about the state of the culture or what the conservative obligation is – what conservatives are seeking to defend there. But it does seem to me that it will be no great victory if one wins the battle about the Constitution and the rule of law and the protection of the rights of individuals to do as they please, unconstrained by government. If the uses of those freedoms are debased, if families decay, if the general moral vision diminishes, and if people don't somehow live up to the possibility that free institutions were meant to advance and secure.

MS. KASS: I have a line here. Heather?

HEATHER HIGGINS: My comment goes back now to several, but particular to Heather's, but first, the comments that David and Stephen just made put me in mind of what Madison wrote, which I'm not going to quote perfectly, but it was that if men were angels, no government would be necessary, and if angels ran the government, then neither external nor internal controls would be necessary. And that reminds me further of what I wanted to bring forth, that Heather provoked in my thinking, which was to sort of take that one step further back: Why is there that lacuna

about the individual and the notion of responsibility? And Dennis Prager gets full credit for this. He postulates that if you go back – and perhaps this is why the Declaration is no longer mentioned so much in liberal thought – that the really great divide now is between what he would call traditional thought versus secular thought. If you start with traditional thought you come out where Madison did. You believe that men are inherently fallen, that individuals are responsible for the choices that they make, that the source of truth is external to us and originates from a higher being and we've got an obligation to try and discover it and we have the capacity to move towards it or away from it.

If you start with a secular vision where there is no higher authority, then the origin of good has to be man himself. Human beings are good; therefore the choices and the ethical choices they make are determined by them. That's part of why there's such an inclination to not be judgmental, because it's everyone's own personal truth. So you need a locus for evil, and that locus for evil, if it's no longer the individual, has to be external social forces. And you get all of your "isms" to blame for the choices that people make. And I think that that's part of why you see a lot of thinking in terms of groups as opposed to thinking in terms of individuals, and you see a move away from the rhetoric that had been used in the early civil rights movement to very, very different rhetoric which implies a totally fundamental different understanding about the nature of human beings.

HEATHER MAC DONALD: I think that's a wonderful analysis. I would just like to put in a counter possibility; that it is possible to arrive at an expectation of a decent society where individuals treat each other with respect without starting from a deity. I believe it is possible to think in terms of certain non-religious ideas of the Golden Rule of treating others how you would have yourself treated without necessarily pointing to a biblical vision.

And I'm also curious – and this is not a rhetorical question but a real question. One often hears in these discussions the distinction between, say, the French Rousseauian vision of a perfectible nature versus the more realistic conservative idea of the fallen man. But what we do see with liberals these days is the assumption that human beings start out with such ineradicable racism and sexism – you don't hear much about sort of a goodness or perfectibility.

So there's a critique on both sides, I think, and I guess you would say that the responses – the solutions would be different. In the case of the liberal criticism of our negative tendencies, it would be a state solution, but you also have individual retraining – all the diversity nonsense that we're going through.

So I don't know if there's such a clear distinction in the ideas of human nature between the two.

MICHAEL CROMARTIE: Yes, I want to say that – I wrote this down to say this before Heather said what she said – (laughter) – and representing the conservative Protestant wing of this panel, down here with Peb Jackson, I wrote down, "After the earlier interventions" – and this may surprise you – "what do you do if God is not assumed in your public philosophy?" I spent a lot of time with evangelical activists who do not know how to build coalitions with people who don't agree with their presuppositions. And so I spent a lot of my time talking to evangelicals about the natural law tradition, which does not assume special revelation to get to the points that Heather [Higgins] just made.

So I'm actually agreeing with Heather Higgins' point here. Too often, at least in religiously conservative communities, 40 percent of which voted for President Bush, there seems to be a concern that we must first of all get the whole culture converted to our theology before you can

work for public good. And my task is to say, actually, that's not going to ever happen – theologically grounded, it's not going to happen. Therefore, how do you find a public grammar, a public language in order to work with people who actually agree with you on the policy but don't agree with you on the theology?

I also wanted to comment on the fact that when the papers came, it wasn't until the paper by Leon Kass came two days ago that, as best I could tell, anyone raised the question about renewing the culture, and I was delighted that he did that. The religious conservative voters who got involved in politics some 25 years ago did so because of the culture war that Jim mentioned. It was a concern about the state of the culture. Surprisingly, it wasn't rooted in kind of theological understanding of the need to do it; they just did it because it was what Nathan Glazer called a "defensive offensive."

And so I think that the evangelical conservatives involved in politics today have a paradoxical concern, and that is this: they're involved in politics because the believe in the inherent dignity of all people – all people made in *imago Dei* – made in the image of God, but also they're anti-utopian because the also believe in the radically fallen nature of our humanity. And therefore, I think a lot of evangelical people – you've heard some talk lately about the evangelical left. Even some people to the left of center have moved toward the right because they've become less utopian in what politics can do in renewing the culture.

So I just want to say – I agree with Heather [Higgins], and thank you, Leon, for saying we need to talk about renewing the culture.

LINDA CHAVEZ: First of all, my apologies for repeating anything that was said before. We are talking about the culture war, and I was actually out fighting the culture war until 9:00 this morning– I have a radio show that airs every morning.

I also talked about that, the problem of the culture war, in my little, short essay and frankly, one of the things that I'm concerned about is that we not be too quick to pat ourselves on the back and to suggest that we are winning the war for ideas in America. I think any look at popular culture today would suggest that we're not winning that war and that we in fact have lost. And one of the great mysteries I think that we have to grapple with is that we are the most church-going population in the world and yet if you look at the behavior of individuals, even those who go to church, as I wrote about in my column today, they often do not display the kind of behavior that we normally associate with churchgoing populations.

And so I think this is a big mystery. And, Heather [Higgins], with all due respect, I do believe that while you may be right – it may be possible to come up with a non-believer's agnostic or atheist sort of code of ethics that relies on the Golden Rule, et cetera – it certainly was not our founders' idea to have such a society, and in fact I think our founders were quite clear that a belief in God was sort of the founding principle on which you could base the idea of freedom for individuals. And I think this is clearly one of the great divides in the conservative movement today – between libertarians who would de-emphasize the role of religion and certainly would not want to see government involved in monitoring morals, et cetera.

But I think most conservatives today are fighting an uphill battle and it is not at all clear to me that we're winning that battle, and quite the contrary; I think we are losing the battle for the culture. And it is something that I think we have to grapple with if, as a movement, we expect to be able to take those other ideas, the ideas of liberty and freedom, because I think in a society in

which individuals do not have self control, it is extraordinarily difficult to have smaller government and less outside control.

MS. KASS: Bob Woodson.

ROBERT WOODSON: Let me yield for the moment to Steve. He's busting out over there, and since I feel the same way sometimes let me yield to him and I'll come back.

STEVE HAYWARD: Are you sure?

MR. WOODSON: Yes.

STEVE HAYWARD: I was going to speak a little bit and weigh in on this. Of course the centrality of God and religion is obviously the American founding, but remember, the sourcing of our rights in the Declaration of Independence is not the loss of God; it was the phrases "the laws of nature" and "nature's God." And Benjamin Rush, one of the signors, explained it this way. He said, "Reason and revelation say the same thing, only revelation says it in a louder, more insistent voice."

And so I do think that – I'm coming down on Heather Higgins' side here – there is a tradition that you do see in a lot of American rhetoric, you see it in both sides of Lincoln's rhetoric and in the 20th century of appealing to a secular tradition of moral values, the natural law tradition Michael mentions. Liberals used to be pretty good at this, and they sort of threw it over aside because they came up against the constraints – against their unconstrained vision implied by human nature. And so they threw it over the side. And I think it's very important for conservatives to reacquire and rearticulate that side and not rely solely on a theological interpretation of the American character.

MR. WOODSON: Just a brief comment and then a question, if I may. I sort of came to conservatism by way of being what Irving Kristol once described as a radical liberal who was mugged by reality. As a social civil rights activist, I realized that a lot of people who suffered and sacrificed did not benefit from the change, that their problems were not racial as such but required some other remedies. And so that's where I'm coming to this.

But the question that I have for the panel is, let's suppose that the nation totally embraced the conservative vision. How would it affect, in practical ways, the plight of the least of God's children? If you could have your way and you walked out of here and everyone signed on to all of what you say we should be, tell me how that would affect the conditions of the least of God's children.

MS. KASS: How about if you make a start at answering your own question? (Laughter.)

MR. WOODSON: You weren't supposed to say that!

MS. KASS: Well, we started, for those of you who arrived after the discussion began, with the question, what should we be conserving? What do conservatives really want to conserve? Many people have spoken about the importance of individualism. Some people have spoken about the importance of the Constitution. Some people have spoken about the importance of taking our bearings from a realistic understanding of human nature. Some people talk about the importance of all of this being predicated upon a belief in the deity, or at least finding a grammar to use that might include that. Other people talk about the primacy of family, of culture, and the community.

Now, one of the questions that we have to face is whether all of these things are mutually friendly and happy or whether there are real tensions within them. But I think the question that you pose is a good way of beginning that.

GROVER NORQUIST: Can I –

MS. KASS: Go ahead.

MR. NORQUIST: The point that I was waiting to make and was in line for earlier – if the conservative vision, the vision that Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush have put forward, and the folks, many of whom have written around this table, was in place, first of all, you wouldn't have a Davis-Bacon Act, which was put in to keep black people out of construction work. That would at least be helpful. We'd get rid of the minimum wage, which makes it illegal to hire teenagers who don't have skills unless they're worth $7, and they're not yet. We would not have Social Security as an unfunded pay-as-you-go system. Instead, the poorest person in the United States could look forward to retiring with tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars saved instead of having their savings taken away in Social Security. We'd have a significantly stronger economy – a whole list of things that one can go through. I think it's fairly self-evident the poorer people would be the greatest beneficiaries of reducing the size and scope of the state.

And the question earlier that Heather MacDonald made of why are we worried about this cult of nobody-is-responsible-for-anything? So the government has come in and said, since you're not responsible we're going to take over control of your life. And they've done this particularly in damaging ways to the lowest-income people, to folks in Indian tribes and to the inner cities. Everywhere the government has gotten involved helping the least among us, or the poorest people, or those who were born with the least number of advantages, they've done tremendous damage to them. The state has an awful lot of blood on its hands, and most of it is the blood of poor people. They tend not to destroy the lives of rich people.

But as to the earlier question, I think we have two conversations going: What should our political position be, and what should the powers and responsibilities of the state be and the freedom of individuals? And I think and hope that all conservatives would agree that we should limit the government and let people maximize freedom. But then the question of what about the general culture came up and Leon Kass seemed to suggest that it wouldn't avail us anything if we were all free but people made the wrong decisions. This of course is the left's concern about separating red glass from brown glass from green glass; that somehow if we were all free we wouldn't follow their version of Leviticus and do all of these things that they've set up that we're supposed to structure our lives around and they want the state to enforce.

Politically, if we say there are private sector institutions, such as religious institutions and other cultural institutions, which fight for cultural values in terms of whether or not somebody's going to get into heaven, those are important. If we bring the state into it, not only does a lot of blood get flowing – because when the state decides to make everybody a Methodist or something else, in history they tend to shoot a lot of people who don't understand what's good for them, okay? And if we're not going to decide whether people get into heaven, we probably ought not to be making decisions about other parts of their life as long as they're not poking their hands in other people's faces or stealing their wallets or burning their houses down.

So one is a political debate on freedom and the other is a debate on how can we encourage people to most constructively use their freedom? But if we're going to go to the American people and

say, the liberals make you do all the wrong things; we'll make you do all the right things, first of all, you're not going to get elected with that position, which makes it sort of a not-terribly interesting concept, but it's also one that has been tried throughout history, and there's just too much blood on the floor from this.

BARBARA ELLIOTT: There have been two concurrent debates, I think, about the nature of conservative thought, and one has focused specifically on what the proper role of the government is, what policy can dictate, and the other, earlier side of the conservative debate had much more to do with what the individual ought to do with the freedom that is carved out in the personal realm. In recent years I would say to some extent the conservative movement has been hijacked by policy wonks, and we've devoted an awful lot of time and energy and resources to policy, which is, in and of itself, necessary, and I have been a wonk and I've spent a lot of years working with wonkish institutions.

However, I think to the extent that we have neglected the arguments that center on civil society, on personal initiative, on community, on family, and I'll even say it again, faith. We have, in a sense, won a lot of the policy wars but we're losing the cultural war Linda has pointed out and a number of others have pointed out in their writings elsewhere. We're losing that side of the debate because we have not yet come up, as a movement, with a good answer to the question, when you have the freedom, what do you then do with it?

And to answer Bob's question, I don't know how many people here could come up with a very good definition of what they personally would do to serve the least of God's children – the least, the last, and the lost. We have not done a good job of that. We've done a very good job as a movement saying what the government ought not to do; we have not done a good job at saying what we as individuals should do, what we as families should do, what we as communities should do, not with somebody else's resources but with our own.

BOB WOODSON: Let me just, if I could, just add a footnote to what Barbara is saying. I think of the time I was with Bill Bennett when he summarized it best for me. He said, when liberals look at poor people they see a sea of victims, and when conservatives look at poor people they see a sea of aliens. And I think what Barbara is saying is, it's not enough, Grover, to say that somehow we have reached a millennium when everybody has all the money they want and the freedom to do with it what they choose. This is an emphasis on secular comforts and somehow secular well-being. Well, if that were sufficient you wouldn't have the sons and daughters of very rich, wealthy white people taking their lives through drugs and alcohol. I can name Gloria Vanderbilt, Paul Newman – you could just list and list them, if that were sufficient.

Obviously there's something else missing in their lives that drives them to those extremes. And when you add to that the social and economic circumstances faced by poor people, it exacerbates the same tensions that exist among the non-poor. So therefore, as James Q. Wilson pointed out, when you manipulate all the variables that are supposed to yield social outcomes and the situation doesn't change, then that something that is missing is culture and values.

And so the challenge, it seems to me, for conservatives is to engage in a kind of self-examination. I find that in the conservative movement, as Barbara is saying, you're too content on winning the academic argument and too little concerned about whether or not your vision or your philosophy produces better people. And the test of whether it produces better people is that the laboratory is among the least of God's children. It's not enough to talk about what you're against; you've got to talk about what you're for. It's not enough to have expectations. Expectations in the absence of opportunity is oppression.

Now, how that opportunity is conveyed, it can be conveyed in conservative means. It doesn't mean the government rushes in and gives people a hand, but in order for people to participate in an economy, they require information, they require training, and conservatives seem to be less enthusiastic about coming close to poor people.

MS. KASS: We could have a long discussion about what would also constitute "better people." However, we must move along – I have a line here: Pete du Pont, David Keene, and Leon Kass.

PETE DU PONT: Bob, I have an answer to your question. It's dreadfully practical and I apologize for it not being a good theoretical answer. What is one good thing we could do for the people who are poor, who are not succeeding? We could give them an education. What does the government do worst in America? Run the school system. The school system is awful. Low-income people have no way out of that school system. If you gave them the opportunity to go to a school of their choice and opened the market up to creating those schools, there's a practical thing that you could do that would help the lower-income and the disadvantaged people in the country, and it would be individualism as opposed to the collectivism of the education system.

DAVID KEENE: What everybody talks about in terms of improving things – the education system, getting rid of the Davis-Bacon Act – all of that is fine. But let's look at it globally for a second, if we're talking about the least of God's creatures, and ask what do they think? For all of its faults, this country and the society that has developed here with its bad education and everything else is nonetheless the embodiment, or the closest thing to an embodiment of the kind of values that most of us share. And wherever folks are, they would do anything to get here. So if we ask, what do they think about what we can do for them, we have a society that may not be perfect but it is a hell of a lot better than anything else in the world and they're willing to give up everything they have just to get here. So if we ask them, I think there's empirical evidence as to how they would vote.

MS. KASS: Okay, Leon Kass, Stephen Moore, Bill Kristol, Peb Jackson, and then James Piereson.

LEON KASS: This is partly provoked by Grover, and others who have spoken here in the same way. Let me even use this to expose what I think is a very deep fissure in the conservative movement, not sufficiently acknowledged, between a certain libertarian strand, however limited it might be to the things that government ought not to be doing, and also the free market and economic strand, neither of which, it seems to me, pay sufficient attention to the very danger of those very good things for the culture as a whole. Anybody in the room with teenage children, ask yourself this question: Is the market, and especially the way in which it appeals to pre-adolescents and adolescents, helpful or harmful in your efforts to try to raise your children? And that's a serious question for us today.

I think fatherless America, home-alone America, questions of the popular culture, the debasement of liberal education, these are not things that the government is going to solve but these are things that conservative institutions and conservative philanthropies should be very much concerned with if we're really going to have the kind of robust citizenry that can in fact govern itself under the Constitution and preserve really a kind of dignified freedom.

This is not an attempt at theocracy, although Leviticus is the place where the world first learned to love your neighbor as yourself.

STEPHEN MOORE: I don't think there's anything wrong with saying we're winning, and I think we are winning, especially when it comes to the economic model. I'm struck by the fact that when I first came to Washington around 1980-81, we had 14 percent inflation rates; we had – what was the top tax rate back then, Stuart? – 70 percent; you couldn't get a job back then with a college degree even as a burger flipper. So the economy was in wreckage; socialism was on the march. And look at the world today versus what the world was like 25 years ago when it comes to economies. The top tax rate went from 70 percent down to – what are we at now? – 34 or 35 percent. That's a huge, huge thing – a big deal. It's happening all over the world. Our ideas – almost every industrialized country and even third-world country is cutting their tax rates. They've learned the dangers of inflationary monetary policy.

So I do think that we are winning, and it's a triumph of conservative free market ideas. I would even make the case – this is going to be a controversial thing to say – but even in the cultural war, I believe our side is winning. Bill Bennett wrote a book a number of years ago about the leading cultural indicators, and just recently I went and looked at – I think he wrote that book about 10 or 15 years ago. I went back and looked at all those statistics, and guess what? Every statistic that Bill talks about in that book over the last 10 or 15 years is actually moving in our direction; things are getting better, not worse.

Just to give you some examples: crime rates have fallen by half since the early '90s; abortion rates are falling; we are seeing dramatic reductions in other social pathologies. The most important social legislation passed in the last 50 years was the 1996 or 1997 welfare reform legislation. That was an enormous victory for the conservative movement and it has been a victory in almost every regard. We've cut welfare usage rates by about 50 percent across the states in just 10 years. That's a big, bid deal.

So where are we losing? I think, Bob, you really have asked the question that's the central challenge for the conservative movement. We've learned to create an incredibly wealthy country with wealth that's unprecedented in the history of the world and we're going to see continued growth. I'm very bullish on the American economy; I think we're going to continue to grow at 3 or 4 percent rates.

The tragedy, as we look over these last 25 years, is that while 70 percent of the population has enjoyed an incredible boom period, you're right – a third of the population has been left behind. And, Pete, you took the words right out of my mouth, because the single-most important thing we can do to make sure that this wealth revolution is shared by every segment of the population is – I mean, we're a first-rate nation with, what, a third- or fourth-rate education system, and this will not stand. If this continues, we'll continue to see a bridge between people who get a good education and people who don't.

And so I would just make the case that the most important challenge we face as a country is to do something about making sure that people who live in inner cities are getting at least a second-rate – a second-rate education would be certainly an improvement over what we're providing them with now, especially as we move into this information-age economy where people aren't going to make money based on the strength of their back; it's the muscle between their ears – their mind. And what is it that the Negro College Fund says – "A mind is a terrible thing to waste," and that's a great theme, and maybe that's a theme for the conservative movement.

MS. KASS: Your optimism is very uplifting and very nice, but there are a lot of people who take their bearings from what they see going on with young people. And, I don't think we could

simply ignore the tension that Leon earlier articulated between the market and the rearing of children. That is something we should address.

Let's have Bill Kristol and then Peb Jackson and Scott McConnell, and then we will have to pause.

WILLIAM KRISTOL: Well, just an obvious point that I don't think has been said straightforwardly, which is in answer to the question, what is the conservative vision for America today, the obviously correct answer is there is no one conservative vision. I believe it's also obviously correct that there has never been one conservative vision, and there shouldn't be one conservative vision. And I guess I – it's too easy to pick a sentence that someone wrote to simulate discussion and criticize it – and this one has done a good job of it, but I would object, I guess, to the notion that we would be better off somehow if there were one conservative vision.

In fact, I went back recently and read some early issues of *National Review*, which is 50 years old now, and early issues of the *Public Interest*, which is 40 years old, and *Modern Age*, and other sort of conservative journals. There has always been incredibly vigorous debate at both the sort of philosophical and theoretical levels among conservatives, and practical levels. Bitter fights. You know, we think of them now, that they're bitter fights between neoconservatives and paleoconservatives, but I think Murray Rothbard, a leading libertarian thinker and economist, bitterly denounced mainstream American conservatism in 19 – what was it, '68 or something like that? I mean, the splits go way back, and they were a mark of health, not of the opposite.

I think it's a conventional view, I gather, of historians of religion, for example, that religions are usually most vigorous when they're full of splits and rifts. You know, those are the moments when they proselytize and grow the most. And conversely, when there's a kind of phony unanimity and uniformity, they tend to be past their peak. And I would actually say that the differences between libertarians and social conservatives, neoconservatives and paleo-conservatives – there are so many different splits that it's hard to keep track of them, and overlapping splits – are a good thing; they're what you would have if you have people actually *thinking* as opposed to simply signing on to a team. People have mentioned the Founding Fathers, and, I mean, there are reputable conservatives – historians, political scientists, journalists – in the last 30, 40 years who tend to agree respecting the Founding Fathers, but there are conservatives who respect the Founding Fathers for their alleged sort of religious views; there are conservatives who like Hamilton; there are conservatives who like Madison; there are conservatives who appeal to Jefferson; there are conservatives who like the anti-federalists.

It is, in fact, a tribute to conservatives that much of the scholarship and writing about all those aspects of the founding has come from a sort of conservative impulse that we need to rethink the American machine; we could learn something from the founders, but the things that have been learned and the founders who have been appealed to have been different ones. Steve mentioned the controversy of the Declaration of Independence. A lot of the most bitter arguments about the Declaration, about Lincoln, have been among conservatives. Conservative historians have published books in the last two years – Conrad Black, who I think is a conservative by most accounts, wrote a sort of defense of FDR as a kind of savior and modernizer of capitalism. There have been interesting critiques by other historians of FDR's economic policies as fundamentally flawed.

Foreign policy I won't even begin with but it's perfectly obvious that there are conservatives who appeal to the tradition of Robert Taft and conservatives who appeal to the tradition of Truman and

Acheson, and conservatives who have very different understandings of Reagan, which is not so long ago even.

And I do think really that is a healthy thing, and I think from the point of view of – obviously as a practical governing matter, the Republican Party has to figure out ways to get these groups to work together on most issues most of the time. The Republican Party, the Republican political leaders have been pretty good at that. The thing that most conservatives have in common, I do think, is an opposition to sort of easy-going, nanny-state, liberal progressivism, which is something worth opposing, and where I think there can be a lot of common ground. I mean, it is the truth about political movements that they define themselves usually by what they oppose.

But intellectually I think it's important to respect and really even praise the diversity of conservative thinking. There are conservatives who appeal to Athens; there are conservatives who appeal to Jerusalem; there are conservative who appeal to Rome; there are conservatives who appeal to the Anglo-American tradition; there are conservatives who appeal to the American founding. I mean, it really is a good and healthy thing, I think, and I think individuals can make up their own minds and make their own choices.

The thing to resist, I do think, is what Allan Bloom called "the closing of the American mind." I mean, there is a tendency I think among – there is a certain progressive tendency which would limit the horizons of debate and of thought even. I think we see that on campuses today. And in that respect I think it's very important for conservatives to stand together against that closing even though their particular preferences of how they would educate people once their minds were opened could be quite different.

PEB JACKSON: Yes, I'd like to piggyback on what Stephen Moore said, in particular in reference to the positive trends – the powerful positive trends in this country from a cultural perspective. The emergence of the evangelical – the conservative evangelical in reference to voting, particularly in philanthropy, has been remarkable, I believe, in the last 20 years, galvanized by – maybe precipitated by – concern for the culture, concern about intrusion of government, concern about redefinition of certain fundamental values in society.

So this has been a galvanizing force, I believe, in this powerful new group, and I think you're seeing this in reference to people across the spectrum from an evangelical perspective, which cannot be defined by any kind of a monolithic definition. It's broad-based and not easily defined. But the other thing I'd mention about that is that you have people today who were weaned and formed on the writings of C.S. Lewis and J.R. Stott and Lee Strobel and Dobson and Lucado and Warren, and this is foundational, too, to the emergence of this huge body of evangelical voters and donors.

SCOTT MCCONNELL: If I'd addressed the earlier question about conservative vision, mine would have been the most banal answer but it would have probably had something to do with a bourgeois democracy somewhat like the United States was before the '60s cultural revolution. But there are aspects to that society – safer cities, rule of law, meritocracy – that have been touched on here. One is the class structure. And as Bob Woodson has said, in the free-market conservative vision largely supported around this table, where would the least among us be? I think that question could be expanded, since we're moving in that direction, to: Where will the most average among us be? In the America of 40 or 50 years ago, a very average guy with a high school education could get a job and have three kids and have his wife stay at home and manage them – care for them. That's completely beyond the realm of possibility now, and I think – you know, the result is losing the cultural war on many fronts.

We talked to our daughter I think last night on the phone about this new novel, *I Am Charlotte Simmons*, and we said, well, it's not really an accurate portrayal of life at American colleges. And she sort of hemmed and hawed – and she's at the University of Chicago where there are no jocks even, but she hemmed and hawed – and she said, well, yeah, you know, it's kind of pretty much like that. There are 14-year-old girls having oral sex as frequently as they used to make out, I think, all over the place. So I don't think we're winning the culture war, and I think the society is worse and worse, not only for God's least favored but for average Americans in terms of being able to have the autonomy to support a family in dignity, and I think that's a problem that conservatives should address.

MS. KASS: We will, as promised, talk about the particular problems and how we might be able to address them in a little bit.

Before we take a break, let me invite one or two questions from the audience. Is there somebody who's very eager to raise a question?

EUGENE MEYER: Gene Meyer, Federalist Society. I wanted to pick up on Bob Woodson's question because he asked what could we have happen that would change if we had our ideal. And while I think it's a long way to get there, my answer would be, what if we had a situation where in fact government did a lot less and people had a lot more money and had responsibility and exercised that responsibility for our private charity, and because it was their money, they would be involved in their lives, in helping people, which is the only way in which I think you really bridge the problem that he described. I don't know if that would answer his question but that would be my answer.

MARK KRIKORIAN, Center for Immigration Studies: The question, it seems to me – we sort of skipped to the second and third parts of what it conservatism is conserving, and I think we assumed something we can't assume anymore, and that is: The first thing that American conservative has to conserve is the independence and the sovereignty of the American nation, and we sort of may all assume that but that's no longer assumable. And so only when there is an independent, sovereign American nation can we then make the decisions about what our tax policy should be, and can we then try to decide about what kind of actions we take, either through the state or through the culture to fight the filth that our kids are subjected to every day. This is just something that we really can't assume anymore, and even though we may assume it among ourselves, we can no longer take this for granted in dealing with the larger society.

MS. KASS: Thank you. Okay, let's break now. We will continue, let's say 10:30.

(End of session.)

VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

A Bradley Center Symposium

PANEL DISCUSSION:
What can philanthropy do to realize a conservative vision?
10:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Moderator: Amy Kass, Hudson Institute

AMY KASS: I think if there is one general point that emerged from the last session, it is that conservatives ought to conserve the multiplicity within conservatism. And that would stand, but with the caveat that the last speaker provided about the importance of sustaining the independence and sovereignty of our nation.

One of the particular subjects of real interest that emerged in our last session was the state of the culture: what we could and should be do about it. Another was education: what we could and should do about it.

As this is the time to be more focused on practice, especially philanthropic practice, let me invite you to reflect in a more focused way on this: What do you think that philanthropy should or could do about the state of the culture?

Somebody might, however, first want to address what exactly is meant when you talk about state of the culture, for it's clear that philanthropists do a great deal with respect to art museums, operas, libraries, schools and so on.

Maybe, Linda, you would like to clarify this matter, as it was really the theme of your essay.

LINDA CHAVEZ: Well, Barbara will get a chance to weigh in in a second, I guess, but I do think that the question of what we're talking about in terms of what we mean by the culture is important, and it's very clear that when conservatives are talking about the kind of degradation that has taken place in our culture, not withstanding the lower out-of-wedlock birthrates, lower abortion rates, et cetera, one of the things that most concerns people is the sexualization of our culture. And while Grover is not here to defend himself, he suggests at one point that, you know, that we believe in having liberty and freedom. Of course that doesn't mean burning down other people's houses. Well, I would contend that in the culture wars they are burning down our houses, and it is – we are being infected. It isn't a matter of simply people making free choices to imbibe or not imbibe in the culture; it is all around us and it invades our homes, it invades our lives in ways over which we have little control.

I was out last night having dinner with my husband, and given the fact that the weather has improved, I rolled down our windows, and next to us was this incredibly vile rap song blaring out, coming into my car. Unless I was willing to keep the windows up and the air conditioning on, I couldn't avoid hearing, you know, simulated sexual intercourse with grunts and lots of words that, you know, I certainly would not have wanted my grandchildren to hear had they been in the back seat.

If you go to the mall it's all around you. It's not just that, you know, you – I'm not talking about whether or not people have the right to go buy adult videos if they choose or don't choose. If you go to the mall you see things that, when I was growing up, would have been the kind of things – had they had adult videos – would have been in those adult videos. I mean, you see just photographs and pictures, and you're constantly absorbed in this.

But I think it is more than just the sexualization of our culture, and I think we need to talk about that. And I wrote a little bit in my essay about some of the other ways in which we are losing the culture war, and I talked about multi-culturalism, for example. Multiculturalism is now the reigning orthodoxy. Even though I wrote a critical review of it at the time, Nathan Glazer was right when he wrote the book *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*. In fact, multiculturalism is very much a part of everyday life. Certainly corporate America has bought into it.

Along with multiculturalism, the idea of judging people on the basis of their skin color – I mean, there is no battle on racial preferences except that which is fought, you know, at a sort of individual-guerilla-warfare level by organizations like mine. In terms of corporate America, in terms of the government, these policies are basically in place, and we've sort of lost.

So I guess I would define the culture broadly. It isn't just about sex; it is about some of these other issues defining our community. Mark Krikorian talked about sovereignty. I am less concerned – I mean, I – because of Mark's emphasis on immigration, he and I would probably disagree about what to do about the immigration issue. However, I think he and his organization are right that the number of immigrants coming into the country has affected our sense of community, has affected how we define ourselves; the notion of an Anglo-American culture that everybody buys into is very much a thing of the past. So I would define it as broadly as all of those subjects.

MS. KASS: Okay, Barbara Elliott, Bill Kristol, Leonard Leo, and Stuart Butler.

BARBARA ELLIOTT: Well, I just really have to take issue with Stephen Moore's cheerful evaluation of the state of the culture, and I know you were waiting for me to rise to the bait, so I will please you by doing so.

Let me just tick off a couple of the issues where I think we clearly are losing the battle, and that would include drug addiction, particularly in pockets of our cities; certainly the rate of inner city crime – not crime in general but relegated to specific areas; teen pregnancy; again, in specific areas of our cities; the fatherless America which we are dealing with, rates of illegitimacy are – while they may be falling are still at catastrophic levels; the rate of recidivism – people going to prison and recycling through again with at least a 60 – perhaps 65 percent chance of going back or committing new crimes over the next three years.

Let me just talk about a couple of the engines of renewal that are addressing those issues really well. The problem with every one of those issues is that you cannot pass a law that will make

people stop doing those things which are destructive to them and which are unraveling civil society. These are the places that laws cannot cure.

However, the little engines of renewal that are doing a pretty remarkable job doing that are quite often in the inner city themselves and run by people who live there. Some of the most effective and the most potent agents of change are the people who are leading small grassroots organizations like those that Bob Woodson has been championing, like those that I have worked with for now a number of years as well. And they're having remarkable success.

Look at a program like Teen Challenge that has an 83 percent success rate of taking drug addicts and putting them back on the street, sober and clean, and 13 years later they're still sober and clean, which is exactly what Freddie Garcia is doing, taking former addicts and using them as the people who are taking addicts up.

These are non-government-supported programs in both cases. They're changing the hearts of the people. Take a program like Bridges to Life, which is in Texas, which is taking victims of crime, and they're walking into prisons, and they're putting them face to face with perpetrators of crime for 12 weeks in a row. So somebody who has had their husband murdered is sitting there talking to a murderer; or parents whose child overdosed on drugs are sitting there talking to a drug dealer. Well, something amazing happens in that – in our action over the space of 12 weeks that changes the heart of the criminal so they never commit crimes again. They've reduced recidivism to 11 percent, and they've now had more than 5,000 people go through their program.

You can look at programs like One by One Leadership in Fresno, California, where they have gotten a variety of civic partners to come to the table together: the mayor, faith-based leaders, people who are in the schools, and apartment building owners, for example, and with a concerted strategy, dropped crime in some of the most afflicted areas where there was massive gang warfare – dropped crime by 65 to 70 percent in one year.

These are the people who are changing the face of America, and they're doing it with very small efforts. They're relatively low-budget items, they're extremely effective in changing lives, and they are doing the difficult work of knitting up civil society – the fabric – the torn fabric of civil society in a way that government policy cannot touch.

[Audio break, tape change.]

WILLIAM KRISTOL: [In progress] – two seconds before mine. He – you know, his hand went up when Linda mentioned adult videos and Steve had – (laughter) – I feel that Steve should be entitled to defend those if you want. That was a – (laughter) – I could see that really hit close to home. But anyway, we don't want to get into that. (Laughter.)

Amy asked what a philanthropist could do practically to help the culture, and I sort of feel that since my wife is president of our synagogue this year, and they are having a much-needed building-expansion campaign – (laughter) – I should – if anyone would like to help a very good cultural institution in Northern Virginia, I can give you an address. (Laughter.)

Actually, I will stay away from that to make a semi-serious point. I think always the best advice to give philanthropists is to do on a big scale what you would want to do on a small scale. Sometimes these things can be over-thought. The best way to help the culture is to help institutions that evidently out there are helping people in one way or another – strengthening families, reducing dependency, helping poor kids, helping various aspects of cultural renewal.

And I do think one should be guided in some ways by the evidence, by reality as much as by some theories of what may happen.

I guess I'm struck – you know, it's not an easy question I don't think, actually, to ask, whether we are in decline or renewal. We're in both, obviously, in the culture. I have a daughter who just graduated from college, a daughter in college, and a son about to go to college, and I have carefully *not* read Tom Wolfe's novel – (scattered laughter) – since I believe ignorance is very important to happiness – (laughter) – but I'm not so sure it's simply the case that the culture is less healthy than it was 15 or 20 years ago or even when I was in college, actually.

I mean, in a way, there has been a big reaction against the early '70s – the height of sort of liberationism – and much more seriousism amongst some young people, I would say, about character and about religion. And among others, there are people who are the products, unfortunately, of 20, 30, 40 years of difficulties for the family. And it's a very mixed bag and I think, you know, it's hard to know which trend ends up prevailing.

I guess the one thing I have learned in politics and looking at these things before getting to politics is, it's very hard to predict what is going to make a difference, you know. I mean, generally speaking, people would have had a very poor record predicting what was going to happen in some of these macro-level issues.

And I think the guidance – the fall of Communism was probably the great instance of our time, and it's very hard even after the fact to know what were the most effective things philanthropists did to help. Was it just supporting Reagan and the military buildup, which is the actual core of what began the change in the Soviet Union? Was it the funding of various democracy groups in Eastern Europe and in Russia itself – support for dissidents? Was it funding of – was it the accident – if it was an accident – of Pope John Paul coming to power and the reviving of a sort of religious impulse against Communism?

A lot of things happened at once. There was Havel; there was the Pope; there was Reagan. It's hard to know how they all fit together. And philanthropists who helped any of those efforts would have done the right thing and it doesn't require some settling ahead of time the question of what is most effective – the kind of religious assault on Communism or the liberal dissident/Vaclav Havel assault, or just a strong U.S. being willing to stand up for its principles, and interest around the world.

So I am on this, too, a bit of an agnostic as to exactly which efforts make sense, but I think – and it's very hard to predict ahead of time, as I say, which end up paying off and which don't. I'm really struck by the degree to which – even on culture, which seems like it is subject to such macro forces and, you know, deep trends, and deep problems of modernity, and therefore, these things are hard to turn around – things can turn around faster than people expect. I mean, no one expected crimes and welfare to decline as rapidly as they did in the '90s and some of that was due to cultural factors, and some of it was due to Rudy Giuliani and others coming to power in key cities and pursuing key public policies.

So if you really want to help poor kids in New York, are you better off funding a lot of faith-based institutions that worked on them sort of through the culture and through society or were you better off just helping Rudy Giuliani become mayor and implement crime policies that were incredibly effective and incredibly important to the revitalization of the city. I think both or all of these efforts are very important. But I council against despair; I really do think that there are a lot

of trends going both ways but could be almost as easily surprised on the upside as on the downside.

MS. KASS: Did you, Leon, want to give a quick, short response to Bill?

LEON KASS: Yeah, just to Bill: In the earlier session, you talked, I think, almost exclusively negatively not about the sort of cultural moorings of the students in the university but of the closing of the minds of the universities. And it seems to me that if one cares – Pete du Pont earlier talked about education; I think he meant primarily K through 12. But Bradley and Olin have worked heroically really to try to preserve pockets in the universities devoted to liberal education – a certain plea for the idea of truth and so on – there I think we have been losing ground.

And I think an important question – some people think we should just write the universities off and I wondered whether you have anything to say about the universities and what philanthropy, you think, might do there, because I think that's not the least part of our concern if they are shaping, really, the hearts and minds of an elite.

WILLIAM KRISTOL: I think the good news is they are probably not shaping a whole lot of hearts and minds, but the bad news is, they are not very good educational institutions and the kids mostly slough off what happens there and go about their lives, which means they are healthier than you would think. I mean, if someone came down from Mars and looked at our universities, they would then be amazed that our 25-year-olds and 30-year-olds, and 35-year-olds are as normal and healthy, really – (laughter) – they have rather healthy opinions on the whole, as they are.

Having said that, I very much agree that from an intellectual point of view – from a cultural point of view, I don't know how important the universities are, but from the intellectual point of view, from the point of view of serious scholarship and real thinking – I think the universities are the great problem that needs to be thought of in a couple of different ways: One, we must do whatever we can within the universities to establish pockets of seriousness and excellence, and true diversity.

And there I think we can use the left's infatuation with diversity against it – I mean, is there a less diverse place? Literally – I mean, just in a very simple empirical way – are the less diverse institutions in America than our elite institutions of higher education? I don't think so. They are literally less diverse in the sense of the views of the people who inhabit them and what is permitted to be said than the military, most religious institutions I know of, business, government – all of these other institutions that actually have reasons for constraining diversity. Universities, which are supposed to be the place of genuine intellectual diversity, have the least. So I think it's extremely important to push on that front.

Now, as a practical matter, one might decide it's hard to get things done in universities and more should be done outside and on the side, and think tanks – and, you know, that that is a sort of interesting question where also I am in favor of letting different approaches prevail. But I guess I would say ultimately it is a disgrace, the state of our universities. Of all the things, I would say when one looks – I mean, there are positive aspects in our religious institutions and our other – sort of our other cultural institutions. The universities really are an embarrassment.

MS. KASS: And yet you seem to be suggesting it is no big deal because academics don't really have an impact on the minds of their students?

MR. KRISTOL: You could have people of healthy character; they just won't be very well educated and I think that's what a lot of our kids are.

STEPHEN MOORE: Can I do 20-second response to this question?

MS. KASS: I'll time you. Go ahead.

MR. MOORE: Okay. Stop funding universities. I mean, the biggest frustration is conservative donors who give money to Harvard and Yale. Hundreds of billions of dollars a year flow into these totally corrupt institutions. Stop! Because the money talks and if conservatives would stop funding these ridiculous programs that universities run, they would have to stop their activities.

LEONARD LEO: I wanted to take issue with what I thought was the undercurrent or premise that we began the culture discussion with and that was that there is somehow a difference or a distinction between the efforts of those who want to limit government power and the efforts of those who want to think about cultural decay or about how people should use their freedom.

I think that there is a lack of morality and a lack of responsibility in using freedom precisely because government is sucking up all of the oxygen in our universe, precisely because of excessive government power. If you look at all of the problems that were just identified by several people here – drug addiction, inner-city crime, teen pregnancy, the recidivism rate, our sexually promiscuous culture – many if not most of those problems can be directly traced to overreaching and lawless courts, and to government policies or government incentives that create all of the wrong incentives for people.

And so I think – and we can't have the faith-based programs or other programs that have been discussed with a nanny state, and especially one that is not particularly good at governing people's conduct or one that is incentivizing them in the wrong way. So I don't think you can separate those two enterprises.

STUART BUTLER: I think this is a very important piece of this discussion for a number of reasons. One is because I think we as conservatives understand the critical importance of discussing and appreciating the role of culture and how people use their freedom of expression and how it affects other people. And I think also it draws a very clear distinction between how liberals in general look at this issue of the role of culture in our society and our political society especially, and how conservatives talk about it.

I think conservatives have a lot to say that is very appropriate in this area. I think liberals are hard-pressed to think about what to say in these areas. And I think when you look at the liberal kind of view of – let me take Linda Chavez's experience yesterday as the kind of quintessential example because I think liberalism in general says when you look at something like this, you either have to accept complete freedom of expression or you are going to have a police state and we are all going to be Evangelical Christians. I mean, it's one or the other. (Laughter.) And that therefore, there is nothing in between and it's not even appropriate for anybody in a position of government or political – to even talk about these matters.

That is fundamentally wrong and I think conservatives should explain it. But I think the American people are nervous about when conservatives talk about culture. They wonder, are we going to have something imposed upon us? I think we can make and should make a least four

specific points about how to think about this issue when we converse with the American people on how we think about its role.

Number one is the very point that people's individual expression, whether it be in culture or expression in any way, affects other people. They don't necessarily affect other people in the same way. When somebody has an iPod and listens to rap music sitting next to me, I don't even know it; it doesn't affect me indirectly; it doesn't affect my kids if they are with me. When they blare it out and force everybody else to listen and be affected by it, that is different – and I think we as conservatives understand these differences and can talk about them and should talk about them, and that strikes a cord with the American people – there are differences in how culture is expressed and how personal preferences are expressed.

I think secondly, that we recognize and I think ordinary Americans – all Americans generally recognize this – that freedom of expression, whether it be in the form of culture or just freedom of speech, does involve appropriate and proper self restraint. There are good manners associated with expression and culture. It is good manners not to blare information and things that will offend people directly into their face. Even though you preserve the right to have that thought and to express it in an appropriate body, there are rules and should be rules about forms of expression.

When somebody is having a discussion in a class in the university and thinking about pushing students, it's quite appropriate to talk about things and to express things quite differently than being in the street doing the same thing. So the notion that is very fundamental I think to how conservatives think about culture – that there are certain implicit or explicit rules about how you express your feelings about the culture and what constitutes culture to you and what you want to watch on television, and what you want to say, and what you want to listen to – that that is a thing that we can answer. There are different rules that apply to different places. And we can talk about those things in ways that don't talk about a police state.

I would say, thirdly, that it is very important that – one can talk about the freedom of people to express their view about what society should be like and what should be a cultural norm in society while denouncing what they actually say. It's quite, it seems to me, okay to say that somebody should have the right and the freedom to have thoughts and to say certain things. I have the right to say that is garbage and that is terrible, and you should say that to people.

I think one of the best things that happened in the culture was Bill Bennett and, I guess, Senator Lieberman went to some of these record companies and said, let me just read the actual lyrics of the songs that you are selling to young children in the inner city. Let me just read them to you. And you had people cringing in embarrassment. So I think it is quite appropriate to say we are not trying to run a police state here and stop people from saying things, but we have the right to say, this is vile, and to discourage you from saying that should be the cultural norm.

And I would say, finally, it's very important to recognize that the culture and the common culture that we share is deeply embedded – as opposed to the occasional and the fashionable. It is part of our society, part of what should be discussed in public policy and political discussion – it is part of that. And to deny it is to deny, for example, the role of the Ten Commandments in the very legal system that we have, the notion of tolerance, and so on – these are all underlying cultural values that are legitimate in political and policy discussion. And when people say that shouldn't be part of political discussion, which many on the left argue, they are denying something which is absolutely central and true to the way in which our societies form and what we mean by our community.

So I think conservatives can quite appropriately say it is in fact quite appropriate to have a discussion of culture within our larger political discussion because that is the society that these instruments of government are involved in. That is quite different from saying that we are going to impose some articulated vision from Harvard or Yale, or from George Mason University, for all I care, on our society. That is not the same thing as saying that there is a cultural dimension to our political discussion that is absolutely fundamental and should be part of it. In that sense, I think some libertarians as well some of the people on the far left are completely wrong to say that is not legitimate in our discussion.

So I think we as conservatives can have a very powerful discussion on culture in our society, which many people on the left basically take themselves out of and are not able to talk about to the American people in ways that conservatives can because of their premises about what culture means in our political society.

MS. KASS: Thank you. I want to emphasize again, yes, we can have lots of good and long discussions about this but the question is, what should be done? What could or should practical minded philanthropists do? What is really possible to do here?

STEVE HAYWARD: I am going to do just that. I was going to begin with Barbara worrying about Steve Moore because it always worries me when someone named Steve misses the mark, I think.

When I hear Steve point to those very important indicators about certain social trends that have turned favorable, it is undeniably important but it does rather remind me of Robert McNamara in 1966 pointing to his 65 quantitative indicators, every one of which said we were winning the Vietnam War.

I think what Leon has said and Linda has said, and Scott McConnell and others, if you strip it down to one sentence, is, when we talk about culture, we are really talking about matters of individual character, which can never be measured in terms a social scientist would recognize or that could be put in one of Bill Bennett's reports. That gets to be very problematic from a philanthropic point of view.

A couple of straws in the wind: People have mentioned Tom Wolfe's book. He didn't need a foundation grant to produce that book. Mel Gibson didn't need a foundation grant to make the *Passion of the Christ* – in fact just the opposite; he ought to form a foundation now on our side, right? Barbara offered us one model, which is to support the little platoons, which it seems to me is most suitable for smaller, local foundations of individual donors.

For the national foundations to try and compete in the world of ideas, it a little hard to see exactly what you might do. Although, if you ask the question, how will we produce the next generations of Tom Wolfes – how would we make some people prominent like he is so that they weigh in to a mass audience – it may be that we ought to extend some of the models that have been followed, which is to support criticism. I mean, the *New Criterion* was formed to weigh in to the world of art criticism. I'm not sure specifically what those might be but that is one idea that might be thought about to be extended.

On the universities, I think since Robby George is one of the [Bradley Prize] honorees tonight, one ought to point to his model at the Madison Center as a way of trying to affect the university without supposing that a Don Quixote likely can actually take over or transform a university.

Rather, you set up competition within universities with these semi-autonomous centers like his Madison Center – there are two or three others around the country. That strikes me as a model that can be followed with the caveat: Do not provide them with a permanent endowment. See Jim Piereson about the Washington University disaster! But to the extent that you can create these academic units that offer real competition – that they are – Robby can tell you, and the other places, how effective they are at winning over the affections of the students, and I think that is one model the foundation should look at.

MS. KASS: Jim, since your name has been invoked, do you want to respond.

JAMES PIERESON: Sure. Well, this whole question about funding the university is a very important one and conservatives have taken different views. We obviously have spent a lot of money on universities over the years. I have a question as to whether or not an important movement like conservatism can write off an institution as important as the university in our society and still prosper, grow, and remain vital in the future. Fifteen million students attend universities at any given time – you know, they train our elites, they generate ideas – so I regard them and have regarded them as very key institutions in our country and as places where we ought to wage war and combat for our ideas and principles.

And one of the reasons we've done this is we more or less accepted and believed in ideas that Irving Kristol articulated – and Myron Magnet: basically, that during that period in the 1960s, our real difficulty was with our elites in the nation. You know, the common people out there, working people, had not yet been corrupted by a lot of these things that we saw in the 1960s, so what we had to do was create elites – leaders who could articulate the principles and values that the people out there felt. And if we could do that, if we could make a strong case at that level, we would be successful. And I think that has borne great success.

Now, of course, others point out that all of these trends that had stricken the elites in the '60s have now spread out through the entire society and to a large extent that is true. But what to do? I think this episode at Hamilton College offers some opportunities. You know, for 30 years university presidents and administrations have funded a host of ethnic studies, racial studies, feminist studies, environmental studies *ad nauseam*. They were slicing the baloney awfully thin over a long period of time. This fellow who went up to Hamilton College to speak was a professor of ethnic studies at the University of Colorado and he went to speak at something called the Kirkland Project at Hamilton College, which was devoted to activism.

So, in other words, they are two sides of the same coin and that is true of all of these movements. They are basically anti-American; they don't believe in progress; they don't really believe in education. They believe in – what would you call it? They believe in a group of slogans, ideologies which are not particularly helpful and not educational.

Now, you know, if – if it could be pointed out that this disgrace that has been brought upon Hamilton College and the University of Colorado was caused by this broad movement that universities have endorsed over the past generation, and if we could begin to point to alternatives like the ones that Steve [Hayward] just mentioned, and Robby George, and – there is a whole movement across the country to start programs to study American history and the Constitution. You might be able to make some headway in the universities. Universities by their nature will move at a different rhythm than our politics and the culture; it's because of tenure and because of the way ideas move, and so on.

So my view is that there are some opportunities there and it's probably not a set of institutions we should write off.

DAVID KEENE: I associate myself completely with that even though, you know, the good news and the bad news about the universities is the universities are the last privileged sanctuary in America for liberal collectivism. The bad news is they have retreated to those universities and clearing them out is a little bit like clearing out the Japanese stragglers on a Pacific Island in World War II. (Laughter.) And so it's God's work but it's not easy, but it is certainly something that we should do.

But I what I wanted to go back to very quickly was to sort of tie a couple of things together and raise an objection to an impression that I think is false. Bill talked in the earlier session about the fact that modern conservatism has always consisted of warring factions debating ideas and approaches, and all of that, and that is true and has been one of the healthy parts of the movement. We have from the '50s and '60s never agreed with each other although we have always – during most of that period at least – been able to march together when we stepped into the political world.

And today, even here, we're talking about this divide between – to personify it – between the Steve Moores of the world and Barbara Elliott, for example. I think I am like most conservatives in that I agreed with everything that Barbara said, but what – and I don't want to speak for Steve – but what is it that she said that is inconsistent with what Steve said or with his beliefs? The fact that if you take the people at this table and conservatives in general – and there may be one or two exceptions – but in most instances, they would have the same set of priorities but they might order them differently.

So the people that are concerned about economic development and the size of government are probably also concerned about the cultural problem. Now, some people may be fighting the broader war on one front and some people may be fighting it on another, but in my experience over the years, it has always been a task – but not a particularly difficult task when you are dealing with reasonable people – to hold all of those people together because they agree on far more than they disagree.

And I don't think we should get the impression that what you have are people who say we ought to eliminate the Davis-Bacon Act and to hell with anybody who has a drug problem. Nor do we have people who say we ought to have a private program to deal with the literacy and to hell with the economy. I don't think that is what Barbara was saying. And I suspect that in terms of her approach on economic matters, she is probably very close to Steve.

And then you go to the role of philanthropy, which is the subject here. Barbara gave you an example of – and I have not read an empirical study of this, but from what reading I have done, a typical liberal foundation would spend a lot of time trying to devise the model of a government program to solve a problem. The conservative foundations ought to be funding exactly the kinds of things that Barbara is talking about, which not only solve problems, but in solving them demonstrate something about the way we look at people and the way we think people operate and the role of the culture in our society.

And I think to the credit of Bradley and others that a lot of that is done, but when you ask what can we do, we should not be spending huge amounts of money sitting down 17 economists and academics to devise a way to change the world; we should go about helping those people who on their own and as individuals, and with others who are likeminded are actually doing that.

ROBERT WOODSON: I couldn't agree more with what Dave is saying. But the difference between Barbara's approach and Steve's is, Steve's gets funded. (Laughter.) And too many conservatives look upon what Barbara does and what we do with sort of quaint condescension – it's kind of nice but let's get back to the real important work – that conservatives are just more comfortable with ideas and funding ideas, and people who talk about ideas. And I would like to just recommend some very specific things that funders can do.

First of all, I'm just reminded – as a preamble to that – of the joke about the man who was drowning 30 feet from shore and a liberal comes along and determines that he is 30 feet from shore and he says, well, I have got 60 feet of rope so let me just throw it all out to him. A conservatives come along and says, oh, he's 30 feet from shore, let me give him 15 feet and let him swim the rest of the way. A neo-conservative comes along, sees a man drowning, and goes home and writes a column about it. (Laughter).

And so therefore, let me just say that I really think the way the liberals prevail with regard to poor people is because they show up. What they do is often injurious to the poor, but they do show up. They appear to be doing something. Conservatives are absent. Let me just give some very specific things.

First of all, back in '83 – I must commend the Heritage Foundation. When I first arrived in D.C., I was amazed that Heritage would tolerate a column on the mandate for leadership that was set against Reagan – in that I said that they were just praising the fact that what conservatives do is cut budgets and not reform those institutions and I called them low-budget liberals. We have got to get away from low-budget liberalism.

The second thing conservatives have to do is on issues of race policies. I said then as I say now, you always hear conservatives when there is a disgruntled white fireman, but never when there is a legitimate racial grievance by somebody who had been discriminated against. And so that would be important in terms of the image.

The other thing that conservatives need to do is take serious what Barbara was saying and begin to fund efforts that consist of people armed with experience. People armed with experience I believe will always prevail against those armed only with an argument. And therefore it's important to fund those individuals that embody the principles that you stand for. And one of the ways you can undermine the left is to demonstrate to people that liberals do not speak for them, by coming in and supporting faith-based efforts that are reducing drug and alcohol, and crime, and what not – come in and demonstrate.

Also I think there should be some incentives for conservative magazines and scholarly works to go out and do research with faith-based groups, to examine whether or not they are more effective than secular approaches or more effective than liberal approaches, and highlight these in their publications. And I think also scholars could really come and reference some of these individuals when you are trying to draw examples. Go in and reference – it would do a lot to validate these groups.

And also finally someone like Clint Bolick who was at American Institute of Justice – when he goes in and his group supports the person who wants the right to run a jitney service free of government regulation, or to have a hair braiding business, to operate a barber – these are small enterprises that embody fundamental conservative principles but they happen to be acted upon by grassroots people who do not define themselves ideologically. Many of them define themselves

the way I do. On my religion, I'm a cardiac Christian and in my ideology and in politics I'm a radical pragmatist.

Most Americans are radical pragmatists. They will be drawn to your beliefs and your principles to the extent that you support the embodiment of those principles in your actions. And so therefore, I think funders should do more to invest in the kind of grassroots efforts that embody the principles that you say you stand for and then let the people speak for themselves.

One final point is just to say that Ralph Nader understands the relationship between symbol and facts. If Ralph Nader wants you to regulate the automobile, he doesn't stand up with five white guys in blue suits with charts from Harvard. Ralph Nader brings a bloodstained, wrinkled fender of a Pinto, puts it on the hearing table, and he has the weeping parents of a teenager who was killed in a car, and he says, this is why we need to regulate the cars. Now, contrast that with people on the other side who are standing there in business suits saying, this is the data based upon our Harvard study. Who is going to win that argument?

PETE DU PONT: Well, first, I guess, I'm sorry I'm in a suit. (Laughter.) Maybe I should take my tie off and talk differently.

I want to come back to what Steve [Moore] said because I think it's important that we not leave it. He said, dealing with universities, that what we ought to do is stop. We shouldn't stop; we should refocus. There are good things going on at universities. You can fund a Harvard Constitutional law program that reflects the values that all of us have. So instead of saying to the donor, don't give any money to Harvard, tell him give it to something that supports our values.

The Bradley Foundation for a dozen years has supported the choice and charter-school movement in Milwaukee that has been the model for the country. It's going on, it continues on, and by keep that alive, you can, as an institution, do some good things. The Madison Center at Princeton – if you're about to give some money to your 25th – I'm looking at the ages here – 50th reunion at some colleges – (laughter) – don't just send them the $5,000. Give it to the Madison Center. Look at what the Bass Family did with the $20 million to Yale. They said, either you're going to do this or we want our money back. Well, Yale said no, and they took their money back.

So if you refocus on what the universities are doing, you can help in specific areas and I think philanthropy can make a big difference.

PEB JACKSON: We're talking about money and I think that we've seen a huge shift from what I'd call – in Biblical metaphor – Lamentations to perhaps the Book of James in reference to playing offense. I can remember back in the '80s when hardly anybody was involved in a lot of these issues of culture and maybe even in as recent as 10 years ago when people would cobble together $10 million to put a film out, and now you have Phil Anshutz who is putting up hundreds of millions (dollars) and changing the scope and scale of the movie industry.

I think there is a huge shift in terms of big money – serious money moving into the cultural area and it's very exciting. You see examples of it this weekend with the movie *Because of Winn Dixie*, and *The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe*, a $185-million production that will be out next December, and *(inaudible) and Newton*, coming out in '06. Other things like this are tremendously exciting to see. People are finally looking at serious money in this area.

In reference to education, nobody has mentioned Christian colleges or seminaries. *God in the Quad*, the book that is out now that's making the rounds points out the health and vibrancy of

these places. A lot of new screenwriters, producers, directors, camera people are coming out of Christian college film schools. There is a huge shift in that area recently. In the area of character, what Bill George is doing at Harvard Business School in ethics and character is threshold-producing. You see a lot of these kinds of things. I'm very encouraged and see the glass half-full in the midst of what some people call the cultural cesspool.

MICHAEL CROMARTIE: Yes, I want to make potentially a heretical point, and that is this, as Bill pointed out, there is a variety of different kinds of conservatism but I think we need to make note of the fact that there are a varieties of different kinds of liberalism. And I think that we're being a little unfair if we say that liberals are not concerned about the state of the culture. We all know that there are serious, thoughtful liberals concerned about fatherless America. We know that there are thoughtful liberals concerned about our toxic culture, we know there liberals who are concerned about the sexualization of our culture.

So I think this is a place where funders can actually work together in a common cause with people concerned about the state of the family in creative ways to help these problems. I think we should be careful lest we be too sectarian on this question because these are concerns by people who we can actually build bridges with and do projects together. I just think there are ways to creatively work with others we can find common ground on when it comes to problems with the culture.

STEPHEN MOORE: Just a couple of points. One is, you know, when I was saying we are winning the culture war, I wasn't saying it's won and I certainly don't think – I mean, obviously there is a huge amount of work that needs to be done and I wasn't trying to make a case for complacency but there have been a lot of strides forward and a lot of it is a result of conservative research and conservative scholars. I mean, take, for example, James Q. Wilson's work on broken windows and how that led to a whole new theory of fighting crime that was so successful in New York. If you don't think, by the way, that the culture is better now than it was 20 years ago, compare New York City today versus 20 years ago in so many ways – you know, from garbage removal to the fighting of crime.

There are other examples. I mean, the conservative movement – groups like the Heritage Foundation and Cato Institute and all of these other great think tanks really spent 20 years building a case for why the welfare state was corroding our nation, and it led to the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, which was – as I said earlier – an enormous victory for our team.

So there are a number of examples where conservative philanthropy has funded the research that has led to enormous gains. I mean, when Hilary Clinton has to say that abortion is a terrible thing – now, I don't know if she believes that but she says it – probably not – but the fact is that more and more people do think that abortion is a bad thing now even though abortion rates are way too high.

I would say that – in terms of answering your question about how can conservative philanthropy continue to fight the culture war, I believe that – and this applies to economic research as well – in most cases I believe that we have won that intellectual fight. That is clearly true in the economic realm – we have won the intellectual fight on what is wrong with the schools and tax policy. And I think even on the cultural war largely we have won the fight.

What we need to do now, I think, is really – move away, not entirely – but shift in focus from what you might call think tanks to what we may call "do tanks" – "do tanks" like funding the

types of projects that you were talking about, which I think are extremely important – people who are actually on the ground doing these things, applying the research that is so important.

One last thing on the culture – because I am probably the only libertarian at this table at this point, and in response to something Linda was saying about the vile music, I want to say: I have 13- and 11-year-old sons, so believe me, I know what you are talking about. But you know, this isn't new. I mean, I think largely it's just a generational thing. We are all a lot of old farts in this room. But if you go back to the late-1950s, read what people were saying about Elvis Presley and, oh, this is just the worst – you know, his gyrations and so on – what? (Laughter.) You're an adult back there. Or, even, you know, the Beatles. I mean, read what conservatives were saying – oh, my god, I want to hold your hand – and all of this stuff is vile music.

So part of it is just, I think, generational, although there is no question the music is a lot worse now than it was back then.

LINDA CHAVEZ: Just a 20-second intervention. For Christmas I got an album of all of the old '50s love songs. The songs then were about love, they were about marriage, they were about fidelity; they are not about those things now. And there really is a difference. The culture has changed and I think you have to have your eyes closed if you can't see that.

MS. KASS: As our time is running out, let me invite attention to slightly different matter – and, Roger [Hertog], let me put you on notice; I would like your response to this.

Conservative philanthropy will no doubt take a different direction in the future. Taking one's bearings from the foundation world, with Olin closing its doors, it will have to. The direction seems to be more and more toward public policy. But there is something larger at stake. From my understanding, the success of the Olin Foundation as well as the Bradley Foundation was in no small part due to their decisions to fund big ideas – to fund individual scholars, and to fund institutions over the long haul.

Jim Piereson put my concern this way at the very end of his paper. "A movement preoccupied by policy will be less compelling to perspective converts than one defined by broader ideas about politics, history, and religion. Few, after all, will become conservatives primarily because they like caps on malpractice awards or private accounts in social security. Conservatives, to maintain and augment their influence will ever have to wage the broader war of ideas, but to do so, they will need the help of far-sighted philanthropists." How would you envision a far-sighted philanthropist responding to this.

ROGER HERTOG: I would hire Jim. (Laughter.)

Let me just say it from my perspective. My philanthropy is ideological, exclusively – whether it's political or cultural or American history, or religion – in my case, I'm interested in Jewish continuity – not in synagogues in Northern Virginia though. (Laughter.)

MR. HERTOG: My view is – I have sort of three points. My central underpinning is that I'm not particularly interested in a foundation. Excepting our host, I think foundations erode over time. The quality of trustees erodes; risk aversion takes hold; individuals begin to see their legacy as opposed to the donor's legacy. And so I think it's dangerous.

I would like to think that we could give away our money in our lifetime. I don't know whether we will be successful but that should be the goal as opposed to some group of men and women over 30 or 40, or 50 years that begin to redefine what the issues are.

I would say the second thing – and I think Steve touched on it – but for me it's an intriguing thing. Too many philanthropists are too not-for-profit-driven. See, there are big battles in terms of institutions, which many times entrepreneurs – intellectual entrepreneurs – want to start as a *for*-profit institution. They may never make any money, but philanthropists ought to be willing to *give away* the money, even though they won't get a tax deduction.

So in that sense, to me, founding or building a newspaper in New York is an interesting idea – dangerous, risky, brings new meaning to the word "passive losses" – (laughter). Magazines, blogs, websites – we ought to be much more adventuresome. We ought to try many different things as opposed to really defining exactly what it is and saying I'm only interested in this.

Third, I think we have got to expand the universe – we have too many of the same people saying too many of the same things over too long a period of time. And I'm guided here by actually Mike Milken – and I'll just give you this vignette quickly. Milken was diagnosed with prostate cancer in '93. He was 46. He went around to all of these experts – medical institutions – and they basically said, there is really no hope; prostate cancer is a backwater; we don't get funding; it takes too long to get funding; there is no real money for this.

He did such a free-market idea that is so obvious, but he brought together a couple of advisors – he said a very simple thing. He went to medical institutions and said – went to individuals at medical institutions as opposed to institutions and said – I only want big ideas. I want your application to be no longer than five pages long. I don't want you to think about anything to deal with it on the margin. If you send it to me, I'll come back to you in 90 days with between $75,000 and $150,000. The first year he got 46 responses; the second year he 200; the third year he got 600.

This idea applies with us as well – finding young people who are willing to come up with an idea – at some university or some place out there, someone who has an idea that we're willing to invest.

From my perspective, it's always funding an individual, not an institution. And institutions, as they get older, become less inspired – even the best-intentioned institutions and individuals, as they do something for 10, 15, 20, 30 years. You have to find new blood. You have to find people who are really willing to think in a way that is inspiring. And that is the hardest part of philanthropy. It's easy to give away a lot of money because institutions will soak it up. Most of the time, it doesn't do that much good. You can give away small amounts of money and do some good, maybe even a lot of good. It's that in-between segment between a small amount of money and a lot of money that's really hard to give.

And it's actually a lot of work; it's actually like running a business and you have to say no more often than you say yes. But if you're ideologically driven, what you try to do is basically just find great people. The people are actually, in my view, much more important than the idea. Great people end up producing big things over the course of their lifetime. And that's what is hard – there aren't that many of them that are really terrific thinkers.

Did I answer that? And hire Jim. (Laughter.)

MS. KASS: Thank you very much. Let's open this discussion to the audience now.

LUIS TELLEZ: (Off mike) – but I'm also with advisory council of the Madison Program in Princeton. Brad is here – also he is the associate director of the Madison Program. And I want to just say three things related to higher education – how we see it from the ground.

The first point I would make – and again, this is based on the experience with the Madison Program – is that it seems to me – and I am an outsider – I think more on the entrepreneurial side of things and in this sense I can related very much to Mr. Hertog – is that it seems to me philanthropy has been removed from higher education. They have been trying – somewhat successfully and sometimes very successfully – to do things from the outside.

A lot can be done and has to be done working on the ground. There are enormous opportunities to change and the Madison Program is an example. But that happened because Robby George and those of us who work with him understood what was going on. And regarding the Madison Program, I think it's important to recognize – and here I would be the first one to give unqualified praise to – Robby George. But even Robby George could not have done this alone. And this really is my first point.

There might be very few but there are some excellent people well positioned in the academy at the elite universities, but they are overworked, alone, sometimes disorganized – after all academics are not the ones that get a high prize for organization, but some do. I want to ask: What is it that we can do here to help these people. How about a free-enterprise, entrepreneurial approach to helping individuals? What I'm saying is not necessarily to create another Madison Program elsewhere. Maybe, maybe not. There is a middle ground here, and that is to help these individuals who are well-positioned by simply answering the question or asking the question: How can we help?

Now, this leads to me an elaboration of the point – perhaps a second point. I am not a scholar, by the way. I just observe and comment on what can be done here, who has the ideas, and how can you make progress.

But I have observed – having been around for 15 years watching education, and especially in the last three or four years – a common pattern that some of our finest scholars are unbelievably under-financed, under-staffed – you know, take – (inaudible) – with an example – when we started a medicine program, the first thing we had to do is help him get organized. So what did we do? Hire a personal assistant to be his assistant. Every body in business – everybody else has one; even the liberals have one – except our best people who are making the case that we want to make – and again, it makes sense. So, to close, it seems to me that the focus on individuals – helping them – would be a terrific step forward in the academy. Thank you.

DAVID KEENE: Nobody else wants to answer the question so I won't be shy. The emphasis on individuals and giving to individual – I understand that's important but philanthropy needs to be institutionalized. And the point about foundations moving to the left basically is true. That is why Mr. Olin set things up the way he did, so that the Olin Foundation is turning into a pumpkin [spending down its funds and closing its doors].

But one of the things that philanthropy can do, it seems to me, is institutionalize *philanthropy* – teach people how to give away money. And the Philanthropy Roundtable is obviously intended to do something like that, but there is enormous amount of money out there which children are inheriting or that people are earning, and recruiting new philanthropy, for our side especially, is

essential. I mean, what I have seen is when the children take over foundations, things lurch to the left for the most part – and this isn't always the case, but for the most part it is.

And there is a lot of money out there, new money that people don't know how to give away. And we need to get to those people, and it seems to me one of the things that philanthropy needs to do is to try to institutionalize itself – not so much that the pool of money is institutionalized and the staff begins to think it's theirs and you end up with the Ford Foundation – but rather institutionalizing the recruitment of new money and new philanthropists so as to create permanent self-regenerating sources of funding for the kinds of things that we're talking about.

MS. KASS: The point is well taken. Many people have argued that the real goal of philanthropy is to make more philanthropists. But I can't help but notice that you are diametrically opposed to what I think Roger was suggesting.

KEVIN BLIER: My name is Kevin Blier, the director for an organization out of Vermont called the Center for American Cultural Renewal. Let me just say because our operation works out of Vermont, we are working out of the belly of the beast. And a lot of what we are trying to accomplish is competing in the world of ideas in that state and in other states where others are operating in the belly of the beast.

Let me just – if I could – bring one military analogy to something that Stephen Moore mentioned not only in his writing but also in his public statements here: the issue of think tanks versus do tanks. And I don't necessarily think they are in a "versus" type of thing. But let me just make the suggestion that there isn't anybody in this room who would look at a $400 billion military budget and say let's send it all to the Pentagon and just pay generals.

And what I mean by that is, I look around the room at the people – a lot of the leadership in this room and a lot of the people at this roundtable – and say, these are the people who are part of the intellectual conservative movement who have a lot of great ideas. I think what we don't do enough of is fund the boots on the ground. And if we want to – if it's a war for territory – let's say if it is a culture war – and we're trying to take territory, we don't take territory by just having generals come up with great ideas. I think we need to do more focus on having the boots on the ground if we are going to win battles.

And I just wanted to throw that out there to those of you who are looking to fund organizations that are going to take ground.

JUSTIN TORRES: Justin Torres with the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

I wanted to pick up something actually that Steven Hayward said because I thought it was really interesting. It's this: He talked about a distinction between big national foundations that are engaging in the war of ideas and smaller local foundations that might have the capacity to find these neighborhood organizations that are doing good work.

I think that is very true, although it's probably not a big-small division, but rather two different modes of inquiry in philanthropy – ways of thinking about the way you do it. There are big foundations that have worked on the local level and there are small foundations – I mean, the one that I work for has a lamentably small endowment but we have been able to I think have a national impact in our chosen area.

And also, even though I'm not wearing a tie, I wanted to defend the white guys in suits a little bit, because one of the things that we have done is we have been able – in Dayton, Ohio, which is where our historical roots are – to find a lot of charter schools there that, you know, frankly are of uneven quality, some of them.

The ability to generate that data, interpret it, and apply it to arguments has allowed us to make distinctions between the charter schools that we fund that are good and the ones that are not good, and some of them are not. And some of these neighborhood organizations are not good. The passionate commitment has to be there, but you also have to have results, which means you have to have ways of judging results. So I would be wary of giving into the idea that you don't need data and that you don't need the white guys in suits to make those judgments.

QUESTION: I do business 1,000 miles from the Beltway and I have a little bit different spin on what I have heard here today. One of the things that has been discussed today is the term "reform." In my lifetime, one of the things that has happened is that – liberal academics used to be the reformers a generation ago. They had the ideas, they set up the programs. A generation later, conservatives have become the reformers. We are the ones with the ideas. We are the ones who are looking to change people's lives at the local level.

I come from a state where we have vouchers. If you asked me 20 years ago: Would you ever have vouchers in Milwaukee? I would have said no. But the reality is because we have had ideas, we have been able to put these things into action; we're improving people's lives. We are doing very well around the country and states. And I think one of the reasons is that we've been able to take some ideas and make them practical and get the legislation passed.

I'll get specific in one area. In the early '80s, Charles Murray wrote a book called *Losing Ground*. That book enabled a lot of us to pass welfare legislation. Ideas *do* matter and conservative foundations with not a whole lot of resources compared to liberals were able to fund ideas to make things work. If you want to know an institution that you want to take a look at in the future that all of us will agree has been overlooked, what is the one institution that trains our teachers, trains bad administrators, puts together dreadful pieces of curriculum – it is on campus. They are called schools of education. That ought to be something that we should be taking a real serious look at over the next 10 years.

DAVID KEENE: I think that is exactly right. When we talk about that, we're really talking about two kinds of philanthropy on the right. First of all, let's think about the fact that the Olin Foundation, the Bradley Foundation in the philanthropic world – while they are huge among conservatives, they are a small part of the philanthropic world. And then think of the leverage that they have had and they have had it exactly because of what Jim Piereson mentions – the funding of ideas.

When I talk to groups about what has happened over the last 50 years, the book that I suggest they read is Danny Yergin's *Commanding Heights*, which has two themes, both of which have been mentioned here. One is that ideas have consequences and that policies follow good ideas, and that the most important things that happened during the '50s and '60s were things like the founding of the Mont Pelerin Society and the funding of big ideas, which led to the second stage now where you can fund the application of those ideas. But never should we forget that those ideas are the important thing at the base. And now conservative philanthropy should be worried about both, not one at the exclusion of the other.

The second part of that book is the other reason that we ultimately won: the other side's ideas were bankrupt. No matter how much money you have, if it doesn't work, it doesn't work. This is a pragmatic country where our ideas are applied and as articulated, and by funding people that have those ideas, we win in the marketplace, and that is how we have gotten to where we are and we should not mess around too much with a formula that has worked.

HEATHER HIGGINS: To reiterate, I think most of us are in violent agreement. (Scattered laughter.) All of these different things that we are talking about are all things that certainly my foundation and others have been actively engaged in: looking for talent where you can find talent and funding talent, looking for important ideas when you are in the part of the process by which ideas move from being held by a few people to being held by the community at large where you are, writing the books and then doing the empirical work, and then creating the organizations that do the wholesale development of these ideas and then the retail selling of these ideas. And eventually they move down that process.

And so all of these things are important. And I would just make a pitch at this point that one of the themes that we have heard today is how important the diversity of the projects which we fund are – the diversity of funders because of the wealth and variety of their interests, and the diversity of organizations large and small which are the recipients of these funds.

And to that end, I would urge you to all be deeply concerned about the draft White Paper that has come out of the Senate Finance Committee that the Alliance for Charitable Reform is trying to address, which would do terrible damage to the capacity of there to be small and mid-sized, non-bureaucratic, innovative foundations that are laboratories for innovations and ideas of citizenship, and would be terribly crippling to particularly the small platoon organizations – the entities that aren't in a position to engage armies of accountants and lawyers to fulfill this bureaucratic top-down assumption that we all are pernicious players waiting to go over the edge into deep wells of self-dealing if only we are not adequately regulated.

This is drafted by people who have an intensely negative view of the philanthropic sector both receiving and giving, and it is unfortunate that although I suspect it was well intended, its consequences could be devastating to philanthropy of all stripes, not just conservative.

MS. KASS: Thank you all. Thank you all for participating and thanks to the audience for your patience.

(Applause.)

WILLIAM SCHAMBRA: We will actually continue some of these themes at lunch. You all are invited of course to lunch in Salon III, which is just around the corner. Pete Wehner, director of Strategic Initiatives at the White House, will be bringing the message. And meanwhile, thank you all again for coming and let us give the panel another round of applause if we could. Thank you.

(Applause.)

(End of session.)

VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

A Bradley Center Symposium

KEYNOTE ADDRESS AND LUNCHEON DISCUSSION:
12:00 – 1:30 p.m.

Introduction: Herb London, Hudson Institute
Keynote Address: Peter Wehner, White House

HERB LONDON: I'm Herb London, president of Hudson Institute, and it's my honor to welcome you to this luncheon sponsored by Hudson's Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civic Renewal. From what I listened to and observed, I think that the sessions this morning were quite extraordinary. I want to thank Bill Schambra, Krista Shaffer, and the people who made this happen. They've really done and extraordinary job. (Applause.)

It's a particular pleasure to have had with us today so many board members and staff from the Bradley Foundation. We will join them in celebrating the winners of this year's Bradley Prizes: George Will, Ward Connerly, Robbie George, and Heather Mac Donald. Earlier this morning we explored the conservative vision for America and the role of philanthropy in promoting that vision. Our luncheon today brings us a bit closer to the realm of practical politics, where grand strategy merges with the ideas and practical judgment and administrative issues. When President Bush and his advisor Karl Rove decided to set up an Office of Strategic Initiatives, they knew immediately that the man for the job had to be an alumnus of the Hudson Institute – something we're very proud of, as a policy institute known for its ability to look over the horizon at tomorrow's grand themes. I say this with great dispassion. (Laughter.)

We are honored to have with us today that Hudson alumnus, deputy assistant to the president and director of the Office of Strategic Initiatives, Peter Wehner. Pete has enjoyed a long and distinguished career in public service as a speech writer and policy advisor, beginning with his time at the Department of Education with Secretary Bill Bennett during the Reagan years, followed by a stint with Mr. Bennett at the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Shortly thereafter, Pete spent some time at Hudson where our staff still talks about his technique for overcoming writer's block, namely Nerf football games in the office hallways. (Laughter.) I guess you didn't think I knew about that, Pete. (Laughter.)

Pete was asked to join the current administration as deputy director of Presidential Speechwriting, no doubt on large measure because of his football skills perfected at Hudson. And when Karl Rove decided that he needed someone to help him take the long view and think about the larger

intellectual legacy that this administration is to leave behind, it was only natural that he should think Pete Wehner could tackle this assignment.

On this day, when our attention is turned to the longer view, we are indeed fortunate to have with us President Bush's point person for that effort within his administration. It is my honor and deep pleasure to be able to introduce one of the nation's foremost strategic thinkers, who invariably fills my e-mail account with words of wisdom, the honorable Pete Wehner.

(Applause.)

PETER WEHNER: Thank you very much, Herb, for your kind introduction. Actually there's another cure for writer's block and it's called a deadline, especially when you're writing for the President. I should say at the outset that all the ideas in this speech have been taken from people in this audience so if you hear an idea that you wrote about, do me the favor of not standing up in the middle of the speech and claiming it. (Laughter.) You can do that during the Q and A session.

As Herb mentioned, I did work at the Hudson Institute a little more than a decade ago, and I look back to that period with a great deal of fondness. It was a time where I learned a lot about public policy and also made some very good friends including people who are once again my colleagues at the White House. Shortly before he assumed the presidency, John Kennedy gave a speech at the National Press Club in which he said that we "must reopen the channel of communications between the world of thought and the seat of power." And the Hudson Institute represents the world of thought, and those of us working in government for the high quality of your work and insights on the great issues of our time.

It's a particular pleasure as well to speak at an event that's supported by the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation. The Bradley Foundation is a remarkable American institution. For decades, it has been devoted to principles and beliefs that sustain democratic capitalism and over the years have supported scholars and writers, public intellectuals and civic projects that have made our common life richer and better, and one are in which the Bradley Foundation has made a particular contribution to the thinking of this administration is the faith-based initiative. That initiative did not come out of the ether. It was based on the successes we were seeing around the country, including faith-based neighborhood initiatives that the Bradley Foundation supported in Milwaukee and elsewhere.

And the Bradley Foundation also honors some of the best among us. This evening, as you know, you'll be celebrating this year's Bradley Prize winners, as Herb mentioned: Ward Connerly, Robbie George, Heather Mac Donald, and George Will. These are individuals with extraordinary intellectual talent. I deeply admire what they have achieved, and I'm grateful for what they have contributed to our national life. Excellence in any field of endeavor is something we ought to honor.

We live in remarkable times, and in working at the White House, one of the striking things to me is the sheer pace of events given the advent of talk radio, cable news, and the Internet – good things all – though I suspect it at least feels as though the pace of events is accelerated compared to just a few decades ago. This afternoon, I hope to step back from the rush of daily events and discuss President Bush's governing philosophy. I'll briefly look at three areas – foreign, social, and economic policy – and make the case for why I believe the President is making significant intellectual contributions to each.

Let me being with foreign policy and by stating a proposition. One of President Bush's key conceptual contributions is the idea that expanding freedom leads to peace among nations and that America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now entwined. A close reading of the President's second inaugural address reveals it is an effort to break down the dividing wall that has sometimes separated American interests and American idealism. The President's speech argues that pursuing our core principles will promote our national security and that what happens within the borders of other nations is often of intense interest to our own. And that may seem unremarkable except if you consider that President Bush has broken with six decades of western policy that accommodated the lack of freedom in the Middle East.

For more than a half century, tyranny and oppression in the Middle East were met with, at best, indifference and, at worst, support. No effort was made to spread liberty to the Arab world, and then came what President Bush called "a day of fire." And in its aftermath emerged a new doctrine for this new century. The core of this doctrine rests on the president's belief that stability cannot be purchased at the expense of liberty. And as long as the Middle East remains a place where freedom does not flourish, it will remain a place of stagnation and resentment, a cauldron of anti-western hatred and violence.

In the aftermath of the September 11th attacks, President Bush made a decision to relentlessly pursue terrorists and to go after the conditions of oppression and corruption that give rise to terrorism. The President adopted a fundamentally new approach, what he calls "a forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East." This means giving practical support to the rise of democracy in the broader Middle East and the hope and progress and modernization that democracy brings.

Our administration is not without its critics, far from it. But it is worth noting, I think, that our critics have offered no competing theory on how to address the generator of global terrorism. They may take issue with our execution of policy, but they have no conceptual theory to offer in its place; and that is, itself, revealing. The president believes the course he has chosen is wise because it is rooted in recent human experience. We are, after all, witnessing the swiftest advances in human freedom in history. According to Freedom House, of 192 countries in the world, 119 (countries) or 62 percent have freely elected governments. And since the midpoint of the last century we have seen almost a doubling of the percentage of people living in democratic states. It's worth bearing in mind that in less than four months we have seen elections take place in Afghanistan, the Ukraine, among the Palestinians, and in Iraq. In the span of 113 days, more than a hundred million people living on two continents have cast free votes in nations that have never known authentic democracy, and more than half of those voters were people of Muslim faith who live in the broader Middle East. For those who remain skeptical of the appeal of liberty and its capacity to take root in foreign soil, it's worth recalling a line from philosophy: "You can prove the possible by the actual." And unfolding before our eyes are historical and enormously hopeful achievements. We are witnessing a great movement toward human liberty.

But the Bush administration's policies are anchored in more than recent human experience; they're also grounded in a particular view of human nature and teleology and in the truths articulated in the Declaration of Independence. "In the enlightened belief in the founders," Lincoln said, "nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on and degraded and imbruted by its fellows." President Bush's policies are consistent with America's ancient faith. He believes liberty is the design of nature, which explains why it leads to human flourishing. And in an important essay in *The Public Interest*, James Ceaser and Daniel DiSalvol wrote on the foundational principles of the Bush foreign policy, and they

concluded this: “Not since Lincoln has the putative head of the Republican Party so actively sought to ground the party in the politics of natural right.”

Now let me insert some important caveats in this discussion. Foundational principles are vital, but they do not provide a president with specific guidance on how to act in every circumstance faced by every nation. The goal of the Bush doctrine is to advance liberty, but the means to the end will vary. Is it really necessary to point out that, in pursuing liberty and ending tyranny, we may use different tactics with an ally that is not yet fully free but is taking steps toward democracy versus a totalitarian enemy that is taking steps toward greater oppression and aggression? Perhaps it is necessary to point that out. And to those who say that the declared goal of American policy to eventually end tyranny in the world is impossible to achieve and cannot possibly be taken seriously, let me offer an enlightened understanding of balancing moral ends and means.

It once again comes to us courtesy of Abraham Lincoln, who said this in his 1857 Springfield speech on the Dred Scott decision. Quote, “The founders did consider all men created equal, equal in certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This they said, and this they meant. They did not mean to assert the obvious untruth that all men were enjoying that equality or yet that they were about to confer it immediately upon them. In fact, they had no power to confer such a boon. They meant simply to declare the right so that the enforcement of it might follow as fast as circumstances should permit. They meant to set up a standard maxim for a free society, which should be familiar to all and revered by all, constantly looked to, constantly labored for, and even though never perfectly attained, constantly approximated and therefore constantly spreading and deepening its influence and augmenting the happiness and value of life to all people of all colors, everywhere.” Unquote.

Those of us in this administration understand that for liberty to take root in a society, more than elections is required. Elections are vital, but they do not, by themselves, constitute a vibrant democratic culture. This requires certain civic habits, which take time to develop and which elections, themselves, can help develop. And elections can also de-legitimize a brutal and bitter insurgency as we saw in El Salvador in the 1980s and as I believe we are now seeing in Iraq. Elections, by themselves, cannot defeat an insurgency, but they can certainly contribute to its eventual demise.

I would add that our own democratic development, which was gradual and halting and involved us in a fiery trial that cost more than 600,000 American lives, is a reminder that we must be patient with others. Working democracies need time to develop, and as they develop, they will reflect their own cultures. That is as it ought to be. And in the United States we’ve taken a two-century long journey toward equality and social justice, and this should make us patient with other nations at different stages in the journey. The president has called this “the work of generations.” It is not something that will come into being in the blink of an eye.

Now with those caveats in place, let me return to my main point. President Bush believes in fixed, immutable principles. In his words, “We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation – the moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right. To those who disagree with this approach, let them say so loudly, clearly, publicly and repeatedly.” As the nation is moving toward freedom, President Bush believes we must show we are worthy of it here at home. He believes rights must be tethered to responsibilities and that the public interest depends on private character. In the words of the President, “Self-government relies, in the end, on the governing of the self.” This belief goes back to the ancient Greeks and to the American founders. It is an old truth, but one that has

been often overlooked in these modern or, as some would have it, postmodern times. Character is formed by habits – Aristotle taught us that – and habits are shaped by key institutions: families and schools, communities and places of religious worship.

These are the institutions that help give purpose and meaning to our lives, and government cannot be indifferent to them. To cite a line penned by one of this year's Bradley Prize winners, George Will, "Statecraft is soul craft." I was actually one of the few dozen people that read that book and liked it very much, actually. That is why the President has spoken out often and eloquently in defense of marriage as a sacred institution and the foundation of society. It is why he has put the government on the side of supporting safe and stable families, adoption, and responsible fatherhood. It's why he signed into law the most important federal educational reform in history, one that insists in testing, high standards, and accountability. It's why faith-based groups are receiving unprecedented support and encouragement. It is why the President has fostered a culture of service and citizenship, and it is why the President is building a culture of life and upholding the dignity of the human person.

There are, of course, limits to what government can do to shape the habits of the heart. Government is a blunt instrument, and everyone in this room is familiar with the law of unintended consequences. Yet surely we can expect the government to be an ally instead of an adversary when it comes to strengthening vital social institutions, those that provide our children with love and teach them empathy, that instill in them compassion and courage, self discipline and honesty, respect for others, and love of country. One of the duties of adulthood is to teach future generations what is worthy of their affections and passion, their honor and their allegiance. "What we have loved others would love, and we will teach them how," Wordsworth said. And teaching them how is preeminently the responsibility of families and schools, communities and houses of worship.

Let me now turn to the President's economic agenda. President Bush has made the case that many of our most fundamental systems – the tax code, healthcare coverage, pension plans, and worker training – were created for a bygone era. The President is committed to transforming these systems so citizens are better prepared to make their own choices and pursue their own dreams. "Whatever else it does," *Business Week* wrote during the 2004 election, "Bush's throwing down the gauntlet will open one of the more striking debates of the campaign. That's because there's a philosophical gulf between liberals' evocations of social equality and the comfort of government helping hand versus conservatives' paeans to individualism and entrepreneurship."

The philosophical underpinning of what President Bush calls "the ownership society" is to provide Americans with a path to greater opportunity, more freedom, and more control over their own lives. "This young century will be liberty's century," the President has said, "and here at home we will extend the frontiers of freedom." And so the President has embraced the ideas of voluntary personal accounts, in which younger workers can save some of their social security taxes in order to build a nest egg for retirement, lifetime savings accounts, which would allow every American to save as much as $7,500 a year and shield from taxation investment returns on those savings, health savings accounts, tax-free accounts designed to help individuals, say, for health expenses, and tax credits for low-income families and individuals to purchase health insurance. The President has also pledged to reform the current tax code, which he calls "archaic" and "incoherent." And he wants a new tax code which is simpler, fairer, and more pro-growth. Homeownership in America is at an all-time high, and President Bush will build on that achievement. And in almost every realm – education, the federal civil service system, drug

treatment programs, foreign aid, and much else – the President is tying public spending to competition and accountability.

Ownership also contributes to community. When people own their own homes, they become not just invested in their property, but in their community, their neighborhood. It makes people more communally responsible. And ownership also elicits greater commitment and care for owners themselves. "In the history of the world," it's been said, "no one has ever washed a rented car." (Laughter.) That's a good case for ownership. As I mentioned before, one of the core questions of political philosophy has to do with habits the government encourages among the citizenry. The aim of the president's policies is to encourage self-reliance and provide greater opportunity. He believes government should promote market reforms and strengthen liberty, and underlying all of this is the belief that government must begin with the proper conception of the individual. Government's default position should not be to view citizens as wards of the state, but rather as responsible and independent, self-sufficient and upright.

The closest example to what President Bush is attempting to do with his emphasis on an ownership society may be found in the policies of former Prime Minister – British Prime Minister – Margaret Thatcher. In her remarkable 1992 book *The Anatomy of Thatcherism*, the political philosopher Shirley Robin Letwin wrote this, quote, "The Thatcherite argues that being one's own master in the sense of owning one's own home or disposing of one's own property provides and incentive to think differently about the world. A Thatcherite stresses that ownership and moral attitudes are connected and sees in wider individual ownership and useful means of promoting the moral attitudes that Thatcherism seeks to cultivate. Nor is it only and independence and self-sufficiency which the Thatcherite hopes to encourage by means of wider ownership. Personal energy and adventurousness, critical components of the vigorous virtues, are also believed by the Thatcherite to be encouraged by wider ownership." Unquote.

The president's agenda is an ambitious one, but to quote *The Economist* magazine, "Mr. Bush is nothing if not ambitious. If his new philosophy endures, he will be a transformative figure in the history of the modern conservative movement."

Le me conclude with a few words about conservatism and America's 43rd president. Many of you in this audience are conservatives because you believe it's the political philosophy that best allows societies to prosper and to flourish. Conservatives understand the important role of the traditions and institutions habits and authorities have in our common life. At the same time, there is a conservative temperament that can be politically counterproductive. For many years, conservatism was characterized by suspicion and defensiveness for the world in which we live. It was primarily a reactive political movement, which mitigated against boldness. The Book of Ecclesiastes tells us that for everything there is a season, and at some points in history, the role of conservatism has been to stop pernicious ideologies – the excesses of the French Revolution, socialism, fascism, and imperial communism. These were monumental achievements, but we have entered a different era. Today the role of conservatism is to be proactive, bold, energetic, and optimistic, to shape history, rather than to try and impede it.

We live in a history-shaping moment. Conservatism is the dominant political philosophy of this young century, and President Bush is making significant philosophical and political contributions to it. In late January of 2001, America's new president said, "We are here to make progress. We are not here to mark time." George W. Bush has been true to his word. He is one of history's consequential presidents. In a single term, he has shaped and redefined the direction of his own party. He has fundamentally recast America's national security strategy, and he has put forward a transformative domestic agenda.

In foreign policy, President Bush has earned the title as one of history's great liberators, and I believe in domestic policy he will be seen as one of its great reformers. His first term was enormously eventful and very successful, but there's more, much more that remains to be done. And now this good man has a mandate to claim and a nation to govern. I can tell you that to be part of that enterprise has been, for me and for so many of my colleagues, the professional honor of a lifetime. Thank you very much, and I'd be happy to entertain your questions.

(Applause.)

MR. LONDON: As Pete has just indicated, he is happy to entertain a few questions.

QUESTION: Does the President ever think about working with foundations in a particular way on his agenda?

MR. WEHNER: Well, I don't know that he wakes up in the morning thinking, there's a foundation I can work with. I think in principle what he does believe in is the work that foundations do, and he wants to create policies and an environment where good foundations can do good work. Now some of that's going to involve taxes and economic policies. Some of it's going to involve, I think, words and the bully pulpit. And I think some of it is going to involve an articulation of some of the things that foundations are trying to encourage, which is civic service and a sense of community and ownership. So, I actually don't know.

He may well have met with heads of foundations, and there are certainly people in the White House who have done that, but he's clearly aware of the work of foundations. As I said, the Bradley Foundation is in many ways extremely valuable and helpful in our efforts on the faith-based initiative. We saw what was going on in the country and wanted to figure out how we can replicate and support it.

QUESTION: When you talked about some of the proposals the President had, you mentioned that – basically various requirements going with the funding, which is, you know, on one level immanently reasonable. But on another level, has there been concern and discussion about the way in which some of those requirements potentially increase even more the role of government?

MR. WEHNER: Yeah, sure. I mean, there's always a tension, I guess, in trying to on the one hand advocate standards and keep standards serious and make sure that they're met and on the other hand not to have the heavy hand of government suffocate and do good work. I guess, probably a pretty good principle is that if the federal government is paying for it, it probably has a right to expect results for it. And there ought to be some kind of mechanisms in government what is – what's the product. So if we're funding education, toward what end? Here's a good question: is learning going up, going down?

And we've done the same thing in foreign aid with the Millennium Challenge Account, which is that there was an increase in foreign aid, but there was a fundamental shift in the policy toward it where we said we were going to try and earmark that money so it goes to countries that are pursuing policies that'll eventually free them from foreign aid in terms of economic development and political freedom and that kind of thing. But you're right. There's always this kind of tension when you get down to the particular facts and circumstances and you have to make a decision on what is government going to do to try and enforce those standards. People will quibble for what we've done. I think, for the most part, we've done it about right.

QUESTION: Joe Dolan (ph) of the Achelis and Bodman Foundations in New York City. Would you share –

MR. WEHNER: No.

(Laughter.)

Q: – with us today what new initiatives, ideas, or programs might emanate out of your office in the next few years?

MR. WEHNER: (Chuckles.) If I had any, I couldn't share them anyway. But, you know, it's funny. It's Office of Strategic Initiatives, which sounds terrific and tells you absolutely nothing. And apropos my last comment, in some ways, on the antithesis of the No Child Left Behind Act, there's not much accountability for my office. We're not a policy executing office.

When Karl designed this office along with Andy Card, what he wanted to do was to get an office that was a sort of in-house White House think tank, that had an outreach to public intellectuals, that monitored what was being said and written both positive and negative. Each person that's a director in any job, you come with it and you bring certain value added, certain things that you don't do as well, and so, you know, these jobs are kind of shaped according to who runs them.

But you know, one of my jobs is to look out there and see things and just weigh in and give my ideas to Karl on communications or on policy. And he's a great boss because if they're a bad idea, he kills it and doesn't say anything. If it's a good idea, you know, he'll follow it up, which is just fine with me. We've got a lot on our plate right now. There's more to come, but we're now engaged in a monumental political debate – Grover can tell you about that – on Social Security, and a lot rides on its outcome. We've got tax reform coming up. We've still got a lot on the foreign policy side and some changes in education. So right now our plate's pretty full, but we're always thinking about new things and in contact with people. Leon Kass is here. So we're always open to people refining ideas that are currently on the table or presenting new ones, but I wouldn't be in a position to reveal them. We tend to like to let the President do that.

QUESTION: In your speech, you used the phrase "totalitarian enemies of the United States." What countries were you referring to?

MR. WEHNER: Well, I'm not the Secretary of State so I won't go beyond that. There are countries in which there are totalitarian ideologies out there, and I think it's pretty clear what some of them might be. They fit the traditional definition of totalitarianism. But they're, you know, there are enemies of America out there, and it does seem to me that when one is looking at the facts and circumstances on how one enforces the Bush doctrine, or at least the Bush doctrine as understood as promoting liberty, it does make a difference whether you're dealing, as I said, with an ally who may be moving even slowly toward freedom and one that's an enemy of America, that's not moving toward freedom, that's moving toward aggression. And the reason you have to make that distinction is because in the aftermath of the state – of the inaugural address, a lot of commentators seemed to fail to make that distinction. They tried to criticize the speech by saying, well, my goodness, President Bush has announced that his goal is the end of tyranny. So what does that mean? Does that mean that next month, in the next 60 days, every country that's not fully free, we're going to go to war with? We're going to cut off all relations with? We're going to cut off all funding? Well, that's ludicrous.

As the President said, the goal of ending tyranny is a generational commitment and a generational struggle. But as I said in my speech, if our critics want to stand up and oppose that goal, I'd love them to do it. They can say it as often as they want, but you're going to – Condie Rice met, I think, yesterday with the leaders of – some of the leaders of Egypt, and she made a case for political prisoners. So, you know, you've – the President is a deeply idealistic man. He's also a deeply practical man. You find out both of those elements when you work with him. And he's a problem solver. It's a hardwiring of him where I think a lot of people, a lot commentators actually don't pick up on that. There's a lot of commentary on how ambitious he is and the big ideas that he takes on, but a lot of the reason that he does that is he sees what he thinks are the pressing problems and he says, how do you solve it? And in trying to figure out how you solve it, he's willing to be pretty bold in that effort.

The freedom doctrine is a manifestation of that. He saw a situation in the Middle East, as I said, where this was seething resentment, cauldron of violence, and the question was, how do you change it; how do you transform the region? And he thought it was a pretty good idea to advance liberty, and he thinks it can work. And we're now testing that proposition and it'll take time to find out whether it'll work or not, but I think the early signs are encouraging. And I can tell you one thing, he's going to stay at it.

MR. LONDON: Pete, thank you so much.

(Applause.)

MR. LONDON: I'd like to thank Pete Wehner. I'd like to thank you for being in attendance. I also would like to thank, yet again, Krista Shaffer for her extraordinary organizational ability and Bill Schambra for making this possible and the rest of the Hudson staff. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

(END)

VISION AND PHILANTHROPY

A Bradley Center Symposium

Biographies

Stuart M. Butler is vice president for Domestic and Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation in Washington DC. He plans and oversees the Foundation's research and publications on all domestic issues. He has been with Heritage since 1979 and is an expert on health, welfare and Social Security policy. He is also an adjunct professor at Georgetown University Graduate School, and in 2002 he was a fellow at Harvard University's Institute of Politics. Butler has played a prominent role in the debate over Medicare, health care for working Americans, and Social Security reform, arguing for solutions based on individual choice and market competition. He has written extensively on Medicare, health care for working Americans, Social Security reform and has testified frequently before Congress on a broad range of issues.

Linda Chavez is president of the Center for Equal Opportunity, a non-profit public policy research organization in Sterling, Virginia. She also writes a weekly syndicated column that appears in newspapers across the country, is a political analyst for FOX News Channel, and hosts a nationally syndicated daily radio show on Liberty Broadcasting. Chavez authored *Out of the Barrio: Toward a New Politics of Hispanic Assimilation* (Basic Books, 1991); published her memoir, *An Unlikely Conservative: The Transformation of an Ex-Liberal* (Basic Books, 2002); and entitled her latest book *Betrayal: How Union Bosses Shake Down Their Members and Corrupt American Politics* (Crown Books, 2004). Chavez has held a number of appointed positions, among them Chairman, National Commission on Migrant Education (1988-1992); White House Director of Public Liaison (1985); Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1983-1985).

Michael Cromartie is vice president at the Ethics and Public Policy Center, where he directs both the Evangelicals in Civic Life and Religion & the Media programs. On September 20, 2004, Cromartie was appointed by President George W. Bush for a two-year term on the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. He is the host of Radio America's weekly show "Faith and Life"; an adjunct professor at the Reformed Theological Seminary; and an advisory editor of *Christianity Today*. He is the co-editor, of *Piety and Politics: Evangelicals and Fundamentalists Confront the World* (1987, now in its fifth printing). He is also the editor of nearly a dozen works, most recently *A Public Faith: Evangelicals and Civic Engagement* (Wm. B. Eerdmans, September 2003). Cromartie has been quoted on issues relating to religion and politics in the *Washington Post*, *Time* magazine, *The New Republic*, the *New York Times*, *Christianity Today*, *Time*, the *National Catholic Register*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and numerous other newspapers and magazines around the country.

Pete du Pont is chairman of the board of the National Center for Policy Analysis and member of the board, Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation. He is a regular columnist on www.opinionjournal.com, the editorial page website of *The Wall Street Journal*. He is also a director in the Wilmington, Delaware law firm of Richards, Layton & Finger. du Pont has served as a state legislator, U.S. Congressman, Governor, and in l988 was a Republican candidate for

President of the United States. In 1996, Pete du Pont co-founded IntellectualCapital.com, a weekly on-line public policy journal featuring the leading ideas of renowned public policy thinkers. He served as editor of this e-zine and bylined his own column until its sale in 2000. In October, 1999, Newsstation.com named du Pont as one of the "50 best, most important, and most influential journalists on the Internet." And Yahoo! Internet Life awarded IntellectualCapital.com the Best Political Commentary site of 1998.

Barbara J. Elliott is the founder and president of the Center for Renewal in Houston, Texas, and the author of *Street Saints: Renewing America's Cities*, and also *Equipping the Saints: A Guide to Giving to Faith-based Organizations*. She served in the White House and on Capitol Hill with the Heritage Foundation before moving to the private faith sector. She is an associate fellow with the Sagamore Institute and a Philanthropic Advisor with the Legacy Group.

Steven F. Hayward is the F.K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute in Washington DC, and senior fellow at the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy in San Francisco. He writes frequently on a wide range of current topics, including environmentalism, law, economics, and public policy for publications including *National Review, Reason, The Weekly Standard, The Public Interest*, the *Claremont Review of Books*, and *Policy Review*. His newspaper articles have appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Chicago Tribune*, and dozens of other daily newspapers. He is the author of the annual *Index of Leading Environmental Indicators*. He is also the author of *The Age of Reagan: The Fall of the Old Liberal Order, 1964-1980,* published in September 2001, and is currently completing the second volume, *The Age of Reagan: Lion at the Gate, 1981-1989*. His other books include *Churchill on Leadership*, and *The Real Jimmy Carter*.

Roger Hertog is one of the founders of Sanford C. Bernstein & Co., Inc., and served as the firm's president until its combination with Alliance Capital Management in October 2000. He currently is vice-chairman of Alliance Capital Management and a member of its Executive Committee. A graduate of City College of New York, he is the past chairman of The Manhattan Institute; a trustee of the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, The New York Public Library, and The New York Historical Society; and chairman of *The New Republic*, The Shalem Center in Jerusalem, and *The New York Sun*. Roger and Susan Hertog provide funding for the "Hertog Research Fellowships" at Columbia University School of the Arts and the "Hertog Scholars" at The City University of NY (CUNY) Honors College.

Heather Richardson Higgins is the president and director of The Randolph Foundation, which focuses on projects related to encouraging the attitudes and values necessary to free and democratic societies. She is also co-founder of the Alliance for Charitable Reform. Additionally, Heather serves on the boards of Philanthropy Roundtable (vice chairman), Independent Women's Forum (chairman), the Hoover Institution (executive committee), and the Committee for Economic Development. Before moving to the nonprofit sector, Higgins worked on Wall Street as a portfolio manager and vice president at U.S. Trust. Prior to working in finance she was an editorial writer for *The Wall Street Journal* and an assistant editor at *The Public Interest*. Higgins has been a frequent political commentator, and she continues to write frequently on both public policy and foundation issues for such publications as *The Wall Street Journal, The Weekly Standard, National Review*, and a variety of philanthropy-related publications.

Peb Jackson is an executive vice president of Saddleback Church in Lake Forest, Calif. Previously he held executive positions with Generous Giving, Young Life, and Focus on the Family. Before entering the ministry world, Jackson was president of J.D. Bradley Co., a public

relations firm in southern California. He also was director of admissions for Azusa Pacific University in Azusa, Calif., and was an executive with the Spartan Oil Co. in southern California.

Robert Kagan is senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. His most recent book, *Of Paradise and Power* (Knopf, 2003), was on the *New York Times* bestseller list for ten weeks and the *Washington Post* bestseller list for 14 weeks. It was also a bestseller in the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, and Canada and has been translated into over 25 languages. Kagan writes a monthly column on world affairs for the *Washington Post*, and is a contributing editor at both the *Weekly Standard* and the *New Republic*. He served in the State Department from 1984-1988 as a member of the Policy Planning Staff, as principal speechwriter for Secretary of State George P. Shultz, and as deputy for policy in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. He is also author of *A Twilight Struggle: American Power and Nicaragua, 1977-1990* (Free Press, 1996), and is co-editor with William Kristol of *Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign Policy* (Encounter Books, June 2000).

Amy A. Kass is a senior fellow at Hudson Institute. For over 25 years, she has been an award-winning teacher of classic texts in the College of the University of Chicago, where she also is a senior fellow in the John M. Olin Center for Inquiry into the Theory and Practice of Democracy. She has directed nationwide seminars on civic leadership, first under the auspices of the "Toqueville Seminars on Civic Leadership" at the University of Chicago and now under the "Project on Civic Reflection" at Valparaiso University. She currently works with donors and foundation leaders to deepen their understanding of the principles and practices of giving as a vehicle for improving civic life. Kass is the author of numerous articles and the editor of three books: *American Lives: Cultural Differences, Individual Distinction,* an anthology of American biographies; *Wing to Wing, Oar to Oar: Readings on Courting and Marrying* (with Leon R. Kass), a companion for young people seeking help in finding a worthy life partner; and *The Perfect Gift: The Philanthropic Imagination in Poetry and Prose,* which aims to help givers, large and small, think about the meanings and purposes of giving.

Leon R. Kass is Hertog Fellow in Social Thought at the American Enterprise Institute and Addie Clark Harding Professor in the Committee on Social Thought and the College at the University of Chicago (on leave of absence). He has been engaged for more than 30 years with ethical and philosophical issues raised by biomedical advance, and, more recently, with broader moral and cultural issues. His widely reprinted essays in biomedical ethics have dealt with issues raised by in vitro fertilization, cloning, genetic screening and genetic technology, organ transplantation, aging research, euthanasia and assisted suicide, and the moral nature of the medical profession. His numerous articles and books include: *Toward a More Natural Science: Biology and Human Affairs* (1984); *The Hungry Soul: Eating and the Perfecting of Our Nature* (1994); *The Ethics of Human Cloning* (1998, with James Q. Wilson); *Wing to Wing, Oar to Oar: Readings on Courting and Marrying* (2000, with Amy A. Kass); *Life, Liberty, and the Defense of Dignity: The Challenge for Bioethics* (2002); and *The Beginning of Wisdom: Reading Genesis* (2003). In 2001, President George W. Bush appointed Kass chairman of the President's Council on Bioethics.

David Keene is chairman of the American Conservative Union. He has been involved in the fields of public policy and politics since 1968. He worked in the Nixon White House as a political assistant to Vice President Agnew and on Capitol Hill as executive assistant to Senator James L. Buckley. His business experience involves both domestic and international trade policy issues. As southern regional coordinator for Ronald Reagan's presidential nomination campaign in 1976 and national political director for George Bush in 1980, he won recognition for his skill as a political organizer and strategist. He was a senior political consultant to presidential candidate Robert Dole

in 1988. Today, in addition to his professional duties, he is a regular columnist for *The Hill* (a newspaper covering Congress) and chairman of the American Conservative Union.

William Kristol is editor of the influential Washington-based political magazine, *The Weekly Standard*. Widely recognized as one of the nation's leading political analysts and commentators, Kristol regularly appears on *Fox News Sunday* and on the Fox News Channel. Before starting *The Weekly Standard* in 1995, Kristol led the Project for the Republican Future, where he helped shape the strategy that produced the 1994 Republican congressional victory. Prior to that, Kristol served as chief of staff to Vice President Dan Quayle during the Bush administration and to Secretary of Education William Bennett under President Reagan. Before coming to Washington in 1985, Kristol taught politics at the University of Pennsylvania and Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. Kristol recently co-authored *The New York Times* bestseller *The War Over Iraq: America's Mission and Saddam's Tyranny.*

Leonard A. Leo serves as the executive vice president of the Federalist Society for Law & Public Policy Studies, where he manages the projects, programs and publications of a nationwide network of about 35,000 lawyers. He also directs the Federalist Society's government and media relations and its ABA WATCH project. Before joining the Federalist Society, Leo served as a law clerk to Judge A. Raymond Randolph of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit and to Judge Randall Rader of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. An active participant in the affairs of the bar, Leo serves as an officer of the American Bar Association's Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice. He has published articles on presidential war powers, executive privilege, legislative responses to judicial activism, casino regulation, takings, and several federal civil procedure issues. He also served as co-editor of the book *Presidential Leadership: Rating the Best and the Worst in the White House* (May, 2004).

Heather Mac Donald is a John M. Olin fellow at the Manhattan Institute and a contributing editor to *City Journal*. Heather's work at *City Journal* has canvassed a range of topics including homeland security, immigration, policing and "racial" profiling, homelessness and homeless advocacy, educational policy, the New York courts, and business improvement districts. Mac Donald's writings have also appeared in *The Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, *The New Republic*, *Partisan Review*, *The New Criterion*, *Public Interest*, and *Academic Questions*. Her book *The Burden of Bad Ideas*—a collection of essays from the pages of *City Journal*—details the effects of 1960s counterculture's destructive march through America's institutions. Her latest book, *Are Cops Racist?*—another *City Journal* anthology—investigates the workings of the police, the controversy over so-called racial profiling, and the anti-profiling lobby's harmful effects on black Americans.

Scott McConnell is the editor and publisher of *The American Conservative*, a magazine he founded with Pat Buchanan and Taki Theodoracopulos in 2002. A Ph.D. in history from Columbia University, he was formerly the editorial page editor of the *New York Post* and has been a columnist for *Antiwar.com* and *New York Press*. His work has been published in *Commentary*, *Fortune*, *National Review*, *The New Republic*, and many other publications.

Stephen Moore is president of the Free Enterprise Fund and a contributing editor of *National Review*. Prior to founding the Free Enterprise Fund in early 2005, Moore was president of Club for Growth. He was the Cato Institute's director of Fiscal Policy Studies, and continues to serve as a Cato senior fellow. He is the co-author of *It's Getting Better All the Time: 100 Greatest Trends of the Past 100 Years* and author of *Government: America's #1 Growth Industry* and several other books. Moore also served as a senior economist at the Joint Economic Committee under Chairman Dick Armey of Texas. He is on the economic board of advisors for *Time*

magazine, is a regular contributor to *The Wall Street Journal*, *Human Events*, and *Reader's Digest*. Moore has appeared on such television shows as CNN's *Inside Politics*, *Crossfire* and *Moneyline*, NBC's *Nightly News*, Fox *Morning News*, and *The McLaughlin Group*.

Grover Norquist has been one of Washington's most effective issues management strategists for over a decade. Norquist is president of Americans for Tax Reform (ATR), a coalition of taxpayer groups, individuals and businesses opposed to higher taxes at both the federal, state and local levels. Norquist also writes in the monthly politics column for the *American Enterprise Institute Magazine*. He is author of *Rock the House*, an analysis of the 1994 elections. In the words of former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, Norquist is "the person who I regard as the most innovative, creative, courageous and entrepreneurial leader of the anti-tax efforts and of conservative grassroots activism in America... He has truly made a difference and truly changed American history." P.J. O'Rourke says, "Grover Norquist is Tom Paine crossed with Lee Atwater plus just a soupcon of Madame Defarge."

James Piereson is executive director and trustee of the John M. Olin Foundation, a private grantmaking foundation located in New York City with an interest in higher education and public affairs. Before joining the Foundation in 1981, Piereson was a member of the political science faculty at the University of Pennsylvania and also served on the faculties of Indiana University and Iowa State University. From 1995 to 1999, Piereson served as chairman of the board of trustees of The Philanthropy Roundtable. Piereson is currently a member of the Hoover Institution Board of Overseers and is a trustee of the William E. Simon Foundation.

William A. Schambra is the director of the Hudson Institute's Bradley Center for Philanthropy and Civic Renewal. Prior to joining the Hudson Institute in January of 2003, Schambra was director of programs at the Bradley Foundation in Milwaukee. Before joining Bradley in 1992, Schambra served as a senior advisor and chief speechwriter for Attorney General Edwin Meese III, Director of the Office of Personnel Management Constance Horner, and Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan. He was also director of Social Policy Programs for the American Enterprise Institute, and co-director of AEI's "A Decade of Study of the Constitution." Schambra was appointed by President Reagan to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, and by President George W. Bush to the board of directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service. Schambra has written extensively on the Constitution, the theory and practice of civic revitalization, and civil society in *The Public Interest, Public Opinion, The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Times, Policy Review, Christian Science Monitor, Nonprofit Quarterly, Philanthropy* and *Crisis*, and is the editor of several volumes, including *As Far as Republican Principles Will Admit: Collected Essays of Martin Diamond*.

Robert Woodson, Sr., has been a source of guidance and support for grassroots organizations around the world for more than 35 years. He is founder and president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise (NCNE), which through its Violence Free Zone project has played a leading role in turning around the lives of troubled youth and helping them to revitalize their neighborhoods. Violence Free Zones have been established in Washington, D.C., Dallas, Los Angeles, Hartford, and Indianapolis. Woodson is the recipient of the prestigious John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Fellowship, often referred to as the "genius" award, and has authored hundreds of articles and several books, including *The Triumphs of Joseph: How Community Healers are Reviving Our Streets and Neighborhoods* (The Free Press in January, 1998).