

Media hits:

John Krauss talked to the Indianapolis Business Journal about semiannual public policy mediation training offered at the IU School of Law in Indianapolis.

- [Class taps into public policy issues](#)
Indianapolis Business Journal, August 19, 2009

Eric Wright was the focus of a Q&A session about health care reform printed in the Indianapolis Business Journal.

- [Health Care Q&A](#)
Indianapolis Business Journal, September 2, 2009

Ken Richards was quoted in a New York Times article about the potential benefits of the Chicago Climate Exchange.

- [Chicago Climate Exchange Seeks D.C. Muscle on Climate Bill](#)
The New York Times, September 9, 2009

Diane Henshel is quoted in this article about deformities observed in dead deer.

- [Divining the Secret of Deformed Roadkill](#)
Miller-McCune, September 14, 2009

Indiana Public Media covered Paul O'Neill's visit to SPEA.

- [Former Treasurer Secretary Paul O'Neill Shapes Up Indiana's Economy](#)
Indiana Public Media, September 16, 2009

Les Lenkowsky wrote an article about Irving Kristol's legacy in the September issue of the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*.

- Irving Kristol's Legacy for Philanthropy (article attached to e-mail)
The Chronicle of Philanthropy, September 2009

Ken Richards was quoted in an article in the *Agence-France Presse* about the difficulty of passing climate change legislation in the Senate.

- See translated text below.
Agence-France Presse, September 22, 2009

Sheila Kennedy's second September editorial in the *Indianapolis Star* focused on the state's controversial "Voter ID" law. Her earlier editorial in September focused on Obama's address to schoolchildren (available in the *Star* archive).

- [Partisan Politics at the Polls](#)
The Indianapolis Star, September 28, 2009

Kirsten Gronbjerg was featured in this article in the *Austin Statesman-American* about the loss of nonprofit leadership.

- [Leadership leaving local nonprofits](#)
The Austin Statesman American, September 28, 2009

IRVING KRISTOL'S LEGACY FOR PHILANTHROPY

Leslie Lenkowsky

Irving Kristol, the writer, editor, and publisher who died Friday at the age of 89, will be best remembered as the intellectual "godfather" of "neo-conservatism," a set of ideas many credit with reviving the Republican Party in the 1980s and shaping public debate over issues as far apart as welfare reform and U.S. policy in the Middle East. He also helped launch the careers of too many young people to count, including this writer, whom "Irving" (as he was always known to his friends) recommended for his first job in the grant-making world, directing the program of a New York foundation.

Less well-known (and understood), however, is the impact he had on philanthropy. Most of Irving's efforts went against the direction its leaders were heading. Yet, they not only accomplished a great deal, but also left a significant legacy, which today's grant-makers would do well to heed.

One of his achievements was to increase the diversity of the philanthropic world where it most mattered: in its intellectual range. During the 1970s, at a time when foundations and other groups focused on increasing the race or gender of their boards, staffs, or grantees, Irving called attention to the narrowness of their political and social views. No matter their gender or race, people who worked in philanthropy increasingly espoused, he wrote, the opinions and values of a "new class," well-educated and brimming with big ideas, but out-of-touch with how American society really worked and what Americans really cared about. As a result, though backed with copious resources, their efforts were apt to fail, or even worse, cause real harm, as the Ford Foundation had done in an ill-conceived school reform experiment in New York in the 1960s.

Irving did not just criticize philanthropy. He also played a key role in establishing or advising a number of influential non-profit magazines (including the one with which he was most closely associated, *The Public Interest*), as well as foundations (like John M. Olin and Smith Richardson), think-tanks (most notably, the American Enterprise Institute), educational organizations (such as the National Association of Scholars), and advocacy groups, all of which provided homes to "dissident" members of the "new class," whose work was generally overlooked and underfunded, if not scorned, by the majority of the grant-making world (and increasingly, higher education).

Thirty years ago, with former Treasury Secretary William E. Simon and others, he founded the organization

now known as the Philanthropy Roundtable, which was meant to provide an arena for discussing serious ideas about what grant-makers could do about poverty, education, arms control and other subjects of interest - without becoming so aligned with government as to be indistinguishable it. At the time, as those of us who served on planning committees for meetings of the Council on Foundations, Independent Sector, and other groups quickly learned, tolerance for such "politically incorrect" thoughts was in short supply. The Roundtable's gatherings provided one of the rare places in the philanthropic world where they could be heard and debated, as they still do today.

Ironically, among the biggest admirers of the kind of philanthropy Irving helped inspire have been left-wing groups in the non-profit world, such as the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. In a series of reports, it acknowledged that despite being outspent by liberal (or "progressive") foundations, "conservative" funders had a greater impact on public policy in the 1980s and 1990s. It attributed this to better coordination, a greater willingness to provide organizational support (rather than just program grants), and other details of how these donors operated. But it missed, perhaps deliberately, the most important reason, the one that Irving understood from the outset: philanthropy can only be successful if it is based on realistic ideas, a lesson that contemporary grant-makers should keep in mind.

Closely related is another part of Irving's legacy, a remarkable address - recently republished in Amy A. Kass' collection, *Giving Well, Doing Good* (Indiana University Press, 2008) -- in which he reminded philanthropy of the importance of caution in how it defined success. Delivered at the closing session of the 1980 annual meeting of the Council on Foundations (this writer was on the planning committee that year), the speech warned grant-makers about "the sin of pride," the temptation -- of which, Irving felt, philanthropy had to be particularly wary -- to believe it has the obligation and ability to make more far-reaching changes than it really does. "Doing good," he said, is a passion, "a noble passion ... And all passions have to be controlled." But far from lowering their sights, foundations and other donors, he argued, had set them too high, aiming, for example, to reform education rather than just establish lots of good schools.

The problem with such out-sized aspirations is not only that grant-makers rarely know how to achieve them. Just as critically, in a world in which many others - notably including politicians - have their own ideas about what should be done and those who are presumably to be helped may not always appreciate the assistance, philanthropy has no special authority to realize its goals. Despite the riches at its disposal, it is simply another

party - and a private one, at that - seeking to have its views heard and adopted. Unless it can curb its "passions," the result will be frustration at best, and at worst, a willingness by philanthropy, in order to attain its objectives, to mesh itself with government, with consequences that will be unpredictable and quite possibly, damaging to the interests of philanthropy itself.

With the White House now enlisting philanthropic partners to promote "social innovation," and foundations joining forces with government agencies to promote programs in education, health care, and other issues, grant-makers seem well-advanced to succumbing to the temptation Irving warned them about. If there is any chance of their turning back, looking again at the clear and insightful thoughts of Irving Kristol, as well as his legacy of accomplishment, would be a good way to start.

Leslie Lenkowsky is professor of public affairs and philanthropic studies at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University and a regular contributor to these pages. His email address is llenkows@iupui.edu.

Ken Richards in the Agence France-Presse (from an online translator, so text may contain oddities):

WASHINGTON, September 22, 2009 (AFP) - The ambitious reform agenda of President Barack Obama created congestion in the U.S. Senate, where the law on climate change will wait his turn ... that is to say, probably the end of the year, according to experts.

"It seems unlikely that the Senate act," said John Pitney political science professor at Claremont McKenna College. "The health reform will occupy the parliament and the president will have to use his political capital on this subject rather than on Climate Change," summarizes there.

In addition, the passing of legislation in the Senate will not be an easy operation. "This vote will be extremely difficult," said Pitney. "Senators represent major energy-producing states (Texas, Virginia, editor's note) which could suffer from the law," says he.

Same analysis for Ken Richards, professor of energy policy at Indiana University, who believes that the prospect of a vote on a climate bill in the Senate this year is "the most distant at this stage."

As for how the law could be passed, Mr. Richards has no more hope than his colleague. "The battle in the House was

so fierce that the Senate is not eager to jump into such a struggle. And it could be even more difficult in the Senate," Professor J. recalling that the House passed in June legislation on global warming on the wire, that is to say with one voice ahead.

Another issue could also come before the climate, the reform of regulation. "The economy is the biggest concern now. So, they (senators) could address the reform of the regulatory climate before," Judge Richards.

More pessimistic still, political analyst and professor of political science at the University of Virginia Larry Sabato does "not think that a bill may leave the Senate.

"They may be adopting a text next year, but not one that was passed in the House, concedes he ensures that the Senate will have to seriously amend the bill passed the House which included a reducing emissions of greenhouse gases emissions in 2020 by 17% over the 2005 level.

"There is a very strong opposition to the system of cap and trade (market for emission rights approved in the House, editor's note) within the American public," said Mr. Sabato yet for whom the proposed reform health coverage, also discussed this more points of consensus.

In this context, Tuesday, U.S. President Barack Obama said he was "determined" to act against global warming, but acknowledged that "the hardest" remained to be done by the Copenhagen conference in December.

"The threat posed by climate change is serious, it is urgent and it grows," Obama said before dozens of world leaders gathered at UN in New York to try to break the deadlock talks on global warming.

Two key committees must address the issue in the Senate, the Foreign Affairs chaired by Senator John Kerry and the Environment headed by his colleague Barbara Boxer.

The two Democratic lawmakers are aware of what Mr. Kerry called the "new challenge to global stability", but last month they have already announced a slight delay in the submission to the Upper House of the law on climate change.