Welcome to the 23rd Annual Meeting of the Philanthropy Roundtable. Thank you so much for joining us. A special thanks to the sponsors of our conference who are listed in our program books. I want to personally thank each of you for coming. If I don’t come over to you, please come over to me to say hello.

Our conference theme is Strengthening Our Free Society. Philanthropy is central to the community institutions that make America a self-governing republic: churches and synagogues, colleges and universities, museums and orchestras, hospitals and scientific research centers, youth programs such as scouting and Little League, and grassroots problem solvers who helped the needy and the homeless in their neighborhoods. Private charitable giving sustains all of these institutions and gives them the independence to make their own decisions.

Private charitable giving is also at the heart and soul of public discourse in our democracy. Name a great issue of public debate in this election year – climate change, the role of government in healthcare, school choice, minimum wage laws,
religious liberty - on all these issues private philanthropy enriches civic life by enabling organizations with diverse viewpoints to articulate and spread their message.

Philanthropy is crucial in driving the public policy and cultural reforms that will enable future generations to enjoy the blessings of liberty. Here are three great challenges in our society where philanthropists around this room are working to find solutions. The first is the crisis in education. One-third of American 4th graders cannot read. In an ever more competitive global marketplace, three-quarters of 12th graders cannot meet world standards for math.

The second is the slowdown in economic growth. Seventeen percent of men between the ages of 25 and 54 do not have a job. The third is the collapse of the family. Forty percent of American children are born out of wedlock. This is catastrophic for children’s future. As a landmark study by Harvard economist Raj Chetty recently found, the single greatest determinant of regional variation in upward mobility is the proportion of children growing up in single-parent homes.

Over the next two days, we will be exploring how philanthropy can find solutions to these and other challenges. As we do so, we are delighted to be holding our annual meeting in the charitable capital of the world. The United States is by far the most charitable country of all major countries, and Utah
is by far the most charitable of all American states. In 2011, according to the Urban Institute, itemizing taxpayers in the Beehive State gave an amazing 4.8 percent of their adjusted gross income to charity - more than twice the national average. No other state came close. Philanthropists of all faiths and none can learn from the Mormon welfare system which doesn’t take a dime of government funding and combines work requirements with extraordinarily generous supports to people to move the in-need to help them move to self-reliance.

Salt Lake City is also one of the nation’s leaders in upward mobility in part because of the strong families here and the strong work ethic of a state whose motto is industry. As in the rest of America, giving in Utah enables civil society to flourish. Thanks to private giving, Utah has a vibrant arts community, including the Sundance Film Festival and the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. Utah leads the nation in the percentage of children who participate in Boy Scouts. At lunch today, we will be awarding the William E. Simon Prize for philanthropic leadership to Jon Huntsman, Sr., lead funder of a great cancer institute.

To welcome us to Utah, I am delighted to call on a member of one of Utah’s foremost philanthropic couples. Ann Crocker regretfully cannot be with us this morning as she has been called to Virginia for the birth of her sixth grandchild. Ann
is chairperson and president of the Sorenson Legacy Foundation endowed by her late father, James LeVoy Sorenson. She serves on the board of the Utah Shakespeare Festival, has been a dedicated leader in arts philanthropy, and for two decades has been a major advocate and supporter of Utah Youth Village which changes the lives of troubled children and families.

Her husband, Gary, is chairman of Merrimack Pharmaceuticals; managing director of Crocker Ventures, a privately held life science and high technology investment firm; and chairman and solo investor in three orthopedic medical devices firms. Gary is chairman of Utah Youth Village and has served on the boards of the University of Utah, University of Utah Hospital, Utah Opera and Symphony, and Utah Technology Council. He is also architect of a very interesting multi-disciplinary approach to entrepreneurship education at Brigham Young University. Please join me in welcoming Gary to the stage.

Gary Crocker: As a representative of the Utah Philanthropic community, I just want to extend to you a very hearty welcome to the great state of Utah. I know you’re going to enjoy your time here in the philanthropic capital of the universe. It’s a wonderful town. You’re just a short light rail drive away from Temple Square if you want to visit the sites downtown.
I want you to know that this tradition of philanthropy in the state runs deep. It’s a 160-year plus tradition. It’s a tradition that’s wonderfully exemplified by the giving and generosity of the gentleman who is going to be honored today at lunch, Jon M. Huntsman.

We are grateful, Ann and I, for the kind introduction that Adam offered. We’re also grateful for the opportunity to be part of this philanthropic tradition here in the state. As Adam noted, Ann has been called away to a higher calling, but together we share a very personal commitment to maintaining and building upon this tremendous 170-year tradition of philanthropy here in the State of Utah, a commitment to building upon the virtuous cycle of philanthropy that’s been firmly established in this state, a cycle of free men assisting free men, which in turn enables the recipients of well-crafted private philanthropy to move forward and to bless yet other lives. What a wonderful cycle of regeneration.

The underlying motivation for such personal philanthropy in this state, and I suspect throughout the nation, is beautifully and stirringly captured in the words of the Christian theologian C. S. Lewis who is widely read and admired in Utah. He wrote, and I quote, "There are no ordinary people. You have never talked to a mere mortal." He went on to note that everyone we encounter has remarkable gifts and potential endowed by their
creator. In short, the impetus and the power behind private philanthropy is truly the deep conviction that individuals matter, that people are important in that if one can intervene charitably at a critical moment, a critical inflexion point in someone’s life, literal miracles can and do happen.

If enough of these personal miracles happen, if individual lives are enriched and ennobled by wise and carefully crafted interventions at these vital inflexion points, then our efforts, again our collective efforts of free men helping free men can indeed enable us as philanthropists and givers to strengthen this free society.

In both our private giving as well as our foundation work, we actively seek out, Ann and I, these critical inflexion points in individual lives as I’m sure all of you do. Most often in this effort, in our journey we have been guided to opportunities in two focused arenas which we believe generate improved lives and career opportunities. That is, first, education at critical points in individuals’ lives. And second, the preservation of families or the care of families from broken and fractured families.

For example, over the last 20 years we have been engaged in supporting the Utah Youth Village which is a remarkable institution here in the state. We funded the Crocker Education Center to educate young people who reside in the villages’ group
homes. They are assigned to full-time parents who are engaged in the family teaching model in these group homes. Anchored by these full-time proxy parents, they have an opportunity to restructure and recreate their lives and to help these youths who have been displaced from their families because of neglect or abuse. The village also has an innovative Families First initiative where, instead of fracturing the family and pulling the children out, experts are sent into the home to attempt to teach vital parenting skills to parents before there is an actual judicial order to fracture the family - an attempt to actually preserve the home before more extreme measures are implemented.

On the education front, the Crocker Innovation Fellows program at BYU offers students an opportunity not only to study theoretically the latest research on successfully starting a new business but to actually provide a hands-on opportunity for teams of students to identify a problem, come up with a solution, and actually start their own new business. The new Crocker Science Center at the University of Utah will allow undergraduates to pursue non-siloed interdisciplinary study. For example, they will not study just math or just chemistry or just physics or biology, but rather they’ll study and graduate in math-biology, biophysics or bioengineering, the kind of interdisciplinary skills that will be the basis and the
groundwork and foundation of success in the future world of commercial research.

On the foundation front, Ann and her siblings have done extraordinary work to build upon the lifework of her mother a state-wide effort for artworks for kids. That initiative has leveraged private funding throughout the state to bring the invaluable educational benefits of an early exposure to the arts back into our public schools literally again throughout the state. Moreover, the Sorenson Legacy Foundation has worked hard to establish arts education teacher development programs and related endowed chairs in every one of Utah’s universities to make sure that trained professionals are available in arts education to sustain and continue this state-wide public effort.

The foundation has given the bulk of its funding over the last several years to other major university initiatives, including the funding of a new arts education and performance complex at the Shakespearean Festival in Southern Utah at the Southern Utah University, and the creation of a remarkable new institution for innovation and science and commercialization of such ideas - the USTAR Innovation Center at the University of Utah.

But behind all of these efforts which are simply examples of the wonderful things that are happening in the state, there lies a common objective: providing individual souls with
opportunities at critical moments in their lives that will enrich the quality of their lives and their employability and enable them to restructure shattered lives through the family breakdowns or actually help preserve the family by teaching the struggling parents specific basic parenting skills.

C. S. Lewis was correct. There are no ordinary people. Each life is sacred and has tremendous value. Private philanthropy driven by a personal concern of free men acting voluntarily has the potential to profoundly strengthen our free society at this time of real need throughout our nation.

Perhaps we will all be inspired by powers greater than our own as we engage in this profound challenge and opportunity. Thank you.

Adam Meyerson: Thank you so much, Gary, for that warm and inspiring welcome. We are delighted to be here. Some people call our annual meeting the World Series of philanthropy, and we are truly honored to have an all-star starting pitcher. To introduce George Will, it’s my pleasure to call on Jim Piereson, president of the William E. Simon Foundation and vice chairman of the Philanthropy Roundtable. Please join me in welcoming Jim.

What Would Tocqueville Think of America Today

James Piereson: I appreciate it Adam. Thanks very much. It’s a great pleasure to introduce our guest speaker here this
morning. George Will is one of the most widely-read writers in the United States and across the world. He truly needs no introduction in this group. His newspaper column has been syndicated by the Washington Post since 1974 and today appears in more than 450 newspapers worldwide. For more than 30 years, he served as panelist for ABC News’ This Week and as commentator for ABC News. Today he is a regular contributor on the Fox News Channel.

It’s important to find out that Mr. Will is a director of the Bradley Foundation in Milwaukee. He has authored more than a dozen books and several collections of his newspaper columns. Mr. Will was educated at Trinity College, Oxford University, and Princeton. He taught at several universities before abandoning the academy for a career as a journalist and author. This morning, he will discuss What Will Tocqueville Think of America Today. Please welcome, George Will.

George Will: Thank you, thank you very much. It’s the case that I only write about politics to support my baseball habit. I come to you today from Washington which is often described as an enclave surrounded on four sides by reality. In fact, it’s an enclave surrounded on four sides by five of the ten richest counties in the United States. There is a reason for that, and it has to do with what de Tocqueville would think of America today. De Tocqueville would wince if he saw any
state other than the one we’re in. I want to explain why this is the case, that Washington is emblematic of a problem that is afflicting all the people in this room particularly. Washington operates on the principle that it was pioneered by Clark Griffith who used to own the Washington Senators baseball team. He said, "The fans like home runs, and we have assembled a pitching staff to please our fans."

Usually when I talk around the country I talk about what’s going on in Washington in your name and with your money and I depress everybody. Today I have a different objective. I want to frighten you. I want to frighten you because you are an endangered species. So far, the vitality of the American philanthropic community is one of the wonders of the world. It is tempting, I think, for people to say, so far, so good. We can coexist with the current trends in our politics. I don’t think so.

It reminds me, as everything does if you’ll forgive me, of a baseball story. A true story. In 1951, Warren Spahn, on the way to becoming the winningest left-handed pitcher in the history of baseball, was pitching for the then Boston Braves against the then New York Giants in the then Polo Grounds. The Giants sent up to the plate a rookie who was 0 for 12 and it was clear never hit big league pitching, some kid named Willie Mays. Spahn stood on the mound 60 feet, 6 inches from home plate and
fired the ball and Mays crushed it, first hit, first home run. After the game, a sports writer went up to Spahn in the clubhouse. He said, Spahnie, what happened? He said, “Gentlemen, for the first 60 feet, that was a hell of a pitch.” It’s not good enough in baseball and it’s not good enough in social and political life either.

I have, as a preface to my remarks, a confession to make which Jim actually revealed. I was at one point in my life a college professor before I turned to, or as my father – a professor of philosophy – said before I sank to journalism. I was almost a lawyer. When I was leaving Oxford I applied to Harvard Law School and Princeton in philosophy. I went to Princeton because it was midway between two national league cities. It gives you an idea of how serious I am. Being a professor for a good reason is not something one wants to do up to these days.

In 1976, when Jim Buckley was a senator from New York and was running against Pat Moynihan, the night they were both nominated, Jim Buckley said, "I want to congratulate Professor Moynihan. Professor Moynihan will conduct the kind of high level campaign you would expect of a Harvard professor." Over at Moynihan’s headquarters a journalist said, “Pat, Jim’s referring to you as Professor Moynihan.” Pat pulled himself up
to his considerable height and said, "Ah, the mudslinging has begun."

I mentioned my background in academia because it’s in the title of a famous book from long ago by Richard Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences*. Not just that ideas have consequences, I’m convinced that only ideas have large and lasting consequences. The ideas at loose in our politics today explain why the philanthropic sector is an endangered species. I want to give you the context around the picture of how we got here and the intellectual forces that are endangering you.

So you’re a little bit like the teacher who told her class full of 8-year olds to draw a picture of whatever they chose, it’s up to them. As they drew, she circulated among their desks. She came to the desk of little Sally and said, "Sally, what are you drawing a picture of?" And Sally said, "I am drawing a picture of God." The teacher told Sally, "No one knows what God looks like." And Sally said, "They will in a minute."

A robust philanthropic sector requires a large protected social space from which government is largely fenced out. But for intellectual reasons and with very powerful momentum, the government today knows no limits, will respect no limits, and increasingly will respect no rivals. Every sermon deserves a text from Scripture, and mine comes from the gospel of de
Tocqueville. Anticipating what he called a soft despotism, he famously wrote that it would degrade men without tormenting them. It is absolute, detailed, regular, far-seeing and mild. It would resemble parental power if like that it had for its object to prepare men for manhood. But on the contrary, it seeks only to keep them fixed irrevocably in childhood. It willingly works for their happiness, but it wants to be the unique agent and sole arbiter of what that is. It provides for their security, foresees and secures their needs, facilitates their pleasures, conducts their principal affairs, directs their industry, regulates their estates, divides their inheritances. Can it not take away from them entirely the trouble of thinking and the pain of living?

So it is that every day it renders the employment of free will less useful and more rare. It confines the action of the will on a smaller space and little by little steals the very use of free will from each citizen. It reduces each nation to being nothing more than a herd of timid and industrious animals of which the government is the shepherd.

Does it sound familiar? We have in our time developed what is called public choice theory for which the economist James Buchanan won a Noble Prize. It simply postulates that government has its own interest and the factions within government are self-interested and act in self-interested ways. We know that
government has a permanent incentive for large deficit spending so that it can deliver current benefits at a discount and shoving the cost of current dependencies as they weave off onto the unvoting because of the unborn generations. We talk a lot about the discord in Washington which is real enough, but the real problem in America today is a consensus. It’s broad as the republic and deep as the Grand Canyon. It is the belief that we should have a large omnipresent, omniprevalent ever-growing welfare state and not pay for it. Everyone’s agreed on that as far as I can tell.

The American people are increasingly ideologically conservative but operationally liberal. They talk like Jeffersonians and insist upon being governed by Hamiltonians, which is to say they suffer from a robust case of cognitive dissonance, holding in their minds with equal fervor and sincerity flatly incompatible ideas. The result is a decadence of democracy. There is no other polite way to put it. It is simply decadent.

We used to borrow for the future. We won wars for the future. We built roads, highways, build ports and airports for the future. Today we borrow from the future to finance our current consumption of government goods and services embracing in the process an ever thickening web of dependency. Think about it. The two largest decisions the average American family
makes - to get a mortgage and to get a loan for a college tuition - are now transactions with the federal government. Even before the Affordable Care Act was passed, the majority of every healthcare dollar was a government dollar. The energy sector has permeated this lifeblood of an industrial society. It’s permeated with political control and dependency. This matters when you realize that no less an authority on energy than Nancy Pelosi recently said not once but several times, it wasn’t a slip of the tongue, Americans should use more natural gas rather than fossil fuels.

In the last six years, the number of Americans on food stamps has increased from 21 million to 47 million. That’s more people that live on the West Coast, in the states of Washington, Oregon, and California. It has been public policy with bonus systems and all the rest to drive up the number of people on food stamps to increase the thickness of the web of dependency. In the last 15 years, for every two private sector non-farm jobs we created, one American went on Social Security disability probably never to leave those ranks.

The American people are healthier than ever before. The workplace is safer than ever before. Work is less stressful than ever before, and disability is multiplying. Why? Because there are put in place incentives to make people increasingly dependent on the public sector. We have now reached the tipping point.
point at which large American majority are either employees of the federal government or its clients. What does the federal government think about the vouchers to free people, to make them independent of the public school system? They’re opposed to them. This is the government that already has 89 percent of all the students in grades K-12.

The TARP, the Toxic Assets Recovery Program, was supposed to be for buying toxic assets. Instead, they bought entire industries - General Motors and Chrysler - to increase the dependency of the private sector on the federal government. Banks under new regulations are increasingly public utilities susceptible to and dependent upon a government that would dictate credit allocation which is the lifeblood of our society. In campaign finance reform, we now see it commonly accepted by large swathes of the American people that it is the government’s job to decide for the American people the right quantity, the timing, and the content of political speech.

Private property normally thought of as a zone of sovereignty is now at the mercy of an eminent domain, which, after the Kelo decision, means that private property can be taken by the government from one private owner and given to another private owner simply because the other private owner may be more affluent or pay more taxes to the political class. You can keep your healthcare plan, except you now know you’re
dependent on the government that says you can’t keep your healthcare plan if it’s a substandard plan. In the views of the government, it comes from a bad apple employer. And so it goes.

As the web of dependency thickens, it is not ancillary consequence of another agenda. It is the agenda to change social norms, de-stigmatizing dependency, and, thereby, changing national character. How did we come to this position? Ideas. I speak as someone who got his doctorate from Princeton. I just served four years on the Princeton board. So I tell you, you can understand everything about the United States in terms of someone from a class of 1771 and someone from a class of 1879. It’s James Madison against Woodrow Wilson, and right now Wilson is winning.

James Madison represented the natural rights doctrine that inherently limits government. The most important word in our most important document, the Declaration of Independence, is the word "secure." We hold this truth to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and governments are instituted among men to secure those rights, not to give us our rights. The rights pre-exist government. The government is inherently limited by its job of securing the most important things that pre-exist government and do not come from it. This assumes and preserves
an enormous private space in which civil society and philanthropic institutions can prosper.

Woodrow Wilson had a different view. He was a progressive. To be a progressive was to want to progress away from and up from something. Well, it was the founders. Progressivism is inherently expansive and hostile to rivals. The Madisonian revolution in political philosophy was this. Before Madison, political philosophers had agreed that if – and it was an enormous if – if democracy were to be possible anywhere, it had to be on a small face-to-face society, a homogenous society. Something like Rousseau’s Geneva or Pericles’ Athens. It had to be so because the assumption was that factions, pluralism in our modern terms, was the problem for democracy.

Madison turned this on its head. Madison and the founders had a catechism. The catechism was this: What is the worst outcome of politics? The answer is tyranny. To what form of tyranny is democracy a prey? Tyranny of the majority. The solution? Don’t have majorities. Or more precisely, don’t have stable potentially tyrannical majorities. Have unstable coalitions, shift-able minorities. So it was in Federalist No. 10. He said, "The first duty of government is to protect the different and unequal capacities of acquiring property because they would produce different and unequal factions, and a saving
multiplicity of factions would give us the pluralist society in which civil society can flourish."

And so it was in Federalist No. 51 that he said we want an extensive republic, not a small republic, an extensive republic in which we will see throughout our system the process of supplying by opposite and rival interests the defect of better motives. Hence the essence of our Madisonian system, the separation of powers that represented distrust of governments’ imperial impulses, its metabolic urge to swallow all of society and would preserve the private sector.

Woodrow Wilson was clear about this. Woodrow Wilson said in so many words, do not read the first two paragraphs of the Declaration. They are, he said dismissively, 4th of July sentiments. Woodrow was our first academic president, our first PhD as president. He was the first president of the American Political Science Association at a time when the social sciences were just being born in the United States imported from Germany. And, not coincidentally, he was the first American president to criticize the American founding, which he did not peripherally but root and branch take special aim at the very separation of powers which was the inhibitor on the government. This was, as I say, progress was going to be progress away from and up from the founders.
The founders put together a Newtonian constitution held in equipoise by countervailing forces. It was to be replaced by a 19th century version, the Darwinian constitution, an evolving, living, and always permissive document. At the time Wilson came along, there was a young man having this formative intellectual experience as science was in the air. Edison, Ford, Marconi, the Wright brothers but also political science understood as administration, understood as perfected by the Prussian bureaucracy under Bismarck the expectation was the government would be filled with experts. It would be benign because they would be disinterested. Public choice theory was not yet seen, that government would have no interest but the public’s and certainly not one of its own.

Woodrow Wilson said that government’s job was to see that individual rights, I quote, "Individual rights can be fitly adjusted or harmonized with public duties. Rights that can be harmonized by the government are rights that will be apportioned by the government." In the 1912 campaign, Woodrow Wilson said, "The history of liberty is the history of the limitation of government power." Ah, but that’s not the future of liberty as he saw it. He said, "The American system of limited government, of delegated and enumerated powers was all very well once when there were 4 million Americans living within 20 miles of Atlantic tide water on the fringe of a continent. Not
satisfactory today," he said. We have a country united by copper wires and steel rails. We need a more unified, energetic and unlimited government.

The current progressive president had a chief of staff that once said you'll never want a serious crisis to go to waste. He was, whether he knew it or not, and he probably didn't echo in Woodrow Wilson. Woodrow Wilson said, "Crises are periods of unusual opportunity for gaining a controlling and guiding influence on society. Therefore," said Woodrow Wilson, "leaders should maintain a crisis atmosphere at all times." Leaders, in other words, are not there - in the boring language of Article 2 of the Constitution - to see that the laws are faithfully executed. No, that's too cramped an office for someone with Woodrow Wilson's ambition. The presidency to Wilson was everything. Executive power was everything, and, therefore, the separation of powers was the enemy.

The progressive doctrine was if we can just concentrate all power in Washington and all Washington power in the executive branch, and all executive branch power in the presidency who, at his whim and discretion, can disperse power to expert disinterested czars, there will be nothing left for the private sector to do. Science will be brought to bear on society, and society will be the passive beneficiary. He got these ideas, of course, from Herbert Croly, who in 1910 published a book that is
still in print. How many books do you know that are in print 104 years after they're published?

Teddy Roosevelt took it on a safari to Africa where in the interstices of his assassination of large animals, he read it. In it he learned, as Woodrow Wilson was to learn from Mr. Croly, the founder of the new republic, Croly referred to America's unregenerate citizens who needed the help of a caring government. Croly said, and I quote, "The average American is morally and intellectually inadequate to a serious and consistent conception of his responsibilities. Unregenerate Americans," said Croly, "would be," and here I quote, "save many costly perversions if the official school masters are wise and the people are neither truant nor insubordinate." You see, he said national life should be a school. "Government is the principal, stern but caring. The exigencies of such education frequently demands severe coercive measures," said Croly. "But what schooling does not?" he said. He was quite candid in a way that today's Progressives are not.

You see, probably the greatest intellectual development of the 19th century is that history became a proper noun. History became a thing, an autonomous thing with agency. It was an unfolding law of history. The unfolding inter dynamics of history could be discerned by a vanguard of very discerning experts. The trajectory of history could be mastered by a
clerisy uniquely privileged with these insights and because of those insights, uniquely qualified to govern. And because of their unique qualification to government, they should not have to suffer rival sources of social authority and power in the private sector.

The very name "progressive" had become a tautology. History is progressive because progress is defined as wherever history is heading. How many times have we heard the current president say that this or that? Most recently the Islamic state is on the wrong side of history. If so, we can all relax because history will take care of it. Progressivism in principle acknowledges no limits on the expansion of the state power.

James Madison said, as all the founders did, "Human nature is fixed and it defines government's duties." The clearest and best expression of this since then is probably on the 150th anniversary address of the Declaration of Independence by President Calvin Coolidge on the 4th of July 1926. Progressives say history defines by its ever-evolving, never limited purposes what the government is up to. This necessarily gives rise to government by condescension.

During the 1952 presidential campaign, the Democrat's nominee, Gov. Adlai Stevenson of Illinois, was assured by a supporter, "Governor, you have the support of all the thinking
people,” to which Stevenson quipped, "Yes, but I need the majority." As Michael Barone said, it is inconceivable that Franklin Roosevelt would have uttered that quip. Even if he thought it, then he probably wouldn't have.

Progressivism contains inherently the clerisy's condescension toward the less discerning, and, therefore, the clerisy's hostility to all rival claimants on social power. This acquired a kind of codification in one of the emblematic books of the 1950s, John Kenneth Galbraith's *The Affluent Society*, the argument of which distilled to us corrupting in essence is. This was at the time when America was just becoming a wired nation with television and advertising was pouring in the living rooms, and Galbraith said, "Advertising is now so powerful that manipulating the passive bovine masses of the American people, that the law of supply and demand is obviated because manufacturers can manufacture a demand for whatever they find it convenient to supply."

A book came out a year before Ford Motor Company produced the Edsel. They had a little trouble then generating demand for that supply. But never mind, that's an empirical matter of no interest to Galbraith. But you can see in the doctrine that progressivism demands condescension because it postulates the discerning clerisy that can decipher the unfolding history, the direction of history on the right side of which today's
progressives assure us they are and we get better get to in a hurry.

Fifty years ago this month, Barry Goldwater was campaigning. I was casting my first presidential vote for Barry Goldwater at Princeton. Mike Gravy [phonetic] was casting his first presidential vote for Goldwater in Vietnam. Goldwater won that election. It just took 16 years to count the votes. While he was campaigning for a limited government, Lyndon Johnson, the president, was crashing around the country. At one point, he was in Providence, Rhode Island. He jumped up on the roof of the presidential limousine, took a bullhorn and said, "I just want to tell you this. We're in favor of a lot of things and we're against a mighty few." Well, what happened in 1960, Goldwater loses.

For the first time since 1938, when the reaction against Roosevelt's court packing plan produced a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats that prevented a Liberal legislative majority in Congress until 1965, the Goldwater landslide gave for two years the most ruinous thing that can happen to a political party. It gave the Democrats the opportunity, and they made the most of it. What happened was what James Q. Wilson called the legitimacy barrier disappeared on our politics. That is, until 1965 Jim thought - and I think he's largely right, he always was about everything - he said
until then the first question when Congress took up any subject was does the limited delegated and enumerated powers of the constitution give us the right to address this? Is it legitimate?

After that, Jim Wilson thought it was after the Elementary and Secondary Education Act wherein government included itself - the federal government - into the quintessentially state local responsibility of education. It was then that the legitimacy barrier disappeared. Henceforth, we'll never talk about that again. The No Child Left Behind Act is, I think, the eighth iteration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Neither party cares a bit about it anymore. All parties in the United States more or less, some party worse than others, but both parties seemed to believe that all activities can be -- there's no legitimacy barrier, no constitutional impediment to all human activities being regulated by the central government so that it can treat all human desires as needs and all needs as entitlements sooner or later; therefore, the metabolic urge of the government to break every private institution to the saddle of the state that is run by this discerning clerisy.

In my capacity on the board of Princeton University, I serve on the Government Affairs Committee, once a year we would come to Washington and we would go to the Education Department where then President Tilghman would sit across the table with us
and the education bureaucrats on the other and they would discuss equably, affectionately what standards the federal government's Department of Education would use to find and judge the coherence - that was their word - the coherence of a Princeton education.

Today's president of Princeton University, Chris Eisgruber, is under the mistake and rather touching delusion that he is actually president of Princeton. The president of Princeton is the head of the Office of Civil Rights at the Department of Education, which recently said to Princeton, unless you agree to our standards of sexual harassment and unless you overthrow 300 years of carefully evolved due process protections and put the burden of proof on the accused and judged by a preponderance of evidence rather than beyond reasonable doubt, you will lose your federal funding. Princeton University, distinguished, proud and subservient has, like all American universities now, lost its autonomy on all matters that the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights wishes to make its own.

We're really concerned about equality. We're going to do something about equality. The government itself is the primary driver of inequality through its web of dependencies. The principal aggravator of equality for the last six years has been zero interest rates, which is trickle-down economics practice by progressives. Zero interest rates are intended to drive money
into assets, farm land, real estate, et cetera, and into the stock market. In order to drive up value of the holdings, of the 10 percent of Americans who own 80 percent of all the directly-owned stocks so they experiencing the wealth effect will spend and invest, and their activity will trickle down to the rest of us. This is why it is now estimated that in the years 2009 to 2012, 95 percent of the wealth created went to the dreaded top one percent.

The welfare state itself is a regressive transfer of wealth aggravating inequality, transferring wealth in the working young and middle aged to the retired elderly cohort which, after a lifetime of accumulation, is the nation's most affluent. This is why we have today the politics of gerontocracy. About 40 percent of all the people who vote in the 2016 election will be 50 years old or older. They vote because the welfare state matters to them because the welfare state has made this most rapidly growing American cohort, the retiring baby boomers, dependent on government and comfortable with their dependency.

We know that the principal cost of inequality is freedom. People have different attributes and aptitudes and interest and different willingness and ability to add value to the economy; therefore, freedom exacerbates inequality. But we also know that in today's context, the principal driver of inequality is family disintegration. Family has always been the primary
transmitter of social capital, and that transmission is broken, which is why the hopes that America will be revitalized by education, the standard American panacea, that hope is now in tatters as a way of strengthening the pluralism and strength of a private sector in a society of free individuals equipped to take advantage of opportunity. We've been worrying about this a long time.

In 1983, Ronald Reagan convenes a big conference on education, grades K-12, that produced the famous report A Nation at Risk containing the famous paragraph that said if a foreign power imposed upon us the educational mediocrity we've imposed upon ourselves, we would consider it an act of war. Well, nothing happened. So in 1994, under Bill Clinton, Congress gave another edict to the future. It said Goals 2000. It said by the year 2000, America will be number one in the world in Science and Math and a graduation rate of 90 percent. We weren't and we didn't. So in 2001, we passed No Child Left Behind. More edicts to the future. It said by 2014 - for those of you keeping score at home, that's now - by 2014 we would have 100 percent proficiency in math and reading. The scary thing is we might because No Child Left Behind contains a powerful incentive for the states to dumb down their definitions of proficiency. We've been doing this a long time.
After the Second World War, when the baby boom generation began going to the public schools like a pig through a python, everyone agreed that the best predictor of a school's performance is the amount of money you spent on it. Increase financial inputs, cognizant developments would increase. So we did under both parties. Teachers' salaries went up, class sizes went down, and schools got better. Everything improved except test scores. So we decided to study it, and the result was James Coleman's study, the largest social science project in American history. This was going on in the late '60s.

Pat Moynihan was back at Harvard one day at a cocktail party and someone came up and said, "Pat, have you heard about Coleman's discovery? It's all families." The sovereign predictor of school's performance is the quality of families from which the children come to school. You can explain about 90 percent of the variables in school's performance by such things as quantity and quality of reading matter in the home, amount of homework done in the home, amount of television watched in the home, number of days truant from school. But most important, don't tell me the pupil-teacher ratio. Tell me the parent-pupil ratio.

And so it was on March 1965 that Pat Moynihan and the Labor Department published a report that was such dynamite he ordered that only 100 copies of it be printed: the famous Moynihan
Report called *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action* in which he said we have a national crisis in our hands because 23.7 percent of African-American children are born to unmarried women. Today it is 72 percent. We know what that means for schools. It means a constantly renewed cohort of inadequately parented adolescent males. We know what that means: unteachable schools, disorderly neighborhoods, and we don't know why it happened, and we're not going to find out because the government cannot talk about it. It's simply such dynamite.

You know, they released the Coleman report on the Friday of a 4th of July weekend hoping no one would notice because it was going to be so, in Pat's word, seismic. Here you have an example of a problem probably to some extent caused by government that government cannot address because it can't discuss it. It's just politically too charged, which is why the family itself is emphatically a problem that will be addressed, if at all, by the philanthropic private sector, which again puts the philanthropic private sector at odds with the public sector and its condescension and claim of having a monopoly on the scientific expertise necessary to fix society.

Ted Kennedy once said all change in America begins at the ballot box - a very clear statement of the progressive view that government is the agent of change, the energizer, the organizer of creativity. Joe Biden, the guest that keeps on giving, don't
you love it. In September 2008, the Lehman Brothers go down, and the private sector is in turmoil, and Biden's faulting the presidential leadership of George W. Bush and said, "Well, in October 1929, when the stock market crashed, President Roosevelt went on television." Fifteen percent of the country wants him to be president. Who are they?

Anyway, Joe Biden recently said every important idea of the last two centuries has depended on government vision and incentive. The president said if you build something, you didn't build it. Society did and society is organized by government; therefore, it really belongs. By the way, you really belong to the government. This is a view of the world refuted by every page of American history.

In 1790s, a young Yale graduate went south to be a tutor on a Georgia plantation. He got tired of hearing the planters sitting around the kitchen table complaining about the problem of separating cotton seeds from cotton fiber. So this young man, Eli Whitney, invented the cotton gin and made the plantation system prosper that led to the spread of slavery, brought on the Civil War in the modern world which is rather a lot of change and it didn't begin at the ballot box. It began in the private genius of one entrepreneurial spirit.

In the 1830s, in Central Illinois where men are men and I am from, in the town of Grand Detour, Illinois - I'm not making
this up - a young blacksmith got interested in the problem of devising a self-scouring steel plow that could turn the heavy black topsoil of Midwest. He did. His name is on big green machines all the world. His name was John Deere. It didn't begin in the ballot box. It began on the creative fermenting pluralism of a free market-oriented society.

When Alexander Graham Bell's words, “Watson, come here. I want you” came down that wire; when Ray Kroc drove into the McDonalds Brothers restaurant in San Bernardino, California and got an idea that became not just a corporation but a whole industry, it didn’t begin at the ballot box. This is why the temperature of American politics today is high because the stakes are high. We have a view that says the government is and ought to be a monopoly on the creative energies and organizer of our society. The other people are saying, no, I'm sorry. There's a fermenting pluralism that de Tocqueville marveled at. It is alive and well and must not be suffocated.

Let me tell you what happens when government begins to suffocate things. I want you to come back with me to a crime scene. A crime occurred at 138 Griffith St. in Jersey city, New Jersey in April 1934. I recently visited the neighborhood. Today, as it was then, a neighborhood of immigrants. Today they're from Latin America and Asia. Then, they were from Eastern Europe. 138 Griffith St. today is a barbershop. Then
it was a men's tailoring and pressing shop run by Joseph Meged, the 49-year-old Polish immigrant and father of two daughters. The crime he committed in broad daylight, he's brazen about it, he put a sign in his shop window that he would press a man's suit for 35 cents. How you may wonder did that become a crime in the land of the free and the home of the brave, I will tell you.

This was the second year of the new deal, and the new deal was progressivism incarnate, and the progressives knew everything. They were so smart. They have a theory. They said in a depression prices fall; therefore, we will have a recovery if we can force prices to rise. To force prices to rise, we must outlaw competition. Competition became anti-social, and price-cutting was anti-social. Therefore, they established the National Recovery Administration. You may remember from your high school civics classes the symbol of Blue Eagle. People were encouraged to put Blue Eagle posters on their shop windows and fly the Blue Eagle flag over their factories. Philadelphia Eagle's football team was founded at this time and named in honor of the National Recovery Administration, which is why all good Americans hate the Philadelphia Eagles.

So the NRA wrote all these codes of noncompetition to cardinalize [sounds like] industries. Remember they're terribly smart. These are progressive clerisy, they know everything.
They said the proper price for pressing a man's suit is 40 cents. Meged had committed a crime for which he was arrested and fined $100. It didn't sound like much but the medium family income that year was $1,500, and he was sentenced to 30 days in jail. In America, he wasn't the only one. Prosecutions occurred all over this country under a government that had to do it because it understood history, it understood progress. It had and ought to have, because it's so smart, a monopoly on power right down to the price of pressing a man's suit in Jersey City, New Jersey.

Well, the judge thought this was a teachable moment. So he cancelled the fine and the sentence and hauled him back in the courtroom where he said, I'm quoting from the New York Times, "I gave Meged a little lecture on the importance of cooperation as opposed to individualism." Meged, duly chastened, left the courtroom and went back of his shop with the New York Times in tow which, the next morning, reported Meged replaced the offending sign with the poster of the Blue Eagle. It said Meged - not quite so ruggedly individualistic as formerly - was a free man once more. Really a free man if you define freedom as embracing the government’s propaganda symbol under the threat of fine and imprisonment. Some of us don't. But that's what happens when the government is everything and the private sector
is nothing. You say, well, that was then and this is now. We're much smarter.

I have schlepped all the way from Washington the Senate Immigration Bill - 1,197 of the distilled wisdom of our Senators. It has to be big because they know everything and had to put it all in here. Don't be cynical. All right, smarty pants, do you know what the hourly wage in 2016 of an immigrant animal sorter should be? Of course you don't. They do. It's $9.86 if you want to know, which, by the way, is 20 cents more than the proper 1916 hourly wage of an immigrant nursery worker. It’s all in here.

Did you know, by the way, that Nevada is a border state? I looked at the map. The southern tip of Nevada is 164 miles north of the border. The senators have decided it's a border state. As Chico Marx says in Duck Soup, "Who are you going to believe, me or your eyes?" There's 20 billion extra dollars of border parks in here. As a majority leader of the Senate, Nevada ought to be illegible for the border parks. So they just made it a border state. This unimpressive little thing is the Homestead Act of 1862, by any measure one of the half dozen most important laws every passed by Congress. It was actually our first immigration law. Its point was to attract immigrants, to draw them into the country to settle. On the American maps, everything west of Mississippi was identified as the Great
American Desert. To be this stupid and to be fair, the parchment copy of the National Archives of the Homestead Act is four pages long. Still that's 1,193 pages shorter than the Senate Immigration Bill, but the senators back then were pre-progressive and didn't know everything.

Now, what I've tried to do and what I've tried to impress - I hope I have - is to tell you there is an enormous intellectual momentum behind the ideas designed to delegitimize the philanthropic sector. Not just to crowd it out, but to say it is illegitimate because it's not on the right side of history, because it is not in touch with the unfolding laws of history. This is what you're up against.

Joseph Schumpeter, a great economist, long ago predicted the conquest of the private sector by the public sector. It was very well-advanced, the attempt to break every little platoon and society. Princeton University, a big platoon, was easy to break. Break all the little platoons in society to regulations so that there will really be no intermediary institutions between the individual and the state because all those institutions will be essentially of the states. This, to repeat myself, is why temperatures of American politics today are high and the stakes could not be higher.

Now, what would de Tocqueville make of this? He would recognize the soft despotism, but I think he would also say -
even if he weren't sitting in Salt Lake City - that America is not such a flimsy thing, that the American people have within them reserves of independence and resistance to dependency not yet conquered, although the conquest of this independence is a quite explicit political agenda. What should we say? We should say what Lincoln said in 1859 to essentially the Wisconsin State Fair, "We're clouds lowering over America."

He told a story of an oriental despot who summoned his wise man and gave him an assignment. He said, "I want you to go away. Don't go back until you have devised a proposition to be carved in stoned, to be forever in view and forever true." Some while later the wise man came back and the proposition he had was "This, too, shall pass away." He said, "Lincoln, how consoling in times of grief, how chastening in times of pride. And yet, if we Americans cultivate the intellectual and moral world within us as assiduously as we cultivate the physical world around us, perhaps it may not be so." So far so good. We have maintained it, but it would be a huge and a lethal mistake for the philanthropic sector of our society not to understand that they are in the cross hairs, that the web of dependency is sickening, as I say, deliberately not as an ancillary report of another agenda. It is the agenda to delegitimize all non-state actors which is why what you are doing, whether you know it or
not, you are doing on the frontlines of an epical battle that cannot be lost.

Now I've talked long enough and you either probably feel annoyed just as Torborg felt when he managed the White Soxs. He went out one day to take a pitcher Jimmy Kern out of the game. He got to the mound and Kern said, "Skipper, I'm not tired." Torborg said, "Jimmy, we know you're not tired but our outfielders are." So on that note, I apologize slightly for the seminar in political philosophy but as a lapsed academic. I had yet one seminar out of me. I appreciate you hearing me out and I welcome your questions. Thank you very much.

James Piereson: Thank you so much, George Will, for a truly, truly wonderful beginning of this program.

[End of File]
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