

BUYING A MOVEMENT

Right-Wing Foundations and American Politics

Executive Summary

Each year, conservative foundations pour millions of dollars into a broad range of conservative political organizations. These foundation gifts are remarkable for two principal reasons: first, their sheer size and concentration; second, the willingness of the foundations to promote a highly politicized agenda by funding a broad range of organizations.

The following report examines the funding patterns of a number of significant conservative foundations and their grantees. The report demonstrates:

- Right-wing foundations have developed a truly comprehensive funding strategy, providing grants to a broad range of groups, each promoting right-wing positions to their specific audiences. The grants have created and nurtured an enormous range of organizations all bent on promoting a far-right-wing agenda. Recipients of foundation largesse include the right-wing media; national “think tanks” and advocacy groups; a budding network of regional and state-based think tanks; conservative university programs; conservative college newspapers; conservative scholars and more. In many of these funding areas, progressive and mainstream foundation giving lags far behind.
- Five foundations stand out from the rest: the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Koch Family foundations, the John M. Olin Foundation, the Scaife Family foundations and the Adolph Coors Foundation. Each has helped fund a range of far-right programs, including some of the most politically charged work of the last several years. For example, the *American Spectator* magazine, which led the charge on President Bill Clinton’s state trooper contretemps and launched a slash-and-burn strategy targeting Anita Hill, is a prime recipient of foundation support.
- Public debate on a number of issues has been transformed by foundation largesse. For example, the Wisconsin-based Bradley Foundation has supported a range of pro-voucher efforts in its home state, sowing the seeds for that state’s first-in-the-nation school vouchers program in Milwaukee. Other such case studies are presented in the report.

BUYING A MOVEMENT

Right-Wing Foundations and American Politics

Introduction

Each year, conservative foundations channel millions of dollars into a broad range of conservative political organizations. Their recipients range from multimillion-dollar national think tanks to state policy centers, universities, conservative journals, magazines and student publications, right-wing television networks and radio programs, and community projects. The issue work funded by these conservative givers ranges from military and fiscal policy to education funding to health and welfare program analysis to environmental deregulation to libertarian workplace policy, and more.

Two points stand out in an examination of these foundations' giving patterns. First, the size of their grants: large grants, often in excess of \$1 million, are commonplace in conservative circles, while comparatively rare among liberal political groups. Second, the nature of their funding strategies: conservative foundations have overt political and ideological agendas and invest comprehensively to promote a given issue on every front. In the words of the director of one foundation, the right understands that government policies are based on information from "a conveyer belt from thinkers, academics and activists,"¹ and provides funding accordingly.

Indeed, the foundations are supporting the work at every station on the conveyer belt. They fund national conservative "think tanks" to package and repackage conservative issue positions; state think tanks to lend a local flair to these issues; national political groups to lobby in Washington and shape national media coverage; state-based groups to do the same in the states; grassroots organizations to stir up local activism; national and state media to report, interpret and amplify these activities; scholars to record the history of such activities and push the intellectual boundaries of the issues; graduate students to form the next wave of scholarship and movement leadership; and college newspapers to shape the milieu in which America's next generation of political leaders comes to their political awakening. Individual donors also contribute greatly to this conveyer belt, and will be the subject of a subsequent report from People For the American Way.

The result of this comprehensive and yet largely invisible funding strategy is an extraordinary amplification of the far right's views on a range of issues. The various funding recipients do not march in ideological lock-step, but they do promote many of the same issues to their respective audiences. They have thus been able to keep alive in the public debate a variety of policy ideas long ago discredited or discarded by the mainstream. That, in turn, has been of enormous value in the right's ongoing effort to reshape American society. The success of the right-wing efforts are seen at every level of

government, as a vast armada of foundation-funded right-wing organizations has both fed and capitalized on the current swing to the right in Congress and in the state legislatures.

These trends also stand in sharp contrast to the giving patterns of the large “progressive” foundations. A glance at a single program area makes the point. A recent article written by *In These Times* associate publisher Beth Schulman, published in *EXTRA!* magazine, revealed that right-wing foundations had poured some \$2.7 million into four conservative publications (*The New Criterion*, *National Interest*, *Public Interest*, and *American Spectator*), while their progressive counterparts (*The Nation*, *The Progressive*, *Mother Jones*, and *In These Times*) received less than ten percent of that amount in foundation grants.² That enormous funding gap permits the conservative publications to focus more of their energies on “reporting” and marketing their stories to mainstream press, and less on fundraising and advertising sales.

Not content with these advantages, and having already vastly outspent and outgunned their progressive counterparts, these right-wing foundations are now pushing to “defund the left.” On Capitol Hill, the effort has been led by Majority Leader Dick Armey (R-TX), whose top staffer on the issue is Virginia Thomas, wife of Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas. No less than the *Wall Street Journal* described the initiative as “A G.O.P. effort to cripple advocacy groups with whom they [party leaders] have ideological differences.”³ Leading “Contract with America” strategist Grover Norquist was still more direct: “We will hunt [these liberal groups] down one by one and extinguish their funding sources.”⁴ Aiding in this endeavor are the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, and other foundation-backed organizations.⁵ The effort has targeted a number of organizations, but two seem to be at the top of the G.O.P. hit list: the American Association of Retired Persons and Planned Parenthood.⁶ Legislation pushed in 1995 by the congressional majority would have placed severe restrictions on the advocacy activities of organizations receiving federal grants beyond a certain threshold, as well as on their affiliated organizations.

In the case of Planned Parenthood, the ethical and legal advocacy of the group’s lobbying arm would have been curtailed if the group continued to receive federal grants. Effectively, Planned Parenthood would have had to choose between lobbying and service delivery. True enough, A.A.R.P. and many Planned Parenthood affiliates receive federal grants -- not for general support or to fund advocacy, but to provide specific services to the public that Congress and the president have deemed to be in the public interest and worthy of grant monies. And why would such legislation not similarly threaten conservative groups? One reason is that while progressive groups commonly provide direct services to the poor, disabled or disadvantaged, conservative groups rarely do. Progressive groups, local and national, have over the years sought to fill in the gaps in the ever more frayed social safety net. Conservative groups have invested their resources, by and large, in efforts to further shred that net. As a consequence, comparatively few conservative organizations receive federal dollars for service delivery, and therefore are far less likely to rely on federal grants to support a significant share of their core program.

That same absence of interest in service delivery helps the conservative foundations focus their resources on political objectives, as well. Though both outsized and outnumbered by large centrist foundations such as the Ford, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur, Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations and others, conservative foundations' aggressive promotion of an ideological agenda and alignment with the Republican Party magnify their influence far beyond their endowments. "Their effort to shape debates is not diluted by concerns with ameliorating any other problems," says one journalist, while progressives underwrite a broad range of social programs such as "relief of poverty, domestic violence, AIDS, environmental abuse."⁷

* * * * *

The report that follows barely scratches the surface of the right wing's funding operation, but it does paint a picture of the enormous amount of money being pumped into some of these political groups, and of the comprehensive approach the conservative foundations have employed.

The report examines the foundations and their grantees from three interrelated perspectives. Part One examines the different types of grants made by right-wing foundations. Part Two focuses on several of the larger foundations and their impact. Part Three comprises a handful of case studies on how the right-wing foundations have used their grants to influence particular issues in the political arena.

Part One: The Comprehensive Approach

Right-wing foundations have developed a truly comprehensive funding strategy, providing grants to a broad range of groups, each promoting right-wing positions to their specific audiences.

National Think Tanks and Advocacy Groups

One of the primary means to influence public policy is to fund think tanks, termed "the shock troops of the conservative revolution" by former Heritage Foundation senior vice president Burton Yale Pines.⁸ The Heritage Foundation is a prime example; known as one of the most influential think tanks in the country, it was founded in 1973 by brewery magnate Joseph Coors in concert with prominent right-wing activist Paul Weyrich.⁹ Through aggressive marketing of policy papers and connections to the Reagan and Bush administrations, the Heritage Foundation crafted the blueprint for such Reagan Administration policies as the Star Wars Defense Strategy and trickle-down economic theory. More recently, Heritage had substantial input into the writing of the Republican Contract with America.¹⁰ The libertarian Cato Institute, the American Enterprise Institute and others also wield enormous influence and rely on foundation largesse for much of their operating budgets. Because such blatantly political policy-oriented output on the

part of Heritage and many conservative think tanks has blurred the line between research and advocacy, the following list of recipients includes both think tanks and advocacy organizations:

- The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) received commitments for \$2.38 million in grants from the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation between 1990 and 1992,¹¹ and more than \$653,000 from the John M. Olin Foundation in 1994.¹² AEI provides or has provided a home for several arch-conservative scholars such as Charles Murray¹³ and Dinesh D'Souza,¹⁴ and former conservative office-holders, including former Judge Robert Bork, former U.N. ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, former chairperson of the National Endowment for the Humanities Lynne Cheney, former defense secretary Dick Cheney¹⁵ and William Kristol, former chief of staff to then-Vice President Dan Quayle.¹⁶ From these posts, such former officials have maintained a public presence, getting quoted frequently in major newspapers, magazines and journals, appearing regularly on network television news programs, and otherwise shaping the public policy dialogue.
- The Heritage Foundation received a commitment for \$2.7 million from the Bradley Foundation between 1990 and 1992;¹⁷ Bradley recently loaned Heritage \$500,000 to expand its “Town Hall” computer network.¹⁸ The Sarah Scaife Foundation gave \$1 million in 1992¹⁹ and the Olin Foundation granted Heritage \$537,500 in 1994.²⁰ Heritage, established with \$250,000 seed money from brewery mogul Joseph Coors in 1973 and approximately \$900,000 seed money from Richard Mellon Scaife,²¹ is considered the leading conservative think tank in America. In 1981, it published *Mandate for Leadership*, an exhaustive set of policy recommendations that proved to be a blueprint for the Reagan administration.²² Since then it has given berths to a broad range of Reagan/Bush officials, including former Attorney General Edwin Meese and former Education Secretary William Bennett.²³ In addition, Heritage contributed substantially to the writing of the Republican Contract with America.
- The Cato Institute received \$6.5 million from the Koch Family foundations over a four-year period (1986-90).²⁴ Cato is the leading libertarian think tank; it has close ties to House Majority Leader Dick Armey, who has frequently given speeches at Cato in the past several years.²⁵
- Free Congress Research and Education Foundation, founded by Paul Weyrich, received \$1.312 million from the Carthage Foundation (a Scaife family foundation) for general operating support in 1992²⁶ and \$450,000 from the Bradley Foundation in 1994;²⁷ it was founded with seed money from the Coors brewery fortune.²⁸ Free Congress is a multi-issue organization, and Weyrich is one of the political gurus of the conservative movement.
- Of the People Foundation was granted \$125,000 by the Bradley foundation and \$50,000 from the Scaife Family Foundation in 1994.²⁹ Of the People has led the charge at the state level to promote a so-called Parental Rights Amendment, which

would grant wide school censorship powers to individual parents and activists and weaken the power of state agencies to combat child abuse.

- The Center for the Study of Popular Culture (C.S.P.C.) received \$125,000 from the Olin Foundation and more than \$480,000 from the Bradley Foundation in 1994, and has received substantial funds from the Sarah Scaife Foundation.³⁰ Its mission, according to a recent C.S.P.C. direct mail appeal, is to “change the leftist, anti-American, elitist culture that is dominant in the entertainment industry [and to expose] the idiocies and the viciousness of radical leftism in the universities, the media, mainstream churches, and everywhere else this modern plague is found.”³¹ The Committee on Media Integrity (COMINT), leader in the de-funding attacks on public television, is a project of the C.S.P.C.³²

A growing number of other conservative think tanks and advocacy groups depend on foundation largesse for both their existence and maintenance. While the Heritage Foundation and Free Congress Foundation (founded with seed money from Coors) and the Cato Institute (founded with Koch family money) are some of the more visible examples, there are a number of others, among them the Ethics and Public Policy Center (EPPC), founded by Ernest Lefever, whose mission is to “reinforce the Judeo-Christian moral tradition in public debate over domestic and foreign policy.”³³ Over 60 percent of its 1993 income came from the “four sisters” (the Olin, Bradley, Smith Richardson and Sarah Scaife foundations).³⁴ The Institute on Religion and Democracy, supporter of the “Contract with America” and known for its attacks on the National Council of Churches, received 89 percent of its support in its first two years from six conservative foundations.³⁵ Hundreds of thousands of dollars in seed money and a commitment for future support from the Koch family foundations made possible the Institute for Justice, a property-rights and pro-voucher law firm.³⁶ In 1992 alone, Koch foundations’ contributions totaled \$700,000,³⁷ fully 70 percent of the Institute’s 1993 budget.³⁸ Continuing Koch support for the Cato Institute is also substantial. Cato president Edward Crane asserts that the Kochs “are very large contributors...[but] it would not be a devastating blow if they stopped supporting us.” Nevertheless, \$1.75 million of Cato’s \$3.2 million 1990 budget -- or over 50 percent -- came from the Kochs.³⁹

One consequence of this extraordinary level of funding from right-wing foundations is that these conservative think tanks vastly outspend their progressive counterparts. According to the Center for Policy Alternatives, the major conservative think tanks in Washington -- American Enterprise Institute, American Legislative Exchange Council, Cato Institute -- had a combined budget of \$45.9 million, while the major progressive think tanks -- the Center for Policy Alternatives, the Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, and the Economic Policy Institute -- had a combined budget of \$10.2 million. That greater than four-to-one advantage permits the conservative think tanks to pour more money into promoting their scholars, staging more conferences, and providing more and better-packaged information to Congress.⁴⁰

Regional and State-based Think Tanks

A growing number of state think tanks have patterned themselves after the Heritage Foundation in recent years; their purpose parallels that of their model: to provide conservative legislators and staff with the fodder for right-wing legislating. One journalist has observed that “[W]ith increasing frequency, legislation, proposed and enacted, can be traced directly to think-tank position papers on such conservative agenda items as welfare cuts, privatization of public services, private options and parental choice in schools, deregulation of workplace safety, tax limitations and other reductions in government, even selling of the national parks.”⁴¹ The primary support for these think tanks comes from such right-wing foundations as the Lynde and Harry Bradley, Sarah Scaife, John M. Olin, Adolph Coors, Carthage, Smith Richardson and J.M. Foundations, as well as large corporations and wealthy individuals.⁴²

- The Wisconsin Policy Research Institute (W.P.R.I.) was given \$2.9 million by the Bradley Foundation between 1990 and 1992.⁴³ W.P.R.I. has been out front on that state’s school voucher programs.⁴⁴
- The Hudson Institute, based in Indiana, received large grants from two prominent foundations: from the Olin Foundation, \$125,000 in 1993 and \$300,000 in 1994;⁴⁵ from the Bradley Foundation, \$600,000 in 1994.⁴⁶ The Institute is a hard-right activist think tank that advocates the abolition of government-backed Social Security and an end to corporate income taxes.⁴⁷
- The Heartland Institute, based in Illinois, received \$100,000 from the Sarah Scaife Foundation between 1992 and 1993.⁴⁸ Heartland is one of several arch-conservative state-based “think tanks” that focus as much energy on media relations as on policy development.
- The Manhattan Institute, based in New York City, is supported by the Olin Foundation (grants increasing from \$140,000 in 1992 to \$205,000 in 1993 and \$315,000 in 1994);⁴⁹ \$275,000 from Bradley between 1990-92;⁵⁰ \$150,000 from Sarah Scaife in 1992⁵¹ and more than \$250,000 from Smith Richardson in 1994⁵² The Institute advocates privatization of sanitation services and infrastructure maintenance, deregulation in the area of environmental and consumer protection, school vouchers and cuts in government spending on social welfare programs; it is a preferred source of information for New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani.⁵³

The investment in these outside-the-beltway think tanks paid off particularly handsomely this past year, when newly minted Republican legislative majorities began acting on a series of right-wing issues. It was no accident. “We simply will not have power on the national level until we declare war on state legislatures” declared Don Eberly, president of the Pennsylvania-based free-market advocacy group, the Commonwealth Foundation for Public Policy Alternatives, in an address to the Heritage Foundation.⁵⁴

One common function of these state think tanks is the creation of policy papers for state legislators, which in turn become the basis of legislation, floor statements, press releases, op-eds, and more. One such group, the Illinois-based Heartland Institute, even named one of its newsletters *Intellectual Ammunition*, suggesting that its ideas were more oriented toward political advocacy than exploration. According to an article in Heritage's *Policy Review*, "The entrepreneurial growth of conservative and libertarian policy groups on the state and local scene has been one of the sleeper trends of American government in the 1980s...The proliferation of intellectual resources on the Right and the revolution in information technology have made it possible."⁵⁵ Indeed, many conservative think tanks have been quick to utilize the "information superhighway," creating web sites on the Internet containing recent publications, membership information and access to a network of like-minded organizations around the country.

Influential think tanks include the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, California Governor Pete Wilson's favored source of information regarding privatization and water rights.⁵⁶ New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani has been dubbed a disciple of the Manhattan Institute,⁵⁷ a New York think tank that advocates school vouchers and deep cuts in welfare, Medicaid and health spending. The Heartland Institute published a newsletter for the Madison Group, a network of conservative and libertarian think tanks; its advocacy of free market principles, school vouchers, privatization and deregulation reaches every state legislator in Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Wisconsin, as well as 1,200 media centers.⁵⁸

These state think tanks are linked to each other, to conservative legal foundations and to national organizations such as the Heritage Foundation and the National Rifle Association both by the Madison Group network and by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC). Established in 1973 by Paul Weyrich of the Free Congress Foundation, among others, ALEC's purpose is to reach out to state office holders.⁵⁹ In the words of ALEC's executive director, Sam Brunelli, "ALEC's goal is to ensure that these state legislators are so well informed, so well armed, that they can set the terms of the public policy debate, that they can change the agenda, that they can lead. This is the infrastructure that will reclaim the states for our movement."⁶⁰ ALEC has the financial support of more than 200 corporations including Coors, Amway, IBM, Ford, Philip Morris, Exxon, Texaco and Shell Oil corporations.⁶¹ William Bennett, Jack Kemp, John Sununu, and George Bush have all addressed ALEC sessions in recent years.⁶²

When ALEC began, it comprised only a handful of right-wing legislators; by 1991, it had grown into a clearinghouse of information for 2,400 conservative officeholders in 50 states, almost one third of the 7,500 state legislators in the country.⁶³ According to a representative of the National Council of State Legislatures, although ALEC has not substantially modified its right-wing position on what it considers to be its core issues, it has been successful in attracting more moderate legislative support by toning down its more extreme rhetoric.⁶⁴

Media

Because the print and broadcast media are essential in shaping public debate, right-wing foundations actively support conservative newspapers, journals, student papers, television networks and radio programs that disseminate their message. For example, *The American Spectator*, an influential conservative news source, is heavily supported by the Bradley, Olin, and Scaife Foundations, among others.⁶⁵ National Empowerment Television, the ultraconservative cable network sponsored by Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Foundation, William F. Buckley's "Firing Line," and a variety of conservative public television programs all receive substantial foundation support. One writer for the *Columbia Journalism Review* notes the powerful effect that the reciprocal relationship of these foundations and their recipients has on media coverage: "By multiplying the authorities to whom the media are prepared to give a friendly hearing, Scaife has helped to create an illusion of diversity where none exists. The result could be an increasing number of one-sided debates in which the challengers are far outnumbered, if indeed they are heard from at all."⁶⁶

- National Empowerment Television, the ultraconservative cable network sponsored by Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Foundation, received \$300,000 from the Scaife Family Foundation in 1992 and more than \$40,000 from the Bradley Foundation in the same year.⁶⁷
- American Spectator Educational Foundation received \$185,000 from the Bradley Foundation in 1994⁶⁸ and a total of \$395,000 from the Scaife family foundations in recent years.⁶⁹ The associated magazine, *American Spectator*, has published a series of virulently anti-Clinton articles, including the initial "trooper-gate" stories.
- *The New Criterion*, a conservative art review founded to counter the allegedly pernicious effects of 1960s leftist radicalism on art criticism, was founded in 1981 with the aid of the Olin Foundation, which pledged \$300,000 seed money to be used for the first 3 years and solicited additional contributions from the Sarah Scaife, Carthage and Smith Richardson Foundations. The magazine received a \$100,000 grant from Olin for both 1994 and 1995;⁷⁰ it also received \$325,000 from the Sarah Scaife Foundation and \$350,000 from the Bradley Foundation between 1990 and 1993,⁷¹ and an additional \$200,000 from Bradley in 1994.⁷²
- *National Interest* and *Public Interest*, magazines published by Irving Kristol as president of National Affairs, Inc., received a combined total of \$1.125 million from the Bradley, Olin, Sarah Scaife, and Smith Richardson foundations between 1990 and 1993.⁷³ Henry Kissinger, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and author Charles Murray sit on the magazines' advisory boards.⁷⁴
- Producers Incorporated for Television received \$250,000 from the Olin Foundation in 1994 for "Firing Line" with William F. Buckley, Jr.⁷⁵

One journalist notes that while “there is nothing illegal or immoral” about media organizations sharing a small funding base, the “reliance of various organizations on the same funding sources does suggest, however, that some of the prominent actors in the culture wars may be more closely related than observers would otherwise assume.” Another states that “[e]very leading neoconservative publication or think tank over the past decade has come to depend on money from...Olin, Smith Richardson, Bradley, Scaife,” creating an atmosphere in which “editors tend to print ‘what they believe will confirm the prejudices of the [foundation’s] program officers.’”⁷⁶

In addition to sponsoring conservative magazines, television operations such as NET TV, “Firing Line” and a host of conservative public television commentators, as well as providing funds to student papers through organizations such as the Madison Center for Educational Affairs, right-wing foundations underwrite attacks on public television and do much to perpetuate the myth of a “liberal bias” in mainstream media reportage. One journalist observed that “conservative foundations and corporations use their financial clout to buy access to public TV, while simultaneously funding media-watch groups that work to deny PBS access to those with opposing views.”⁷⁷ Think tanks such as Reed Irvine’s Accuracy in Media, which frequently attacks PBS’s allegedly “pro-Communist” agenda, and David Horowitz’s Committee for Media Integrity (COMINT) a project of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, are dedicated exclusively to attacking public television. While Horowitz claims he does no direct lobbying, he takes credit for legislative attacks on PBS: “Probably Senator Dole and I are the two individuals that had the most to do with the present hold [on reauthorization of PBS funding].”⁷⁸ More than 50 percent of C.S.P.C.’s budget in 1992 came from three foundations: Olin, Bradley and Sarah Scaife (joint contributions totaling \$482,500).⁷⁹ COMINT itself was begun with \$125,000 in start-up funds from the Sarah Scaife Foundation in 1988.⁸⁰ The Center for Media Affairs and the Media Research Center, engaged in campaigns to paint PBS as skewed to the left, also receive substantial foundation grants.⁸¹

A recent documentary on the Contract with America vividly illustrates the seamless relationship between foundation funding, right-wing policy and the media. “Inside the Republican Revolution: The First Hundred Days” was written, researched and produced with help from Olin-backed Heritage Foundation, which played a major role in shaping the Contract. The “documentary” itself was made possible by major funding from the Olin Foundation. Not only did Olin fund much of the work to promote and sell the Contract, it funded a sympathetic telling of its trip through the congressional process. Ironically, the program aired on PBS.⁸²

Conservative University Programs and Academic Associations

In order to secure a lasting victory in the battle for America’s future, right-wing foundations are aware that they must not only control contemporary public debate, but also foster the next generation of conservative scholars, journalists, government employees, legislators and activists. To this end, Bradley, Olin, Scaife, Smith Richardson

and others funnel millions of dollars into conservative university programs, university chairs, lecture circuits and right-wing student publications, and promote conservative research in the media to legitimize their positions. They have created and continue to support networks of conservative professors, such as the National Association of Scholars and the Madison Center for Educational Affairs, whose “Collegiate Network” links 70 conservative student papers. According to the founder of the Center for Campus Organizing, a clearinghouse of information for progressive students, roughly \$20 million is pumped into the campus right on an annual basis; almost one fifth of this comes from a handful of right-wing foundations.⁸³ In the words of one journalist, these conservative foundations have, “by strategically leveraging their resources...engineered the rise of a right-wing intelligentsia that has come to wield enormous influence in national policy debates.”⁸⁴

- The University of Chicago was authorized \$3.7 million by the Bradley Foundation for its Bradley Fellows program between 1990-1992.⁸⁵
- The Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University, devoted to the study of “the self-ordering market, free trade, free migration,”⁸⁶ received \$2 million from the Koch Family between 1986 and 1990.⁸⁷
- Harvard University received more than \$6.2 million from the Olin Foundation between 1993 and 1997 to set up various conservative law, business, economics and strategic studies programs.⁸⁸
- The National Association of Scholars (N.A.S.), a network of conservative university professors dedicated to combating perceived “liberal bias” on college campuses, received \$125,000 from Olin in 1994;⁸⁹ Bradley granted \$378,400 between 1990-92⁹⁰ and authorized a two-year, \$150,000 grant in 1994;⁹¹ the Scaife foundations have contributed more than \$400,000 in recent years;⁹² and the Adolph Coors, J.M. and Smith Richardson foundations are also regular contributors.⁹³
- The Madison Center for Educational Affairs, formerly the Institute for Educational Affairs, founded by Irving Kristol and former Treasury Secretary William Simon (current president of the Olin Foundation) to finance right-wing research and conservative student publications, received \$100,000 grants from the Olin, Scaife, J.M. and Smith Richardson foundations.⁹⁴ Its “Collegiate Network” of conservative student newspapers was signed over to the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI), in 1996.⁹⁵ Founded by William F. Buckley in 1953, ISI works, in its own words, to “battle the radicals and P.C. types on the campuses.”⁹⁶ It receives regular funding from the Bradley, DeVos, Lilly, Olin, Murdock and Scaife foundations.⁹⁷

In addition to funding conservative programs, particularly in the fields of business administration, economics, law and history, foundations also channel money into organizations that monitor academic output and propagate neoconservative and right-wing agendas in the academic community. In 1978, former Treasury Secretary William

Simon and neoconservative ideologue Irving Kristol founded the Institute for Educational Affairs (I.E.A.).⁹⁸ Its purpose is to seek out promising Ph.D. candidates and undergraduate leaders,⁹⁹ help them to establish themselves through grants and fellowships and then help them get jobs with activist organizations, research projects, student publications, federal agencies, or leading periodicals. I.E.A. received start-up grants of \$100,000 from the Olin, Scaife, J.M. and Smith Richardson foundations, as well as substantial contributions from Coca-Cola, Dow Chemical, Ford Motor Co., General Electric, K-Mart, Mobil and Nestle corporations.¹⁰⁰

In 1990, I.E.A. merged with the Madison Center, founded in 1988 by William Bennett, Allan Bloom (author of *The Closing of the American Mind*), and Harvard professor Harvey Mansfield to become the Madison Center for Educational Affairs (M.C.E.A.);¹⁰¹ its current president, Charles Horner, was the associate director of the United States Information Agency under Ronald Reagan.¹⁰² Between 1988 and 1991, eight conservative foundations pledged in excess of \$1.5 million.¹⁰³

Recognizing the importance of campus newspapers in the dissemination of its right-wing agenda, I.E.A. established the “Collegiate Network” of right-wing student publications. Unlike many student publications, the member newspapers are far less reliant on university funding for their existence.¹⁰⁴ As noted earlier, 70 student papers belonged to the network by 1994; researcher Sara Diamond notes that the ultraconservative *Dartmouth Review* was its first member.¹⁰⁵ Beyond that, however, the Network provides substantive content guidance to the student newspapers; the editor-in-chief of the Network-sponsored *Stanford Review* acknowledged as much in most direct terms, saying that the Network staff “help us form our opinions.”¹⁰⁶ In 1990, M.C.E.A. spent more than \$300,000 on its network activities alone, and \$1 million on all its projects.¹⁰⁷

In contrast, “On the left there is no commitment to funding any sort of national press apparatus,” according to the director of the University Conversion Project, which tracks right-wing investment on campuses.¹⁰⁸

M.C.E.A. has also joined in efforts to recruit minority students to the cause of conservatism. In 1990, the M.C.E.A. established a project to recruit minority students supportive of its conservative agenda. One of the participants at the founding conference was Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas.¹⁰⁹

Other conservative networks have sprung up to counter multicultural education and progressive academic trends. The National Association of Scholars (N.A.S.), founded in 1985, was created to unite right-wing faculty against “politically correct” multicultural education and affirmative action policies in college admissions and faculty hiring that take race or gender into account.¹¹⁰ In addressing issues that are of academic concern across the political spectrum, the N.A.S. has recently been successful in attracting a small number of liberal and moderate faculty,¹¹¹ but the overall thrust of the N.A.S. remains conservative. In lecture halls and on the op-ed pages of many prominent

national papers, N.A.S. members across the country put forward the idea that multicultural education, gender studies and affirmative action policies are simply trendy endeavors or throwbacks to 1960s “radicalism.”¹¹² Invariably, these programs are described as threats to the study of Western civilization. As of 1996, the organization has approximately 4,000 members (faculty and graduate students), with 38 state affiliates;¹¹³ it has representatives in the American Sociological Association, the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association.¹¹⁴

The N.A.S. is heavily backed by the Olin, Bradley, Sarah Scaife, J.M., Coors and Smith Richardson foundations,¹¹⁵ among others, receiving a combined total in excess of \$348,000 from these foundations alone in 1990-91.¹¹⁶ Its advisory board lists right-wing intellectuals such as Jeane Kirkpatrick, co-director of Empower America and senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute; Irving Kristol; Leslie Lenkowsky, president of the Hudson Institute; and Chester Finn of the Edison Project,¹¹⁷ a corporation formed to privatize public education.

The association first gained notoriety in 1990 at the University of Texas, at Austin, where N.A.S. faculty succeeded in blocking the inclusion in an English course of civil rights readings that had been proposed in response to increasing racial and sexual harassment on campus.¹¹⁸ During the controversy, the faculty group also encouraged a right-wing student group to lead an ultimately successful campaign to defund the university’s Chicano newspaper.¹¹⁹ More recently, the N.A.S. released an update of a 1994 report urging the University of Massachusetts system to abandon its goal of expanding minority enrollment to 20 percent of the freshman class, and to end a program that encourages the hiring of women and minorities. The report focuses on SAT scores to claim that minority students are below average, and therefore unfairly take the place of qualified white students. The University of Massachusetts chancellor countered that the practice is based on the philosophy that “the class should reflect the diversity of seniors graduating from the high schools.”¹²⁰

The N.A.S. has also come out with a 1996 survey, heralded in a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed by William Simon, president of the Olin Foundation and major N.A.S. backer. The survey asserts that the decrease in core requirements at the top 50 universities and colleges since 1914 threatens “the common frame of reference that...has sustained our liberal, democratic society,” according to N.A.S. president Stephen Balch.¹²¹ The N.A.S. fixes much of the blame on student activism in the 1960s “when the rage in higher education was a radical libertarianism based on notions of ‘relevance.’”¹²²

Part Two: The Givers

While any number of foundations contribute to conservative political groups, five are worthy of particular examination: the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Koch Family foundations, the John M. Olin Foundation, the Scaife Family foundations and the Adolph Coors Foundation.

Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation

The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation illustrates the power of a well-financed foundation with a clearly articulated political and ideological vision. With assets exceeding \$420 million,¹²³ it is one of the nation's largest supporters of conservative thought and activity.¹²⁴

Lynde Bradley and his brother Harry made their fortunes by founding the Allen-Bradley company, producing electronic and radio components. Harry Bradley was an active member of the John Birch Society and a contributor to the *National Review*. The Bradley company's foundation did not become a major donor until 1985, when Allen-Bradley was bought by Rockwell International Corporation, an aerospace and defense industry conglomerate. As a result of the sale, the foundation, as the sole recipient of a Bradley trust, increased its assets to \$290 million.¹²⁵

Bradley Foundation president Michael Joyce is a key figure in conservative giving circles and beyond. He is the former president of the Olin Foundation and is chairman of the Philanthropy Roundtable, established to help conservative foundations and corporations coordinate their activities and strategy. The Roundtable has been instrumental in the creation of a nationwide network of state-based "think tanks"¹²⁶ more devoted to issue advocacy than policy analysis. No such network of state think tanks exists with a mainstream, liberal, or progressive orientation.

The Bradley Foundation provides major funding to the sponsors of what has come to be one of the right's most powerful communications weapons: National Empowerment Television (NET).¹²⁷ Sponsored by Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Foundation, NET can be found in millions of cable homes, pumping an unrelenting and unapologetic stream of far-right and Religious Right dogma. NET has provided programming time for dozens of far-right organizations, including the Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, the National Rifle Association, Accuracy in Media, the Eagle Forum and the Family Research Council. Another national media source receiving Bradley support is the American Spectator Educational Foundation, publisher of the far-right *American Spectator*. The publication is best known for breaking the "trooper-gate story" venting Paula Jones's assertions against President Clinton, touching off a wave of mainstream media about the story. Bradley authorized \$345,000 to the magazine's publisher from 1990 through 1992¹²⁸ and granted \$185,000 in 1994.¹²⁹

Michael Joyce believes that investment in academia is vital to the long-term success of the conservative movement, and has directed millions toward academic research and program development. According to Joyce, Bradley has helped pay for the work of approximately 600 graduate students over the years. "That's like building a wine collection," he said.¹³⁰ Explaining the reason Bradley concentrates its money on programs at prestigious universities, Joyce stated: "Elite opinion is formed in America at the top of a pyramid...elite institutions [are] important in the shaping of public policy."¹³¹ Two institutions known for their stable of conservative thinkers, the University of Chicago

(authorized \$3.7 million in 1990-1992),¹³² and Virginia's George Mason University (receiving more than \$280,000 in 1994)¹³³ both receive annual grants from the foundation. George Mason University has risen rapidly in conservative circles, significant in part because it is located within the Washington media market and is therefore a ready and convenient source of conservative scholarship for national news and commentary.

The Bradley Foundation also contributes to conservative and often highly controversial scholarship, publications and "academic" research aimed at legitimizing far-right policy positions. In 1992, it contributed \$11,850 to David Brock for the publication of his work *The Real Anita Hill: The Untold Story*, which attacked Hill's credibility. The book was commissioned following Brock's original article on Hill, which appeared in *American Spectator* (a recipient of both Olin and Bradley Foundation money) in which he described Hill as "a bit nutty and a bit slutty."¹³⁴ Olin Foundation president William Simon was at that time the finance chairman of the Citizen's Committee to Confirm Clarence Thomas.¹³⁵

Bradley has also helped Charles Murray, author of *The Bell Curve*, which argues that intelligence is predicated on race, and *Losing Ground*, whose thesis is that social programs should be abolished. Murray's work was so controversial and objectionable that the conservative Manhattan Institute, for which he worked, asked him to leave. However, the Bradley Foundation, which had funded him at the Manhattan Institute, stood by him because Murray, according to Joyce, "is one of the foremost social thinkers in the country."¹³⁶ Bradley extended Murray's \$100,000 per year grant when he went to the American Enterprise Institute;¹³⁷ as of 1996, he is still a grant recipient.¹³⁸ *The Bell Curve* was published just as the affirmative action debate was reemerging on the national scene. Affirmative action programs are under attack from a variety of far-right leaders and organizations, some of whom, such as the conservative Ethics and Public Policy Center and the Hudson Institute, enjoy Bradley funding.

Koch Family Foundations

David and Charles Koch own virtually all of Koch Industries, an oil, natural gas, and land management firm and the second largest privately owned company in America.¹³⁹ The brothers have a strong interest in libertarian theory; the three family foundations operated by the Kochs (the Charles G. Koch, David H. Koch and Claude R. Lambe Charitable Foundations) made possible the libertarian Cato Institute and Citizens for a Sound Economy (\$6.5 million and \$4.8 million contributed between 1986 and 1990, respectively).¹⁴⁰ Unlike the Bradley, Scaife and Olin Foundations, the Kochs focus exclusively on free-market philosophy. "My overall concept," said David Koch, "is to minimize the role of government and to maximize the role of private economy and to maximize personal freedoms."¹⁴¹

However, the Kochs do share with these foundations the conviction that the advancement of their philosophy is contingent upon investment in academia. In addition to their interest in influencing current public policy, they channel funds into fellowships,

grants and scholarships to conservative university programs such as the Institute for Humane Studies at George Mason University to develop future proponents of their cause. Said John Blundell, former president of the institute (which received \$2 million from Koch between 1986 and 1990, and is also supported by the Bradley and Olin foundations),¹⁴² the Institute “looks for good young people who are going to become academics and journalists and writers and novelists and clergymen and other dealers in ideas, who have shown some interest in the ideas that interest us.”¹⁴³

The Koch family also donates substantial sums to other libertarian and free-market groups. When Clint Bolick, former director of the anti-affirmative action Landmark Center for Civil Rights, and William Mellor, former president of the conservative, pro-voucher, free-market advocacy Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, decided to form a public-interest law firm to defend property rights and school vouchers, they went to the Koch family. The Institute for Justice was then formed with hundreds of thousands from the various Koch foundations, along with a commitment for future support.¹⁴⁴ Also recipients of Koch largesse are the Reason Foundation (publisher of the libertarian *Reason* magazine), the Illinois-based libertarian think tank Heartland Institute and the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy.¹⁴⁵

John M. Olin Foundation

The John M. Olin Foundation grew out of a family manufacturing business, and has grown substantially in the past 20 years. While it contributes large amounts on a regular basis to conservative national think tanks, including the American Enterprise Institute (more than \$443,800 in 1993 and more than \$653,000 in 1994),¹⁴⁶ the Heritage Foundation (\$262,500 in 1993 and \$537,500 in 1994),¹⁴⁷ the Manhattan Institute for Public Policy Research (more than \$315,000 in 1994), and the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace, which funds conservative research on domestic and international affairs (more than \$800,000 in recent years),¹⁴⁸ much of its focus is on university program funding.

James Piereson, executive director of the Olin Foundation, echoes the philosophy of Bradley president Joyce with respect to Olin’s mission: “We invested at the top of society, in Washington think tanks and the best universities, and the idea is this would have a much larger impact because they were influential places.”¹⁴⁹ Olin fellowships are an academic haven for academics who support Reaganite economic and social policies. According to the *Nation*, the foundation’s 1988 annual report shows that \$55 million in grants were distributed, primarily to underwrite university programs “intended to strengthen the economic, political and cultural institutions upon which...private enterprise is based.”¹⁵⁰ Explaining his efforts to convince corporations to halt grants to university programs deemed “liberal,” Olin president William Simon argues that many businesses are “financing their own destruction.” “Why should businessmen,” Simon asks, “be financing left-wing intellectuals and institutions which espouse the exact opposite of what they believe in?”¹⁵¹

The Olin Foundation, along with a number of other conservative foundations, links universities to Republican legislators, right-wing think tanks, as well as conservative publications, such as *Commentary* and *The Public Interest* (publications also funded by Olin).¹⁵² Research done in Olin programs provides an academic basis for right-wing policy. Articles written by Olin-backed scholars are published in such mainstream publications as the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* and *Time* magazine.¹⁵³ One *Chronicle of Higher Education* writer notes that critics charge Olin with spending “millions of dollars to support activities that directly challenge the spread of diversity and multiculturalism on campus. Far from promoting objective, dispassionate scholarship, as it claims, the Olin Foundation has an explicit political agenda, with ties to officials in the Republican party.”¹⁵⁴

One of Olin’s chief program areas is “Law and Economics,” an interest of the foundation for almost 30 years. Under this program, the foundation first established a seat at the University of Chicago in the 1960s for the purpose of teaching “free market economics” as it applies to law.¹⁵⁵ According to an Alliance for Justice report, the Chicago School emphasizes “‘economic efficiency’ and ‘wealth maximization’ as the conceptual cornerstones” for judicial opinions.¹⁵⁶ The report finds a significant and long-standing movement to reshape the American legal system on the part of “a powerful coalition of business groups and ideologically compatible foundations [who are] engaged in a multi-faceted, comprehensive and integrated campaign to elevate corporate profits and private wealth over social justice and individual rights.” Further, “[c]onservative foundations, particularly Olin, Sarah Scaife, Lynde and Harry Bradley, and Smith Richardson, are the effort’s philosophical leaders.”¹⁵⁷ In 1992-3, Chicago’s law and economics program received \$731,000; in 1994-5, \$740,000. Olin’s contributions to the university as a whole total more than \$3.7 million between 1992 and 1995.¹⁵⁸

Subsequently, the foundation has funded a number of conservative “Law and Economics” programs at a number of otherwise mainstream institutions of distinction, as well as conservative history, business, and political science programs. Yale University is one of the biggest recipients, with professor George L. Priest receiving \$1.5 million in 1990¹⁵⁹ and the law and economics program receiving more than \$2 million from 1992-1996. (Total contributions to Yale since 1992 surpass \$4.2 million.)¹⁶⁰ Harvard University received a three-year, \$2.4 million grant in 1995 for the John M. Olin Center for Law, Economics and Business,¹⁶¹ \$1.39 million to establish the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies in 1989¹⁶² with an additional \$1.5 million for the years 1995-97.¹⁶³ Olin grants and obligations to Harvard since 1993 total more than \$6.2 million.¹⁶⁴ George Mason University received almost \$200,000 in both 1994 and 1995 to host a law and economics teaching institute for federal judges (criticized by some as an attempt by corporate interests to influence the legal system);¹⁶⁵ the Scaife and Bradley foundations also contributed to the institutes.¹⁶⁶ The University of Virginia, Johns Hopkins, New York University, Georgetown, Princeton, Stanford and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology¹⁶⁷ are also recipients of substantial Olin grants.¹⁶⁸

Although it is uncommon for a university to turn down such substantial funding, the University of California in Los Angeles rejected an Olin Program in Law and Economics in 1985 after one year. The program granted John M. Olin Fellowships to students, who were taught by faculty also receiving money from the foundation; students were required to attend symposia with right-wing speakers such as Robert Bork and Antonin Scalia. The University Law school's principal objection to the program, according to its law school curriculum committee, was that Olin was "taking advantage of students' financial need to indoctrinate them with a particular ideology."¹⁶⁹

The foundation also funds the work of selected conservative scholars. Allan Bloom received \$3.6 million to head the University of Chicago's John M. Olin Center for Inquiry into the Theory and Practice of Democracy.¹⁷⁰ Bloom is best known as the author of *The Closing of the American Mind*, a right-wing critique of the "decline" of American academia and the "pervasive social leveling effects" of the 1960s. Irving Kristol, considered to be one of the foremost neoconservative thinkers in the country (and Bradley president Joyce's mentor)¹⁷¹ received \$376,000 as distinguished professor at New York University's graduate school of business administration, and then as an Olin Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute¹⁷² (more than \$380,000 between 1992 and 1994).¹⁷³ In 1994, Robert Bork received \$162,812 for an AEI Olin chair in Legal Studies; Bork has received like sums from Olin on an annual basis for the past several years.¹⁷⁴ Robert Leiken, a leading defender of the Nicaraguan *Contras* in the 1980s, was granted a \$75,000 Olin Research Fellowship at Harvard University.¹⁷⁵ William J. Bennett received a \$100,000 Olin Fellowship in 1993 while at the Hudson Institute.¹⁷⁶ Also receiving more than \$100,000 in 1993 as AEI Olin Research Fellow is far-right author Dinesh D'Souza,¹⁷⁷ recently in the public spotlight for his book, *The End of Racism*, described by its critics as seeking to legitimize racism.

Other recipients of Olin money include the Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy (\$120,000 in 1992),¹⁷⁸ a right-wing legal group; Phyllis Schlafly's Eagle Forum (\$10,000 in 1993 and \$10,000 in 1994) for conferences to discuss women and capitalism and free-market philosophies;¹⁷⁹ Paul Weyrich's Free Congress Foundation (authorized \$50,000 in 1994)¹⁸⁰ and the arch-conservative think tank the Hoover Institution (more than \$800,000 authorized in the past few years).¹⁸¹

Scaife Family Foundations

According to a recent *Wall Street Journal* article, Richard Mellon Scaife, a member of the Mellon banking and oil family, is "nothing less than the financial archangel for the [conservative] movement's intellectual underpinnings."¹⁸² His contributions over the years total more than \$200 million. His three nonprofit foundations, the Sarah Scaife, Carthage, and Allegheny foundations, have together given away approximately \$400,000 a week in recent years, much of this going to "New Right" causes and conservative think tanks such as the Heritage Foundation, the Cato Institute, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Center for Strategic and International Studies. The Scaife Family Foundation, another Mellon family foundation, has similar giving

patterns.¹⁸³ Over the years, Richard Scaife has provided financial backing to such political figures as Barry Goldwater, Richard Nixon, William Bennett and Paul Weyrich. According to University of Massachusetts political science professor Thomas Ferguson, Richard Scaife “had as much to do with the Gingrich revolution as Gingrich himself.”¹⁸⁴

Indeed, House Speaker Newt Gingrich himself describes Scaife as one of the people who “really created modern conservatism.”¹⁸⁵ He was instrumental in the proliferation of conservative think tanks during the Reagan administration, sowing the seeds for the current conservative “revolution.”¹⁸⁶ In recent years, Scaife has contributed enormous sums to a variety of organizations, including \$515,000 to the American Enterprise Institute; \$1.012 million to the Free Congress Research and Education Foundation; \$1.625 million to the Heritage Foundation; \$800,000 to the conservative Washington Legal Foundation; and \$450,000 to the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, at Stanford University. Scaife’s foundations have also contributed well more than \$100,000 to both the American Legislative Exchange Council (which plays a key role in spreading conservative legislation from state to state), and the conservative Landmark Legal Foundation.¹⁸⁷ His various foundations backed the *American Spectator*’s work while it was pursuing and publishing stories about President Clinton’s alleged sexual and financial improprieties.¹⁸⁸

Adolph Coors Foundation

The Coors family, beneficiaries of the Adolph Coors brewery company and family fortune, have been instrumental in funding conservative causes through individual, foundation and corporate donations.

The brewery was established in 1873 by Adolph Coors, Sr. in Colorado and has been a family operation since 1880.¹⁸⁹ It gained nationwide notoriety for its anti-union, anti-gay, anti-minority and anti-woman stance during a ten-year national boycott initiated by the AFL-CIO in 1977¹⁹⁰ in support of a Brewery, Bottling, Can and Allied Industrial Union local then negotiating with the company.¹⁹¹ Coors ultimately broke the union by hiring hundreds of non-union workers who, along with employees who did not join the strike, voted to decertify the union in 1978.¹⁹² A loose coalition of feminist, gay rights, minority rights, environmental, and student groups have also condemned Coors for its support of the Heritage Foundation, Free Congress Foundation, Phyllis Schlafly’s Eagle Forum and STOP ERA campaign, the John Birch Society, the Nicaraguan *Contras* and other right-wing groups.¹⁹³

Coors’s image was further tarnished as a result of a 1984 William Coors speech to a Denver, Colorado minority business group, in which he reportedly told a largely African American audience that “one of the best things they [slave traders] did for you is to drag your ancestors over here in chains.”¹⁹⁴ Later in the speech, he asserted that weakness in the Zimbabwe economy was due to black Africans’ “[l]ack of intellectual capacity -- that has got to be there.”¹⁹⁵ Coors claims his remarks were taken out of context and threatened to sue the conservative newspaper that reported them, *The Rocky Mountain News*.¹⁹⁶

To counter the resulting negative publicity and boycott by African American and Hispanic groups, the corporation pledged hundreds of millions of dollars¹⁹⁷ to African American and Hispanic organizations.¹⁹⁸ This strategy masked an ongoing funding pattern by the Coors family and foundation directly hostile to minorities, women, and labor. The engine of that anti-minority effort is the free flow of cash to the establishment and maintenance of the Heritage Foundation, the Free Congress Foundation, the Council for National Policy, and a variety of other Religious Right and far-right organizations. Of late, the foundation says it has cut back its funding initiatives outside of Colorado.¹⁹⁹ But that has not prevented large grants to the Colorado-based, right-wing Independence Institute, a Heritage-style research center backed by oil and coal interests to advance “market incentives” for environmental protection and to advocate the privatization of federal environmental projects.²⁰⁰ According to its former president, Independence examines “topics as diverse as Pacific trade, *Sandinista* totalitarianism and the fallacy of U.S.-Soviet moral equivalence” as well.²⁰¹

However, Coors’s most enduring contribution to the conservative cause was the establishment of the Heritage Foundation, begun with a \$250,000 grant from Coors in 1973. (The next year, Coors collaborated with the conservative guru Paul Weyrich to form Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress, out of which evolved the Free Congress Foundation.)²⁰² While Heritage is often described as a “conservative think tank,” its true mission is one of advocacy and public relations. Author Russ Bellant writes that Heritage “creates justifications for preconceived positions and then professionally packages the results in a format palatable to politicians and the press.”²⁰³ Author Alan Crawford, in his study of right-wing organizations *Thunder on the Right*, finds that Heritage studies “invariably confirm the notions to which its conservative colleagues and trustees...are already committed.”²⁰⁴

Heritage is best known for authoring *Mandate for Leadership*, considered the blueprint for the Reagan administration; Bellant asserts that Reagan’s early reputation as a decisive leader was “primarily due to the fact that his script had already been written for him by the Heritage Foundation before he won the election.”²⁰⁵ *Mandate* advocated greater freedom for the Pentagon and intelligence agencies, coupled with reductions in spending for education, welfare, health services, and other social programs. Approximately two-thirds of these recommendations were adopted within Reagan’s first year in office.²⁰⁶ *Mandate for Leadership II*, written when Reagan won reelection in 1984, furthered the conservative agenda by recommending cutbacks in food stamps, Medicare, child nutrition, farm assistance, legal services for the poor, and the expansion of ‘low intensity’ warfare in several developing countries.²⁰⁷

The Coors Foundation has also provided major funding to Reed Irvine’s Accuracy in Media, formed to combat supposed liberal bias in the media. The group maintains, for example, that PBS airs “blatantly pro-Communist propaganda.”²⁰⁸

Unlike some other foundations that shy away from explicit identification with Religious Right causes, Coors family heirs have a long-standing relationship with many prominent Religious Right leaders. Coors grantee Paul Weyrich, together with Robert Billings, then director of the Coors-founded Free Congress Foundation, engineered the formation of the Moral Majority with Jerry Falwell at its head. Phyllis Schlafly has received money from Joseph Coors for her STOP-ERA organization;²⁰⁹ Coors supported Bob Simonds' National Association of Christian Educators/Citizens for Excellence in Education (CEE) which has sought to "reclaim our Christian heritage in our public schools."²¹⁰ Other recipients include Pat Robertson's Regent University, Morality in Media and the Rutherford Institute.²¹¹

Interestingly, corporate policy recently diverged from foundation and individual funding patterns when the Coors company became one of the first major corporations to extend full domestic partner benefits to gay and lesbian employees.²¹² In light of the Coors family and foundation's continuing support for right-wing, anti-gay, anti-labor and anti-civil rights organizations, it is likely that the domestic-partner policy is more reflective of an effort to appeal to a particular segment of the beer-drinking market than of a change of heart on gay rights issues.

Other Major Foundations

In addition to the Coors, Bradley, Olin, Scaife and Koch family foundations, a number of conservative foundations have developed both funding strategies and endowments similar to those described above. Among these is the Smith Richardson Foundation, often referred to as one of the "four sisters" of conservative foundations for its tendency to fund in concert with the Olin, Sarah Scaife and Bradley foundations.²¹³ Like the other three, it grants hundreds of thousands of dollars to academic groups such as the Madison Center for Educational Affairs and the National Association of Scholars, and such conservative think tanks as the American Enterprise Institute, the Ethics and Public Policy Center, Hoover Institution, Manhattan Institute, the Reason Foundation and the Hudson Institute.²¹⁴ Also among the top conservative foundations are the Amoco and Alcoa foundations, the J.M. Foundation, the Rockwell International Corporation Trust and Ford Motor Company Fund.²¹⁵

Individual Donors

Foundations alone are not the sole supporters of conservative causes. A number of individuals also make enormous financial contributions to Religious Right and ultra-conservative causes in their private capacities. A handful of the more prominent donors are profiled below. A subsequent report from People For the American Way will examine in greater detail the impact of individual right-wing donors' efforts.

The movement has generous friends in two California multimillionaires, Howard Ahmanson, Jr. and California state Senator Robert Hurtt, members of the secretive Council for National Policy.²¹⁶ Unlike some libertarian and neoconservative donors who

either shy away from cultural and religious issues, or at the very least are not explicit in their support, Howard Ahmanson Jr. is very open about his mission to save America: “My purpose is total integration of biblical law into our lives.”²¹⁷ Ahmanson’s money, inherited from his father’s Home Savings of America, goes chiefly to anti-abortion, anti-gay rights and pro-business state Assembly candidates in California, many of whom beat out moderate Republicans in the June 1992 Republican primary.²¹⁸

Robert Hurtt is owner of the Container Supply Company and now a California state senator. He, Ahmanson, and two other California businessmen contributed a total of \$1 million directly to hard-right candidates, and have funneled much more through their contributions to seven right-wing political action committees. For example, Ahmanson, Hurtt and their two colleagues were the sole contributors to the Allied Business PAC (approximately \$800,000 by September of 1992); about 70 percent of this was used to fund right-wing candidates.²¹⁹ In 1994, the PAC spent almost \$2.8 million on state legislative races;²²⁰ of the 32 candidates receiving PAC money, 29 won primaries, and 24 went on to win seats in the Legislature, primarily in the state Assembly.²²¹

When in 1993 Robert Hurtt ran a successful campaign for state senator, he began to distance himself publicly from the Allied Business PAC. Allied has since changed its name to the California Independent Business PAC both to reflect Hurtt’s departure and its new “farm team” strategy, which consists of recruiting local businessmen with experience in school board and city council races for future congressional races.²²²

Robert Hurtt himself is a substantial contributor to right wing and Religious Right causes. In the 1980s, he became an avid fan of James Dobson’s Focus on the Family, donating \$250,000 between 1987 and 1989. He says he was inspired to become politically active while traveling with Dobson and other donors to meet with Reagan administration officials, including then-aide Lt. Col. Oliver North.²²³

While Hurtt bristles at suggestions that he represents the Religious Right and bills himself simply as a pro-business conservative, Religious Right leaders are not nearly so reticent.²²⁴ In 1992, Hurtt was one of 53 activists recommended by televangelist Pat Robertson to be a delegate to the Republican National Convention from California.²²⁵ The Reverend Lou Sheldon, director of the Religious Right group Traditional Values Coalition, calls Hurtt “our Daddy Warbucks,” and Gary Bauer, president of the Family Research Council, speaks of “Rob” admiringly.²²⁶ Hurtt’s support for Religious Right causes goes beyond financing, however. While in the state Senate, Hurtt has been a chief advocate for so-called parental rights legislation, an initiative being pushed in nearly 30 states and in Congress by the Religious Right. In California, the bill would weaken the ability of local child protection agencies to act in cases of suspected child abuse and allow individual parents to change the curriculum for entire schools if they object to coverage of such issues as sexuality education, condom availability programs, tolerance for homosexuality, and more. Hurtt was the sponsor of a parental rights proposal in 1995 but the bill was not pursued at that time.²²⁷ A similar version, drafted by the Rutherford Institute, a Religious Right law group, was also introduced in the state assembly.²²⁸ In

addition, Hurtt, along with Ahmanson, co-founded the Capitol Resource Institute (CRI), a Religious Right lobbying group affiliated with Focus on the Family; his contribution totals \$1 million. Hurtt's chief of staff and spokesman both come from CRI.²²⁹

Hurtt's chief focus as senator has been to fund Republican candidates for the 1996 and 1998 elections to achieve a right-wing Republican state Senate.²³⁰ In that event, Hurtt is believed to harbor ambitions about becoming president *pro tem*. Meanwhile, his advocacy group, Capitol Resource Institute, actively lobbies against the interests of public education and gay rights, and pushes for welfare limits and parental rights.²³¹ This frees Hurtt to pursue his more purely business-driven agenda: lifting governmental restrictions on business in such areas as affirmative action, environmental protection, tax law, and minimum wage requirements.²³²

Across the country, Religious Right-aligned business leaders contribute substantially to local, state and national political causes. For example, the DeVos family, cofounders of the home product distribution network Amway, which sells more than \$5 billion of merchandise annually, contributed \$2.5 million to the national Republican party in 1994 for the construction of a television studio in order to produce a weekly Republican program.²³³ DeVos sits or has sat on the boards of directors of a number of far-right and Religious Right groups, including the Free Congress Foundation, Federalist Society for Law and Public Policy Studies, National Legal Center, and Council for National Policy,²³⁴ and he served on the Chairman's Council of the Conservative Caucus.²³⁵

In Michigan, Tom Monaghan, founder and CEO of Domino's Pizza, has channeled large sums into anti-abortion groups such as Operation Rescue and the Committee to End State-Funded Abortions in Michigan. In 1987 he set up the Domino's Foundation to fund far-right Catholic organizations and educational institutions,²³⁶ and is also the founder of Legatus, a group of Catholic CEOs whose companies earn more than \$4 million annually. Legatus aims to represent the Pope's religious activism and anti-communism in the workplace.²³⁷ Monaghan recently presented the Domino's Humanitarian Award to James Dobson, leader of Focus on the Family, which has waged effective anti-gay, anti-abortion and anti-sex education campaigns in recent years.²³⁸

In Washington, D.C., Robert Krieble, characterized by one journalist as "a longtime sugar daddy of the Right," is spending \$800,000 of his own money to sponsor a year-long program of training sessions for conservative candidates and activists. The monthly seminars are broadcast nationwide via satellite; speakers include Paul Weyrich, president of the Free Congress Foundation; Tanya Metaksa, the top lobbyist for the National Rifle Association; and R. Marc Nuttle, vice president for political affairs at the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., and former campaign manager for Pat Robertson's presidential bid in 1988.²³⁹

Krieble finances and runs the Krieble Institute, a project of the Free Congress Foundation, which has in the past staged grassroots seminars in former Communist

countries. The Institute has recently switched its focus to domestic politics in the U.S., because Krieble, who puts up 75 percent of the Institute's budget, believes that "it will be easier to fend off socialism" at home. At the Heritage Foundation, Krieble has earned the title of "founder" in recognition of his contribution of about \$100,000 per year for almost a decade; says Heritage's executive vice president: "[Krieble's] hit up by everybody in the conservative movement."²⁴⁰

Part Three: Case Studies

The following case studies illustrate the impact conservative foundations' aggressive, comprehensive funding strategies have on such diverse areas as school vouchers, affirmative action, academic funding, and even academic curricular decisions.

School Vouchers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Bradley Foundation's involvement in the issue of school vouchers is a useful illustration of a single foundation's comprehensive funding strategy around the development of a single political issue. As noted earlier, the Bradley Foundation maintains a keen interest in pushing voucher programs around the nation, and particularly in its home state of Wisconsin. Over the past six years, Bradley money has funded groups that have laid the intellectual foundation for school vouchers, provided vouchers to parents, and litigated to defend them from challenge.

In 1989, the Wisconsin legislature adopted a limited voucher plan, subsequently challenged in court by the Wisconsin teachers union, the NAACP and the American Civil Liberties Union. Bradley's president responded to the suit by helping to establish and support a legal foundation to fight the case.²⁴¹ Bradley's help came in the form of a \$180,000 donation to the Milwaukee Parental Assistance Center, founded by the author of the voucher legislation.²⁴²

At the same time, Bradley took the position that the school choice plan, limited to secular private schools, was too narrow because public education officials resisted Bradley's efforts to add a former Catholic high school aided by the Bradley Foundation to the program. In response, the Foundation helped to found Partners Advancing Values in Education (PAVE) with \$1.5 million, matched with approximately \$1.3 million donated by corporations, foundations and individuals. PAVE gives up to \$1,000 in vouchers to low-income parents to send their children to any school, including religious schools. In 1993, PAVE had financed 3,000 students, more than four times the number in the state voucher plan.²⁴³ In 1994, Bradley authorized a second, \$1.7 million dollar grant for continued support of the program.²⁴⁴ By providing private funding for grants to parents, Bradley thus arranged to create support for vouchers, while bypassing their single largest practical problem: that they unduly drain the public schools of vital resources.

Not surprisingly, Wisconsin became the first state in the nation to adopt a voucher plan to include religious schools. When the plan was challenged in court, Bradley again

rose to the occasion, providing funding for what was dubbed a “legal dream team” to support Gov. Tommy Thompson’s voucher plan. The team includes Whitewater independent counsel Kenneth Starr. (It was Thompson’s own chief of staff who acknowledged publicly that the “vast majority” of the funds for defense came from Bradley).²⁴⁵ Also joining the team is Clint Bolick,²⁴⁶ now the vice president and director of litigation at the Institute for Justice (I.F.J.). Earlier in his career, Bolick led the defense for the first Wisconsin voucher law, while working for the Landmark Legal Foundation (L.L.F.); the L.L.F. received \$310,000 from the Bradley Foundation between 1990 and 1992.²⁴⁷

Throughout the course of the six-year battle, Bradley has funded a variety of pro-voucher organizations that helped shape public debate over vouchers. The Foundation donated \$2.9 million to the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute between 1990 and 1992; the Institute frequently publishes pro-voucher policy papers. Bradley also granted \$40,000 in start-up funds to the pro-voucher Center for Parental Freedom in Education at Marquette University.²⁴⁸

Bradley is also promoting vouchers outside of Wisconsin. Between 1990 and 1992, Bradley funneled \$780,000 into the Educational Excellence Network,²⁴⁹ a project of the Hudson Institute.²⁵⁰ The Network funds school vouchers in Indianapolis through CHOICE Charitable Trust.²⁵¹ In 1994, the Foundation contributed \$50,000 to TEACH Michigan,²⁵² an organization whose intent is to use public funds for private and parochial schools,²⁵³ and provided \$70,000 to the Claremont Institute, a conservative California-based think tank, for voucher research.²⁵⁴

The Attack on Affirmative Action

One particularly contentious issue that the right wing has reignited in recent years is affirmative action. While the racial tensions underlying this debate have been long present, the current raft of anti-affirmative action initiatives is in great measure floating on a river of political opportunism and right-wing foundation money.

Over the past several years, the foundations have worked first to produce materials that foster a climate of hostility to affirmative action, and even to racial minorities. They have then gone on to fund the individuals and organizations leading the charge on affirmative action in the courts and more recently in a groundbreaking ballot initiative in California. While much of the visible attack is undertaken by legislators across the country, their efforts are supported by the research, legal representation and academic groundwork done by right-wing foundation-backed scholars and think tanks.

In the realms of both academia and policy, authors Charles Murray and Dinesh D’Souza, both heavily supported by foundations, have laid the groundwork for the attacks on affirmative action programs by arguing that African Americans are inferior either genetically or culturally, and that racism is no longer a problem in America. Murray’s *The Bell Curve* concludes that African Americans are genetically inferior, a conclusion

based in part on IQ scores, and D’Souza’s *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus* is a frontal attack on affirmative action and “political correctness.” His next book, *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multi-Racial Society*, argues that African American culture is pathologically inferior to the majority culture. Both are currently at the American Enterprise Institute, Murray as a Bradley Fellow and D’Souza as an Olin Fellow. The fellowships entitle each to approximately \$100,000 per year.²⁵⁵

Other foundation-sponsored academics include sociologist and government professor Frederick Lynch at the Claremont-McKenna college in southern California, (author of *Invisible Victims: White Males and the Crisis of Affirmative Action*),²⁵⁶ who received \$23,000 from Olin in 1994 to complete a book entitled *The Diversity Crusade and the White Male Revolt*.²⁵⁷ Terry Eastland, former Reagan Justice Department official and now a senior fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center (EPPC),²⁵⁸ has recently published *Ending Affirmative Action: The Case for Colorblind Justice*.²⁵⁹ The EPPC received \$100,000 from Olin²⁶⁰ and \$350,500 from Bradley in 1994 alone.²⁶¹ Allan Bloom, author of *The Closing of the American Mind*, received more than \$3 million from the Olin Foundation while at the University of Chicago.

Having thus contributed to the climate of hostility toward affirmative action, the foundations have then gone on to fund the ensuing legal and legislative assaults. One result of this effort will be a critical ballot initiative on the 1996 California ballot. The misleadingly named California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI), intentionally evocative of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, says the “state shall not discriminate against, *or grant preferential treatment to*, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.”²⁶² [emphasis added] While seemingly benign, the “preferential treatment” language would abolish all state public affirmative action programs based on race, sex and ethnicity by defining aid based on these criteria as “preferential treatment.” CCRI aims to eliminate financial aid directed specifically to women and minority students at colleges and universities, prohibit the consideration of race and sex as factors in college admissions, end voluntary public school desegregation programs, and terminate voluntary state hiring programs that target women and minorities.²⁶³

The CCRI initiative has become the model for efforts by conservative state legislators across the country seeking to dismantle affirmative action policies.²⁶⁴

The co-author of CCRI is Thomas Wood, a former philosophy professor. While Wood states that the initiative is “the most political thought I’ve ever had in my life,” he is the executive director of the California Association of Scholars,²⁶⁵ the state affiliate of the National Association of Scholars (N.A.S.), (described above in “Conservative University Programs and Academic Associations”). The N.A.S. is heavily funded by the Bradley, Olin, Scaife, Coors, Smith Richardson, and J.M. Foundations;²⁶⁶ average grants from Olin, Bradley and Smith Richardson, for example, exceed \$100,000 per year.²⁶⁷

In fact, N.A.S. is nothing if not political. It is one of the most vocal advocates for the abolition of affirmative action in universities, both in faculty hiring and student admissions, most recently calling on the University of Massachusetts system to abandon its affirmative action goals.²⁶⁸ But the Massachusetts policies are not the only ones under attack. The California University system will no longer consider race as one of the many criteria for admission, despite massive student and faculty protest,²⁶⁹ and Georgia has announced a similar plan.²⁷⁰ A study released by the U.C.-Berkeley Office of Undergraduate Admissions found that admitting students to Berkeley only on the basis of test scores and grades (as many affirmative action opponents demand) without considering race would cause African American enrollment to fall from six percent to under two percent, a minimum of a 66 percent drop. Native American representation would fall from just over one percent to as little as one-tenth of one percent, and Hispanic enrollment would drop from more than 15 percent to a maximum of just over six percent.²⁷¹

University affirmative action programs also suffered a major setback in this year's *Hopwood v. State of Texas* decision, where four white students charged that they were denied admission to the University of Texas law school due to affirmative action. Here again, right-wing foundation money made its mark. All four plaintiffs in the *Hopwood* case were represented by the Center for Individual Rights,²⁷² a right-wing public interest law firm that specializes in fighting "political correctness" on campus. When the center opened, it relied heavily on referrals from the N.A.S.; it is now well established and supported by foundation, individual and corporate donations.²⁷³ Its executive director and president are former staff members of the Washington Legal Foundation.²⁷⁴ Between 1989 and 1994, Smith Richardson donated \$570,000; Bradley and Carthage (a Scaife family foundation) each gave \$450,000, and Olin contributed \$385,000.²⁷⁵ The 1994 contributions of Bradley, Olin and Smith Richardson (\$100,000, \$60,000 and \$100,000 respectively)²⁷⁶ covered approximately 48 percent of the center's expenses.²⁷⁷

In *Hopwood*, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruled that race and ethnicity cannot be used as a factor in law school admissions, even to correct racial imbalance. The decision has caused reverberations throughout the academic community although the court's jurisdiction is limited to Texas, Louisiana and Mississippi. In the wake of the *Hopwood* ruling, the same federal judicial circuit refused to block the enactment of new admissions standards that mandate equal scores for African Americans and whites, ending a policy originally enacted to adjust for the impact on test scores of different income and educational backgrounds. The policy could cut African American enrollment in Mississippi's three historically black colleges by 50 percent. Says a former president of Clark College and advisor to the plaintiffs, "*Hopwood* is the closing of the doors to the elite universities and graduate and professional schools at the top...This case is about closing the door for the mass of blacks at the bottom."²⁷⁸ Conservatives hail *Hopwood* as a major victory; according to Clint Bolick of the Institute for Justice, "This is clearly another nail in the coffin of racial preferences."²⁷⁹ Robert Berdahl, president of the University of Texas at Austin, says the ruling could cause the "resegregation of higher education."²⁸⁰ (Ironically, the University

of Texas was forced to integrate 46 years ago when Thurgood Marshall, as first director-counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, successfully argued before the Supreme Court that the school's admissions policy was racist.)²⁸¹

Another foundation-backed legal group is now representing California Governor Pete Wilson in his bid to end affirmative action in that state. The Pacific Legal Foundation (P.L.F.), a conservative legal advocacy group, is providing *pro bono* representation²⁸² to Governor Wilson in his challenge to five state statutes dealing with affirmative action in state employment²⁸³ and contracting goals.²⁸⁴ The case is now before a California superior court.²⁸⁵ Over the years, P.L.F. has enjoyed funding from the Sarah Scaife, Smith Richardson and Bradley foundations,²⁸⁶ as well as a host of smaller foundations.

Another player in the attack on affirmative is Clint Bolick, director of litigation for the Institute for Justice. Bolick is drafting a bill that would end all affirmative action programs on the federal level;²⁸⁷ the Institute receives generous donations from the Bradley, Olin²⁸⁸ and Koch family foundations.²⁸⁹ He is also the author of *The Affirmative Action Fraud: Can We Restore the American Civil Rights Vision?* published by the foundation-backed Cato Institute.²⁹⁰ Also a harsh critic of affirmative action is the director of the Hudson Institute's commission on social justice, Michael Horowitz.²⁹¹ A number of fellows at foundation-sponsored think tanks have weighed in against affirmative action in op-ed pages and newspaper articles, including representatives of the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, Claremont Institute, National Association of Scholars, Manhattan Institute and the Center for Media and Public Affairs.²⁹²

Yale University Endowment

In 1990, Texas billionaire Lee Bass donated \$20 million to Yale University, his *alma mater*, to establish a course in Western Civilization. Five years later, his donation was returned amidst a storm of accusations that the "radical multiculturalism" of the Yale administration was to blame. The national press generally reported the incident as the newest clash in the culture wars: *Newsweek* headlined its story, "The Fall of Western Civ," while *U.S. News & World Report* columnist John Leo wrote of "How the West was Lost at Yale."²⁹³ Upon closer inspection, however, it develops that national media coverage of the incident was almost entirely based on a distorted account of events published in a right-wing college journal, then peddled nationally by the journal's publisher, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI), then spun in the national media by the publisher's funder.²⁹⁴

The source of the explosive national coverage was an article written by college junior Pat Collins in the conservative Yale student magazine *Light and Truth*.²⁹⁵ Collins charged the college president with stonewalling implementation of the program and asserted that "a number of faculty have even tried to have the funds redirected to their own projects after...killing the original proposal,"²⁹⁶ a charge later proved false.²⁹⁷ Citing Collins, a *Wall Street Journal* editorial announced that "[t]here can be little doubt that the

faculty quarters ideologically opposed to the Western Civilization program...played a crucial role in derailing the initiative” while the front page of the *New York Times* metro section stated that “[t]he dispute says much about the perils of trying to expand a Western history curriculum in an era when debates about multiculturalism divide campuses.”²⁹⁸ John Leo in *U.S. News & World Report* warned that the incident was a “reminder of how far the modern university president will go these days to avoid hurting the feelings of the campus left.”²⁹⁹

However, careful documentation by *Washington Post* reporter David Karp demonstrates that the return of the donation had less to do with multiculturalism than with administrative delays and budgetary squabbles. In fact, there is almost unanimous agreement among those involved that there was never any thought to moving the course away from Western Civilization. Even “Bass professors” angered by the delays and obstacles agree; said one, “People are creating a straw man that does not exist, so they can tear it down”; another asserted that “It was a question of money...There was no [ideological] criticism advanced in a significant fashion.”³⁰⁰

Why then did Yale return the \$20 million Bass gift? The press coverage was right in one respect: debate over multiculturalism did play a role in the incident, but only as inspiration for the donation, not in the revocation of the money. Lee Bass was inspired to donate the money after hearing a speech by history professor and then-dean Donald Kagan. Professor Kagan (a member of the National Association of Scholars), disturbed by what he perceived to be the corruption of intellectual rigor at Yale by the forces of liberalism, delivered a speech to the N.A.S. that enraged a number of professors and sparked acrimonious debate. Professor Kagan continued to deliver a series of speeches on this topic, including one for incoming freshmen the following September that Bass attended. Kagan eventually stepped down as dean, due more to bitter budgetary squabbles than to political debate.³⁰¹

In the lengthy departmental in-fighting, student Pat Collins saw an opportunity for a story that, in the words of one Bass professor, was “simplified to make it dramatic.”³⁰² In this endeavor he was aided by the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI). ISI, which publishes *Light and Truth*, was founded in 1953 by William F. Buckley, Jr.³⁰³ after he published *God & Man at Yale*, a blistering and highly publicized attack on Yale’s supposed liberal bias. ISI’s mission is to ensure that universities teach traditional values and avoid what it regards as “trendy” issues such as feminism, gay and African American studies.³⁰⁴ To ensure that Collins’ article would receive national attention ISI issued a press release before the magazine reached campus, and gave Collins a list of reporters to call.³⁰⁵ Bass was outraged by the news he read in the *Wall Street Journal*, which was corroborated by T. Kenneth Cribb, Jr., the president of ISI, who flew to Texas to brief the millionaire.³⁰⁶

The Intercollegiate Studies Institute gets its support from a number of conservative foundations; it received \$200,000 from the Olin Foundation³⁰⁷ and \$375,000 from the Allegheny Foundation (a Scaife family foundation)³⁰⁸ in 1994 alone. In the

same year, ISI spent \$2.4 million for student magazines, fellowships and lecture series, such as one given by Dinesh D’Souza, author of *Illiberal Education*, for which he received more than \$173,000.³⁰⁹ Its board of directors includes the presidents of the Heritage Foundation and the Sarah Scaife Foundation, representatives from the Adolph Coors Foundation and Amway Corporation, and U.S. Representative Philip Crane (R-IL).³¹⁰

The connections between Collins, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute, and conservative foundation money come full circle in a *Washington Times* op-ed by William Simon, former U.S. secretary of the treasury and current president of the Olin Foundation. Writing that the Yale “incident spoke volumes about the intellectual and moral bankruptcy that has swept the U.S. academic community,” Simon neglects to mention that the campus magazine that “brought to public attention the behind-the-scenes machinations conspiring to destroy the program” was made possible in part by a grant from his own Olin Foundation. With no acknowledgment of his own politically motivated involvement, Simon states that the “Bass episode is symptomatic of a wider sickness that is infecting institutions of higher learning across the country” and that “hostility towards Western Civilization...contempt for donors and standards of honesty...[are] evidence of an increasing tendency to subvert true learning by replacing intellectual goals with political ones.”³¹¹

Raising a New Right-Wing Generation: Dinesh D’Souza

Dubbed a “New Right wunderkind” by one journalist,³¹² Dinesh D’Souza perfectly illustrates the right-wing foundation goal of cultivating the next generation of conservative leaders by supporting their undergraduate work, linking them with conservative networks and internships, placing them with think tanks and guiding them toward high-level government positions. D’Souza’s career serves as a prime example of Bradley president Michael Joyce’s attempt to cultivate a “wine collection.”

D’Souza, a native of India, came to the United States as a high school student in 1978 and attended Dartmouth College, where he served as a founder and editor of the ultra-conservative *Dartmouth Review*,³¹³ the first student paper to belong to the Madison Center for Educational Affairs’ “Collegiate Network” (then the Institute for Educational Affairs). D’Souza was the *Review*’s editor when it published an offensive parody of African American Dartmouth students entitled “Dis Sho Ain’t No Jive Bro.”³¹⁴ With the aid of the Madison Center’s internship, training and placement programs,³¹⁵ he then went to work as the editor of *Prospect*, a magazine funded by conservative Princeton alumni. According to author Ellen Messer-Davidow, during D’Souza’s tenure, *Prospect* published an attack on women’s studies and published an exposé on the sex life of a female undergraduate student without her permission.³¹⁶

After writing a complimentary biography of Moral Majority leader Jerry Falwell, D’Souza became a senior domestic policy analyst in the Reagan administration.³¹⁷ He then found a home at the American Enterprise Institute where he is currently a John M.

Olin Scholar, entitling him to an annual grant in excess of \$100,000.³¹⁸ D’Souza frequents the university lecture circuit, earning substantial fees from organizations such as the Intercollegiate Studies Institute.³¹⁹ He is also a regular contributor to the Heritage Foundation’s *Policy Review* and was its managing editor from 1985 through 1987.³²⁰

D’Souza was propelled to national prominence with the publication of his 1991 *New York Times* best-seller, *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. Funded in part by the Olin Foundation through the Institute for Educational Affairs and the Madison Center and promoted by such foundation-backed publications as the *National Review*,³²¹ *Illiberal Education* is a vitriolic attack on affirmative action and “politically correct” higher education that D’Souza describes as a critique of the “rhetorical excesses and coercive tactics of the Politically Correct.”³²² Summarizing his views on affirmative action in a 1995 *Wall Street Journal* op-ed entitled “Separation of Race and State,” D’Souza cites the University of Berkeley, California study finding that black enrollment without affirmative action would drop from six percent to one to two percent and concludes that “Proportional representation will end only when we have the courage to say that we are willing to live with these outcomes until blacks are able to raise their own standards to compete at the highest levels.” In blithe disregard of American employment history, D’Souza argues that discrimination in hiring qualified African Americans “makes no economic sense” and therefore discrimination will be eliminated by the free market.³²³

D’Souza has recently come under criticism across the political spectrum for his 1995 book *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*. Unlike his AEI colleague Charles Murray, who finds African Americans to be genetically inferior, D’Souza argues that black culture, particularly poor black culture, is pathological,³²⁴ and that “[f]or many whites the criminal and irresponsible black underclass represents a revival of barbarism in the midst of Western civilization.”³²⁵ Rather than question either the validity or accuracy of this assumption, D’Souza places the burden of proof on the black community: “if blacks as a group can show that they are capable of performing competitively in schools and the work force...then racism will be deprived of its foundation in experience. If blacks can close the civilization gap, the race problem in this country is likely to become insignificant.”³²⁶

D’Souza’s analysis of African Americans’ history in the United States includes the notion that slavery was not a racist institution because some African Americans owned slaves. Subsequent segregation, he argues, was designed to protect African Americans and “to assure that [they], like the handicapped, would be...permitted to perform to the capacity of their arrested development.” Elsewhere in the book, D’Souza states that the moral legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. “remains ambiguous” because he “was never able to...raise the competitiveness and civilizational level of the black population.”³²⁷

Two prominent African American conservatives, Robert Woodson, Sr. and Glenn Loury, renounced their affiliation with the American Enterprise Institute over its support

for *The End of Racism*. Hardly a member of the radical left, a description generally applied to D’Souza critics, Woodson called D’Souza “the Mark Fuhrman of public policy,” referring to a racist policeman in the O.J. Simpson case.³²⁸ Loury, in his review of the book, notes that AEI marketed it extensively in business circles, that “Republican staffers on Capitol Hill are said to have eagerly anticipated how the book might move the affirmative action debate in the ‘right direction,’” and that D’Souza was generously supported for the book’s duration by the Olin Foundation.³²⁹

Conclusion

Conservative foundations invest efficiently and effectively. They offer a clearly articulated vision of their plan for America, and they invest wisely to effect that vision. They are comprehensive in their funding strategies and extraordinarily generous in the size of their donations. ALEC’s executive director, Sam Brunelli, eloquently expresses the mission of conservative foundations and that of the organizations they fund:

“If we intend to govern this nation, then our battle begins on the other side of the Beltway. And we must recognize that on this new battlefield, a negative agenda will not sell. In the states, the conservative movement must advance a positive agenda for governance, an agenda which speaks to the real challenges people face and that draws its strength from the principles and values that the people hold dear.”³³⁰

What makes the right-wing funding stream so significant is the absence of a parallel stream funding progressive organizations. While progressives fund a variety of causes, progressive and mainstream organizations simply do not have similar foundation support. Executive director Linda Tarr-Whelan of the liberal Center for Policy Alternatives, commenting on progressive funding at the state level, poses the issue as a challenge to the progressive foundation community: “Progressive funders are funding direct service efforts at the state or local grassroots level....What’s missing is anything dealing with a larger vision. Who is funding the infrastructure for a progressive agenda?”³³¹ The answer to that question may well determine the future course of American governance in this time of conflict and hardship.

Buying a Movement

Right-Wing Foundations and American Politics

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	4
PART ONE: THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH.....	6
NATIONAL THINK TANKS AND ADVOCACY GROUPS.....	6
REGIONAL AND STATE-BASED THINK TANKS	8
MEDIA.....	11
CONSERVATIVE UNIVERSITY PROGRAMS AND ACADEMIC ASSOCIATIONS	12
PART TWO: THE GIVERS.....	15
LYNDE AND HARRY BRADLEY FOUNDATION	16
KOCH FAMILY FOUNDATIONS	17
JOHN M. OLIN FOUNDATION	18
SCAIFE FAMILY FOUNDATIONS.....	20
ADOLPH COORS FOUNDATION.....	21
OTHER MAJOR FOUNDATIONS.....	23
INDIVIDUAL DONORS.....	23
PART THREE: CASE STUDIES.....	26
SCHOOL VOUCHERS, MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN	26
THE ATTACK ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	27
YALE UNIVERSITY ENDOWMENT.....	30
RAISING A NEW RIGHT-WING GENERATION: DINESH D'SOUZA	32
CONCLUSION	34

-
- ¹ Joel Bleifuss, "Who Funds the Right?" *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Fall 1995
- ² Beth Schulman, "Foundations for a Movement: How the Right Wing Subsidizes its Press," *EXTRA!*, March/April 95, p. 12
- ³ "Foundations in the Newt Era." Special Report from the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, September 1995, p. 11.
- ⁴ Jeff Shear, "The Ax Files," *National Journal* 4/15/95 (whole paragraph)
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ Beth Schulman, "Foundations for a Movement: How the Right Wing Subsidizes its Press," *EXTRA!*, March/April 95, p. 12
- ⁸ Larry Hatfield and Dexter Waugh, "Right Wing's Smart Bombs," *San Francisco Examiner*, 5/24/92
- ⁹ Bill Meunier, "Controversy Brewing as Public Learns that Coors is Brewing Zima Malt Liquor," *Wisconsin Light*, 4/14/94.
- ¹⁰ Douglas Burton, "To win the battle of Ideas, send in the Think Tanks" *Insight*, 3/6/95, pp. 16-17
- ¹¹ Barbara Miner, "The Power and the Money: Bradley Foundation Bankrolls Conservative Agenda," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 1994, Vol. 8, No. 3
- ¹² John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹³ Barbara Miner, "Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 1994, Vol. 8, No. 3
- ¹⁴ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁵ Douglas Burton, "To win the battle of Ideas, send in the Think Tanks" *Insight*, 3/6/95, p. 17.
- ¹⁶ James A. Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, p. 563
- ¹⁷ Miner, "Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 1994, Vol. 8, No. 3
- ¹⁸ Derk Arend Wilcox, editor, *The Right Guide 1995: A Guide to Conservative and Right-of-Center Organizations*, Economics America, Inc. Ann Arbor, Michigan, p. 176
- ¹⁹ The Foundation Grants Index 1995 (FGI), 23rd Edition, The Foundation Center, p. 1259
- ²⁰ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ²¹ Eric Morgenthaler, "Reagan makes Joseph Coors a Happy Fellow," *Wall Street Journal*, 6/4/81; Steve Rendall and Jill Steinberg, "Heritage of Extremism," *EXTRA!* July/August 1996, p. 11.
- ²² Josh Daniel, "Uncivil Wars, the Conservative Assault on Public Broadcasting," *Independent*, Aug./Sept. (no year)
- ²³ George Archibald, "Meese to Join Heritage, Will Write, Speak on Policy," *Washington Times*, 7/14/88; William J. Bennett, "The War Over Culture in Education," Heritage Foundation 1991.
- ²⁴ W. John Moore, "Wichita Pipeline," *National Journal*, 5/16/92, p. 1169.
- ²⁵ Burton, "Think Tanks..." *Insight*, 3/6/95, p. 17
- ²⁶ 1995 FGI, p. 1258
- ²⁷ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ²⁸ Russ Bellant, *The Coors Connection: How Coors Family Philanthropy Undermines Democratic Pluralism*, Political Research Associates, 1990, p. 21
- ²⁹ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report; Scaife Family Foundation 1994 Annual Report.
- ³⁰ John M. Olin and Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Reports; FGI 1995
- ³¹ Center for the Study of Popular Culture funding appeal (no date)
- ³² Josh Daniel, "Uncivil Wars," *Independent*, Aug./Sept. (no year).
- ³³ 1995 Right Guide
- ³⁴ Leon Howell, "The Role of the Four Sisters: Funding the War of Ideas," *Christian Century*, July 19-26 1995, p. 702
- ³⁵ Leon Howell, *Funding the War of Ideas: A Report to the United Church Board for Homeland Ministries*, Cleveland, Ohio, October 1995, p. 33.
- ³⁶ W. John Moore, "Wichita Pipeline," *National Journal* 5/16/92, p. 1168
- ³⁷ 1995 FGI, p. 288; 293
- ³⁸ 1995 Right Guide
- ³⁹ W. John Moore, "Wichita Pipeline," *National Journal*, 5/16/92, p. 1172

-
- ⁴⁰ "Foundations in the Newt Era." Special Report from the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, September 1995, p. 29
- ⁴¹ Hatfield and Dexter, "Smart Bombs..." *San Francisco Examiner*, 5/24/92.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ Barbara Miner, "The Power and the Money: Bradley Foundation and Milwaukee," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ⁴⁴ "Conservative Spotlight: Wisconsin Policy Research Institute," *Human Events*, 10/13/95, p. 18.
- ⁴⁵ John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ⁴⁶ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁴⁷ "Special Report: Conservative Think Tanks and Foundations," *Group Research Report*, Vol. 30, No. 1 Spring 1991, p. 2.
- ⁴⁸ Heartland Institute, 9/96.
- ⁴⁹ 1995 FGI, p. 1254; John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ⁵⁰ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3, p. 3
- ⁵¹ 1995 Foundation Grants Index, p. 1259.
- ⁵² 1995 FGI, 194, 286, 1233; Smith Richardson Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ⁵³ Michael Barone, "Seeking Civility in America's Cities," *US News & World Report*, 4/4/94
- ⁵⁴ "Burgeoning Conservative Think Tanks: The Madison Group: Heritage Offshoots Seek to Influence State Legislation," *Responsive Philanthropy*, Spring 1991 p. 1
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 1-2
- ⁵⁶ Hatfield and Dexter, "Smart Bombs..." *San Francisco Examiner*, 5/24/92.
- ⁵⁷ Michael Barone, "Seeking Civility in America's Cities," *US News & World Report*, 4/4/94
- ⁵⁸ "Burgeoning Conservative Think Tanks," *Responsive Philanthropy* Spring 1991 p. 2, 16.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 20
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 20
- ⁶¹ Ibid., p. 12, 20
- ⁶² Ibid., p. 20
- ⁶³ Ibid., p. 20
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 12
- ⁶⁵ Lynde and Harry Bradley, John M. Olin 1994 Annual Reports; FGI 1995
- ⁶⁶ Leon Howell, "Funding the War of Ideas," *Christian Century*, July 19-26 '95, p. 702
- ⁶⁷ 1995 Foundation Grants Index, p. 1259, 1262
- ⁶⁸ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁶⁹ Phil Kuntz, "Citizen Scaife: Heir Turned Publisher Uses Financial Largess to Fuel Conservatism," *Wall Street Journal*, 10/12/95 p. A5
- ⁷⁰ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report, (entry under the Foundation for Cultural Review)
- ⁷¹ Schulman, "Foundations for a Movement," *EXTRA!* March/April 95, p. 11
- ⁷² The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁷³ Schulman, "Foundations for a Movement," *EXTRA!*, March/April 95, p. 11.
- ⁷⁴ 1995 Right Guide, p. 185
- ⁷⁵ John M. Olin Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁷⁶ Leon Howell, "Funding the War of Ideas" *Christian Century*, July 19-26 1995 p. 702 whole paragraph
- ⁷⁷ Josh Daniel, "Uncivil Wars," *Independent*, Aug./Sept. (no year)
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ 1995 FGI 1995 pp. 1400, 1406, 1408; The 1995 Right Guide for C.S.P.C. information.
- ⁸⁰ Josh Daniel, "Uncivil Wars," *Independent*, Aug./Sept. (no year)
- ⁸¹ "Private Foundations Boost Conservative Programs, Oppose Public Funding, *St. Louis Journalism Review*, 6/92, p. 6
- ⁸² "Inside the Republican Revolution: The First Hundred Days," copyright 1995 Manifold Productions.
- ⁸³ Joel Bleifuss, "Doing Right by the Campus Left," *In These Times*, Jan. 22, 1996.
- ⁸⁴ David Callahan, "Liberal Policy's Weak Foundations," *The Nation*, November 13, 1995
- ⁸⁵ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ⁸⁶ 1995 Right Guide
- ⁸⁷ Moore, "Wichita Pipeline," *National Journal*, 5/16/92, p. 1169

-
- ⁸⁸ JM Olin Foundation Gains \$100 M in Assets," Foundation Giving Watch Vol XIII, Issue 11 April 94 p. 2; John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.1994 Annual Report
- ⁸⁹ John M. Olin Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁹⁰ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ⁹¹ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ⁹² Phil Kuntz, "Citizen Scaife," *Wall Street Journal*, 10/12/95
- ⁹³ Major Grants to 'Campus 12' R-W groups," *Study War No More: UCP's Guide to Uncovering the Right on Campus*, University Conversion Project, 1994 p. 11
- ⁹⁴ Sara Diamond, "Corporate Interference: Endowing the Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 91, p. 46
- ⁹⁵ "Conservative Forum," *Human Events*, 2/23/96, p. 21
- ⁹⁶ Intercollegiate Studies Institute solicitation letter to Young Americans for Freedom members, 3/2/92
- ⁹⁷ Major Grants to 'Campus 12' R-W groups," *Study War No More: UCP's Guide to Uncovering the Right on Campus*, University Conversion Project, 1994 p. 11
- ⁹⁸ Sara Diamond, "Corporate Interference: Endowing the Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 91, p. 46.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁰¹ Jonathan Bloedow, "God and Journalism on Campus," *World*, 4/1/95, p. 14
- ¹⁰² "The Right Fuels a Press Network on Campus" *New York Times*, 10/24/90
- ¹⁰³ Madison Center for Educational Affairs Tax Form 990, 1992
- ¹⁰⁴ "Conservative Forum," *Human Events*, 2/23/96, p. 21.
- ¹⁰⁵ Diamond, "Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 1991
- ¹⁰⁶ Martin Boer, Conservative Campus Groups Recharge New Right Campus Politics in the 1980s" University Conversion Project, 1994, p. 20.
- ¹⁰⁷ Diamond, "Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 1991, p. 47, quoting MCEA 90 AR and other sources
- ¹⁰⁸ Joel Bleifuss, Who Funds the Right, *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Fall 1995
- ¹⁰⁹ Diamond, "Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 1991, p. 49.
- ¹¹⁰ "NAS: The Wrong Way to Reduce Campus Tensions," A Statement by the National Association of Scholars, 1991
- ¹¹¹ Courtney Leatherman, "Conservative Scholars' Group Draws Increasingly Diverse Voices to its Cause," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 4/28/93, p. A15.
- ¹¹² See, for example, Letters to the Editor, *New York Times* 11/16/90; "Fear and Loathing at Princeton," *Washington Times*, 1/2/92 (Jeffrey Hart is member of N.A.S. Speaker's Bureau, according to N.A.S. catalogue (no date)); "Humanism has a rightful place on Campus, *Washington Times*, 3/13/96; Hoops over Hamlet, *USA Today*, 3/19/96.
- ¹¹³ Phone notes with the N.A.S. national office in Princeton, NJ.
- ¹¹⁴ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁵ "Major Grants to "Campus 12" Right Wing Groups," University Conversion Project, 1994 p. 12.
- ¹¹⁶ "Major Grants to "Campus 12" Right Wing Groups," University Conversion Project, 1994, p. 11
- ¹¹⁷ The Right Guide, p. 186.
- ¹¹⁸ Diamond, "Right-wing Academic Agenda" *Covert Action* #38 Fall 1991, p. 48.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ Alice Dember, "Umass Group Challenges Affirmative Action," *The Boston Globe*, 3/14/96
- ¹²¹ "The Core of the Matter," *US News & World Report*, 3/21/96, pp. 57-8.
- ¹²² Ibid.
- ¹²³ James Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93
- ¹²⁴ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹²⁵ Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, pp 564-5
- ¹²⁶ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹²⁷ Ibid.
- ¹²⁸ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹²⁹ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report

-
- ¹³⁰ Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, pp 564-5
- ¹³¹ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹³² Ibid.
- ¹³³ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ¹³⁴ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹³⁵ Ibid.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 4
- ¹³⁷ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹³⁸ Welfare Reform: Rhetoric and Reality, Woodstock Theological Center--Forum Announcement, Georgetown University, March 12, 1996
- ¹³⁹ W. John Moore, "Wichita Pipeline," *National Journal*, 5/16/92, p. 1171
- ¹⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 1169.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁴² Ibid., p. 1169
- ¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 1174
- ¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 1168
- ¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 1168
- ¹⁴⁶ John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ¹⁴⁷ John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ¹⁴⁸ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1993 Annual Report.
- ¹⁴⁹ James Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, P. 564.
- ¹⁵⁰ John Wiener, "Olin Money Tree: Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, January 1, 1990
- ¹⁵¹ "Simon: preaching the word for Olin," *New York Times*, (no date)
- ¹⁵² "Special Report: Conservative Think Tanks and Foundations," *Group Research Report*, Vol. 30, No. 1 Spring 1991, p. 3
- ¹⁵³ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12.
- ¹⁵⁴ Josh Daniel, "Uncivil Wars," *Independent*, Aug./Sept. (no year)
- ¹⁵⁵ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12.
- ¹⁵⁶ "Justice for Sale: Shortchanging the Public Interest for Private Gain," A Report by the Alliance For Justice, 1993, p. 27.
- ¹⁵⁷ "Justice for Sale: Shortchanging the Public Interest for Private Gain," A Report by the Alliance For Justice, 1993, p. 1.
- ¹⁵⁸ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁵⁹ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12.
- ¹⁶⁰ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶¹ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶² "JM Olin Foundation Gains \$100 M in Assets," *Foundation Giving Watch* Vol XIII, Issue 11 April 1994
- ¹⁶³ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶⁴ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶⁵ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶⁶ Jay Mathews, "Business tries to Shape Legal System, Report Says," *Washington Post*, 5/19/93
- ¹⁶⁷ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12.
- ¹⁶⁸ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁶⁹ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12-13.
- ¹⁷⁰ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12
- ¹⁷¹ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ¹⁷² Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 12.
- ¹⁷³ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ¹⁷⁴ John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ¹⁷⁵ Weiner, "Dollars for Neocon Scholars," *The Nation*, 1/1/90, p. 13
- ¹⁷⁶ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1993 Annual Report
- ¹⁷⁷ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1993 Annual Report
- ¹⁷⁸ 1995 FGI, p. 1262

-
- ¹⁷⁹ John M. Olin Foundation 1993 and 1994 Annual Reports
- ¹⁸⁰ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁸¹ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ¹⁸² Phil Kuntz, "Citizen Scaife," *Wall Street Journal*, 10/12/95
- ¹⁸³ See Scaife Family Foundation 1994 Annual Report.
- ¹⁸⁴ Phil Kuntz, "Citizen Scaife," *Wall Street Journal*, 10/12/95
- ¹⁸⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 2
- ¹⁸⁸ Phil Kuntz, "Citizen Scaife," *Wall Street Journal*, 10/12/95
- ¹⁸⁹ Russ Bellant, *The Coors Connection: How Coors Family Philanthropy Undermines Democratic Pluralism*, Political Research Associates, p. 29
- ¹⁹⁰ Bella Stumbo, "Coors Clan: Doing it their Way," *Los Angeles Times*, 9/18/88.
- ¹⁹¹ Thomas Knudson, "Labor Truce Welcomed at Coors Base," *New York Times*, 9/7/87
- ¹⁹² Russ Bellant, *The Coors Connection: How Coors Family Philanthropy Undermines Democratic Pluralism*, Political Research Associates, p. 69.
- ¹⁹³ Victoria Cross, "Coors Brings Beer and Controversy to Detroit," *Detroit Metro Times*, 1/22/86
- ¹⁹⁴ Victoria Cross, "Coors Brings Beer and Controversy to Detroit," *Detroit Metro Times*, 1/22/86
- ¹⁹⁵ Russ Bellant, *The Coors Connection: How Coors Family Philanthropy Undermines Democratic Pluralism*, Political Research Associates, p. 62
- ¹⁹⁶ Jonathan P. Hicks, "Coors Mends Minority Fences," *New York Times*, 7/25/85; "Coors Drops Libel Suit Against Paper," *Washington Post*, 8/26/87.
- ¹⁹⁷ Bella Stumbo, "Coors Clan: Doing it their Way," *Los Angeles Times*, 9/18/88.
- ¹⁹⁸ Jonathan P. Hicks, "Coors Mends Minority Fences," *New York Times*, 7/25/85
- ¹⁹⁹ Phone interview with Coors Foundation office, Colorado.
- ²⁰⁰ Hatfield and Waugh, "The Right's Smart Bombs," *San Francisco Examiner*, 5/24/92; 1995 Foundation Grants Index, p. 1231.
- ²⁰¹ "Special Report: Burgeoning Conservative Think Tanks," *Responsive Philanthropy*, National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, Spring 1991 p. 13.
- ²⁰² Bellant, *The Coors Connection*, Political Research Associates, 1990, p. 21
- ²⁰³ Ibid., p. 11
- ²⁰⁴ Ibid., Bellant quoting Alan Crawford.
- ²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 19, 16.
- ²⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 16-17
- ²⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 17-18
- ²⁰⁸ "Private Foundations Boost Conservative Programs, Oppose Public Funding," *St. Louis Journalism Review*, 6/92.
- ²⁰⁹ Victoria Cross, "Coors Brings Beer and Controversy to Detroit," *Detroit Metro Times*, 1/22/86
- ²¹⁰ Bellant, *The Coors Connection*, Political Research Associates, 1990, p. 25
- ²¹¹ "Who Funds the Radical Right?" *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Autumn 1995
- ²¹² Michael Booth, "Coors Adds Partners to Benefits," *Denver Post*, 7/7/95
- ²¹³ Leon Howell, "The Role of the Four Sisters: Funding the War of Ideas," *Christian Century*, July 19-26 1995, p. 701.
- ²¹⁴ 1995 FGI p. 425; 1232-3; 602; Smith Richardson 1994 Annual Report.
- ²¹⁵ "Foundations are Four Times More Liberal than Conservative: Capital Research Center Reports to Nation," *Responsive Philanthropy*, National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, Fall 1991, pp. 1, 12.
- ²¹⁶ The Council for National Policy, *Without Justice for All*, p. 61, (no date).
- ²¹⁷ Ralph Frammolino, "Ahmanson Heir Bankrolls RR's Agenda," *Los Angeles Times*, '92, (incomplete date)
- ²¹⁸ Ibid.
- ²¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²²⁰ John Borland, "Dollars from the Right: Conservative Group is finding that even Ideology has a Bottom Line," *California Journal*, Sept. 1995, p. 16

-
- ²²¹ Eric Bailey, "Affluent Conservative Political Group to Focus on Local Issues," *LA Times*, 7/5/95
- ²²² Ibid.
- ²²³ Dan Morain and Carl Ingram, "Hurtt's Spending Equals his Bold Conservative Agenda," *Los Angeles Times*, 11/24/95
- ²²⁴ Barber, "Rob Hurt: New Power on the Right," *California Journal*, February 1994, pp. 8-9.
- ²²⁵ Letter from Ralph Reed to Charles Black, April 3, 1992.
- ²²⁶ Morain and Ingram, "Hurtt's Spending," *Los Angeles Times*, 11/24/95
- ²²⁷ California State Senate Legislative Counsel's Digest Bill Analysis.
- ²²⁸ Mary Lynne Vellinga, "'Parental Rights' Movement Grows," *Sacramento Bee*, 5/27/96
- ²²⁹ Morain and Ingram, "Hurtt's Spending," *Los Angeles Times*, 11/24/95
- ²³⁰ Ibid., p. 1
- ²³¹ Ibid., p. 2
- ²³² Ibid., p. 3
- ²³³ "The Christian Capitalists," *US News & World Report*, 3/13/95, pp. 59-60
- ²³⁴ Bellant, *The Coors Connection*, Political Research Associates, 1990, p. 30.
- ²³⁵ Ibid.
- ²³⁶ "Who Funds the Radical Right?" *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Autumn 1995
- ²³⁷ Lynda Edwards, "The Pizza Empire Strikes Back" *Washington Post*, 3/18/90
- ²³⁸ "Who Funds the Radical Right?" *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Autumn 1995
- ²³⁹ Peter H Stone, "His pockets run DEEP," *National Journal*, 12/9/95, pp 3042-3
- ²⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ²⁴¹ Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, p. 566
- ²⁴² Miner, "The Power and the Money: Bradley Foundation and Milwaukee," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ²⁴³ Barnes, "Banker with a Cause," *National Journal*, 3/6/93, p. 566
- ²⁴⁴ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ²⁴⁵ Daniel Bice, "Private Funds Pay for Choice Defense," *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*, Dec. 1, 1995.
- ²⁴⁶ Miner, "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3
- ²⁴⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 3
- ²⁵⁰ 1995 Right Guide (Educational Excellence Network entry)
- ²⁵¹ Ibid.
- ²⁵² The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ²⁵³ Mark Adnrejevic, "Charter School Fight Continues," *Lansing State Journal* (no date).
- ²⁵⁴ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ²⁵⁵ "The Power and the Money," *Rethinking Schools*, Spring 94, Vol. 8, #3; John M. Olin 1994 Annual Report.
- ²⁵⁶ K.L. Billingsley, "Conservative Republicans Hit for Affirmative Action Silence," *Washington Times*, 2/12/95, p. A5
- ²⁵⁷ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.1994 Annual Report (The working title listed in the Annual Report is *The Managing Diversity Crusades*. Confirmation of the final publication's identity comes from Olin Foundation's New York office, phone interview with PFAW researcher)
- ²⁵⁸ Ann Bradley, "Rights Chief Defends Teacher-Layoff Stance and Affirmative Action," *Education Week*, 4/5/95
- ²⁵⁹ Nelson Lund, "In Defense of Colorblindness," *Wall Street Journal*, 3/22/96.
- ²⁶⁰ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc.1994 Annual Report
- ²⁶¹ The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ²⁶² California Civil Rights Initiative, A project of Californians Against Discrimination and Preferences, Los Angeles, CA.
- ²⁶³ Gayle M.B. Hanson, "Color-Blind Initiative Makes Foes See Red," *Insight*, 2/20, p. 6.
- ²⁶⁴ Kathryn Wexler, "Women's Groups Take on California Initiative," *Washington Post*, 3/3/96, p. A3, according to the president of the Feminist Majority.
- ²⁶⁵ "The Mother of All Wedge Issues," *U.S. News & World Report*, 6/5/95, pp. 30-31.

-
- ²⁶⁶ Major Grants to ‘Campus 12’ R-W groups,” *Study War No More: UCP’s Guide to Uncovering the Right on Campus*, University Conversion Project, 1994 p. 11
- ²⁶⁷ See John M. Olin, Lynde and Harry Bradley and Smith Richardson Annual Reports.
- ²⁶⁸ See “*Update to November 1994 MAS Report: Turmoil and Tension at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst: History, Analysis and Recommended Solutions*,” March 1996, Massachusetts Association of Scholars.
- ²⁶⁹ “University’s Leaders are Torn by Affirmative-Action Ban,” *New York Times*, 1/28/96.
- ²⁷⁰ “Preliminary Analysis of *Hopwood v. State of Texas*,” NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., April 15, 1996 p. 3.
- ²⁷¹ Sarah Lubman, “Campuses Mull Admissions without Affirmative Action,” *Wall Street Journal*, 5/16/95.
- ²⁷² “All our Axes are in Texas: Hopwood, et. al., State of Texas, et. al.,” *Center for Individual Rights Docket Report*, Second Quarter, 1994, p. 3.
- ²⁷³ Courtney Leatherman, “A Public-Interest Law Firm Aims to Defend the Politically Incorrect,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11/23/94, p. A19.
- ²⁷⁴ Ellen Messer-Davidow, “Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education,” *Social Text*, Fall 1993, p. 64.
- ²⁷⁵ Leatherman, “A Public-Interest Law Firm Aims to Defend the Politically Incorrect,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 11/23/94, p. A19.
- ²⁷⁶ Lynde and Harry Bradley, Smith Richardson and John M. Olin 1994 Annual Reports
- ²⁷⁷ 1995 Right Guide; calculations based on total expenses for FY ending 3/94.
- ²⁷⁸ Peter Applebome, “Equal Admission Standards Leave Mississippi’s Black Universities Wary,” *New York Times*, 4/24/96
- ²⁷⁹ Peter Applebome, “Universities Troubled by Decision Limiting Admission Preferences,” *New York Times*, 3/21/96
- ²⁸⁰ Tony Mauro, “Ruling spurs Texas School to Suspend Admissions,” *USA Today*, 3/21/96
- ²⁸¹ “Preliminary Analysis of *Hopwood v. State of Texas*,” NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., April 15, 1996 pp. 7, 2.
- ²⁸² Maura Dolan, “Wilson to Push Affirmative Action Case,” *Los Angeles Times*, 1/5/96.
- ²⁸³ Claire Cooper, “Court Stands Pat on Preference Laws,” *Washington Times*, 1/6/96.
- ²⁸⁴ As per phone interview with ACLU office in San Francisco, California 4/25/96.
- ²⁸⁵ As per phone interview with ACLU office in San Francisco, California 4/25/96.
- ²⁸⁶ 1995 Foundation Grants Index, pp. 287, 308, 311.
- ²⁸⁷ Scott Jascik, “Affirmative Action under Fire,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3/10/95.
- ²⁸⁸ See Lynde and Harry Bradley and John M. Olin 1994 Annual Reports.
- ²⁸⁹ W. John Moore, “Wichita Pipeline,” *National Journal*, 5/16/92, p. 1168
- ²⁹⁰ Nelson Lund, “In Defense of Colorblindness,” *Wall Street Journal*, 3/22/96.
- ²⁹¹ Hanson, “Color-Blind Initiative Makes Foes See Red,” *Insight*, 2/20, pp. 7-8
- ²⁹² “Women Need Not Fear the Civil Rights Initiative,” *Los Angeles Times*, 1/24/96; “Rights Initiative Rebounds,” *Washington Times*, 2/15/96; “Let’s End Bias on Campus,” *USA Today*, 6/1/95; “The Wedge Issue,” *National Journal*, 4/14/95, p. 792; “A Speak-No-Evil Veil Lifted,” *National Journal* 4/1/95.
- ²⁹³ Dave Karp, “A Whiter Shade of Yale?” *Washington Post*, 6/4/95
- ²⁹⁴ Dave Karp, “A Whiter Shade of Yale?” *Washington Post*, 6/4/95; Jonathan Bloedow, “God and Journalism on Campus,” *World*, 4/1/95
- ²⁹⁵ John Leo, “How the West was Lost at Yale,” *US News & World Report*, 4/3/95 p. 19
- ²⁹⁶ John Leo, “How the West was Lost at Yale,” *US News & World Report*, 4/3/95 p. 19
- ²⁹⁷ Dave Karp, “A Whiter Shade of Yale?” *Washington Post*, 6/4/95
- ²⁹⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹⁹ Leo, “How the West was Lost at Yale”, *US News & World Report*, 4/3/95
- ³⁰⁰ Karp, “A Whiter Shade of Yale?” *Washington Post*, 6/4/95
- ³⁰¹ Ibid., p. 2
- ³⁰² Ibid., p. 3
- ³⁰³ 1995 Right Guide
- ³⁰⁴ Karp, “A Whiter Shade of Yale?” *Washington Post*, 6/4/95

-
- ³⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 4
- ³⁰⁶ Ibid., citing *Newsweek*.
- ³⁰⁷ John M. Olin Foundation, Inc. 1994 Annual Report
- ³⁰⁸ Allegheny Foundation 1994 Annual Report
- ³⁰⁹ Karp, "A Whiter Shade of Yale?" *Washington Post*, 6/4/95
- ³¹⁰ 1995 Right Guide, p. 154
- ³¹¹ William Simon, "Paying a Price for Campus P.C.," *Washington Times*, 9/10/95
- ³¹² Joel Bleifuss, "Who Funds the Right?" *National Campaign for Freedom of Expression*, Fall 1995.
- ³¹³ Ellen Messer-Davidow, "Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education," *Social Text*, Fall 1993, p. 67
- ³¹⁴ Jon Wiener, "Reagan's Children: Racial Hatred on Campus," *The Nation*, 2/27/89.
- ³¹⁵ Debra L. Schultz, "To Reclaim a Legacy of Diversity: Analyzing The 'Political Correctness' Debates in Higher Education," A publication of the National Council for Research on Women, 1993, p. 13
- ³¹⁶ Ellen Messer-Davidow, "Manufacturing the Attack on Liberalized Higher Education," *Social Text*, Fall 1993, p. 67
- ³¹⁷ Biography of Dinesh D'Souza, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 9/95.
- ³¹⁸ John M. Olin, Inc, 1994 Annual Report
- ³¹⁹ Karp, "A Whiter Shade of Yale?" *Washington Post*, 6/4/95
- ³²⁰ *Policy Review*, Fall 1995, Summer 1987.
- ³²¹ "Review of Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus," *National Review*, Vol. 43, 4/15/91, p. 49
- ³²² Debra L. Schultz, "To Reclaim a Legacy of Diversity: Analyzing The 'Political Correctness' Debates in Higher Education," A publication of the National Council for Research on Women, 1993, p. 8
- ³²³ Dinesh D'Souza, "Separation of Race and State," *Wall Street Journal*, 9/12/95
- ³²⁴ Glenn Loury, "One Scholar Meets...Another Man's Poison," *Bostonia*, Winter 1995-96, p. 74.
- ³²⁵ Dinesh D'Souza, *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*, The Free Press, New York, 1995, p. 527.
- ³²⁶ Ibid.
- ³²⁷ Glenn Loury, "One Scholar Meets...Another Man's Poison," *Bostonia*, Winter 1995-96, p. 74.
- ³²⁸ Carol Innerst, "Blacks quit Conservative Think Tank," *Washington Times*, 9/20/95
- ³²⁹ Glenn Loury, "One Scholar Meets...Another Man's Poison," *Bostonia*, Winter 1995-96, p. 73.
- ³³⁰ "Burgeoning Conservative Think Tanks," *Responsive Philanthropy*, National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, Spring 1991, p. 12
- ³³¹ Ibid., p. 5