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Carnegie Corporation of New York was founded in 1911 by Andrew Carnegie “to do real and permanent good in this world.” The Corporation, which is now approaching its centennial year, was the last of the more than twenty trusts, institutions and organizations Mr. Carnegie created in the United States and abroad. Hence, its name sounds more like a company than the philanthropic foundation it is, simply because Mr. Carnegie, through his generosity, had run out of names to use in establishing his foundation. Having reached the latter part of his life, he gave the bulk of his fortune “to the public,” as noted in a 1922 report written by Henry S. Pritchett, Acting President of the Corporation, and he did so by endowing Carnegie Corporation with both his money and a mission aimed at the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding. A man of great conviction, he deeply believed that with great wealth comes great responsibility, and that those who earn fortunes are obligated—obligated, by what is morally right and by their duty to their fellow men and women—to give away their money to be used for the betterment of society. Andrew Carnegie’s 1889 Gospel of Wealth, in which he stated this credo, has in many respects become a how-to manual for a century of philanthropists who followed after him, from his contemporary and fellow believer in the ideals embodied in philanthropic giving, John D. Rockefeller, all the way forward to individuals such as Bill and Melinda Gates, George Soros and Warren Buffett.

It was with this history in mind that in December 2009, just prior to a meeting of the Corporation’s Board, a number of the Corporation’s Trustees, staff members and myself gathered at the Corporation’s archives, which are housed at the Rare Book and Manuscript Library of the Butler Library at Columbia University. The Corporation’s archivist, Jane Gorjevsky, had brought out a number of historical documents for us to review. I must say that we were awestruck to be in the presence of these materials, which resound with meaning for all the Carnegie family of institutions, but also somewhat humbled by the realization that nearly one hundred years ago, Andrew Carnegie had the insight to direct the entities he had created to focus their work on the core issues that to this day continue to affect the welfare of humanity around the globe: education, international peace, and strengthening the pillars of democracy.

Among the materials that we saw at the Rare Book Library were Andrew Carnegie’s naturalization documents, which reminded us that he was an immigrant from Scotland and a proud American by choice. We also saw drafts of his will; handwritten minutes and stock certificates relating to the Carnegie Home Trust, the first entity established by Mr. Carnegie exclusively for the purpose of giving away money; the original charter and by-laws of our sister organization, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (the Carnegie Foundation), which is now located in Stanford California, but in its early years shared both offices and officers with the Corporation; and records relating to some of the Corporation’s earliest grantmaking.

The vitality of Carnegie Corporation, embodied in Mr. Carnegie’s foresight about how the road into the future cannot always be precisely charted by those living in the present, is evident in the intertwined strands of continuity and change that are the hallmark of our work.

The Carnegie Foundation, an independent policy and research center dedicated to supporting needed transformations in American education, recently celebrated its double-year centennial, having been founded by Andrew Carnegie in 1905 and chartered by an act of Congress in 1906. The Carnegie Institution of Washington, now called the Carnegie Institution for Science, has also recently passed its centennial year, as it was founded in 1902 as an organization dedicated to scientific discovery. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, whose mission focuses on advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States, will be celebrating its centennial this year, 2010. Along with such other institutions as The Carnegie Foundation in the Netherlands, which Mr. Carnegie created in 1903 to establish and administer the Peace Palace in the Hague; to the trusts he established in Scotland and England to open university education to those who would otherwise be unable to afford it as well as to fund social welfare projects addressing issues of poverty, unemployment and urban renewal; to his establishment of more than 2,500 libraries in the United States and throughout the world; even to his gift of organs to some 8,000 churches in the U.S. and overseas—as his founding of Carnegie Hall in 1891 suggests, the ability of music to uplift the human spirit was a notion he was invested in, both emotionally and financially—we can see that this was indeed a man who wanted to make the world a better place not only for the citizens of the United States but others around the globe, as well.

The centennials of the Carnegie institutions, including the Corporation’s, remind us that anniversaries and birthdays are not only the occasion for celebration and looking back at achievements, but for renewals. Carnegie Corporation of New York is indeed blessed to be approaching its 100th year of grantmaking. Mr. Carnegie himself was

(Continued on page 11)
A Note About This Issue

We at Carnegie Corporation of New York are centenarians. We’re old! But as you can tell from Vartan Gregorian’s eloquent letter that starts on the opposite page, there is a lot of energy and opportunity around this big birthday. Being one of the oldest foundations in the country gives each of us who works here more than a job or even a mission. We have a sense that we are part of the storied history of this institution and we must live up to our legacy.

We will be sharing that legacy with you in this magazine over the next few publications.

Karen Theroux has dived into our archives and traces how the art of the commission has advanced the Corporation’s grantmaking. Many think “Carnegie” and “Commissions” go together and various presidents have used commissions to put both national and international issues on the agenda. Her story takes us on quite a ride through the 20th century. Eleanor Lerman shows you how even unearthing early Mayan ruins benefited from the Corporation’s support. Dick Clark, the former senator from Iowa, has built a highly regarded program at the Aspen Institute with Corporation support. In the noise of Washington, intelligent, bipartisan talk is rather unusual and so is Dick Clark. Veteran reporter Lee Michael Katz explores 25 years of congressional seminars on substance.

Two other stories about current priorities at the Corporation take you to Africa and the Middle East. Caryle Murphy, the award-winning journalist and author, proves that there is nothing old-fashioned about a library in Egypt and that scholarship on Islam is a very dynamic enterprise. Alan Anderson visited many of the young African scientists who are part the Corporation-funded Regional Initiative for Science and Education and tells us the story of some of those leaders. We don’t often get to see the faces and work of the next generation in Africa who toil behind the headlines. Meet them inside—they are the promise of tomorrow’s Africa. In addition, the Council on Foundation’s president, Steve Gunderson, challenges those who work in philanthropy to see ourselves “as part of a sector and a movement.”

We hope you find something worth reading in these pages. Next edition, we’ll walk you through more of our 100 years of grantmaking.

Susan King, Vice President, External Affairs and Program Director, Journalism Initiative, Special Initiatives and Strategy
THE
Library
OF
Alexandria
A Treasure House of Knowledge

by Caryle Murphy

Officials and guests attend the opening of the new Library of Alexandria in Egypt, October 16, 2002.
ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT—Every morning, as a soft breeze floats in from the Mediterranean, long lines of foreign tourists and Egyptian students form outside a prime attraction of this ancient city. Thousands more enter daily through its online portal, www.bibalex.org, accessible in four languages.

These visitors are not arriving to view one of Egypt’s storied treasures from its Pharaonic past. Rather, they come to see an embodiment of what many hope will be its future: the Library of Alexandria, also known by its Latin name, Bibliotheca Alexandrina.

Thirty years in the planning, the Library opened in 2002 in an architecturally innovative building. Its mission: to revive the full-bodied pursuit of knowledge that historians say flourished in this city because of the ancient Library of Alexandria. In existence from roughly 290 BCE to 415 CE, the Library at its peak was a center of vibrant intellectual creativity that led to ground-breaking advances in many fields.

Its modern reincarnation, which draws about 1.2 million visitors annually, aims to become a “center of excellence for the production and dissemination of knowledge, and...a place of dialogue and understanding between cultures and peoples,” according to Library director, Ismail Serageldin.

But resurrecting its ancestor’s intellectual legacy is only one of Bibliotheca Alexandrina’s ambitions. It also aspires to be a major actor in the expanding frontiers of global digital access to knowledge. One of its prime assets is a digitization lab. The most advanced such facility in the region, the lab has already scanned 130,000 of the Library’s books, creating the largest collection of digitized Arabic books in the world.

Even as it seeks to become an online resource for people around the world, the Library is also striving to serve its local community. In a country where public libraries are almost non-existent, it offers programs catering to university students, children, the visually impaired, and ordinary folks who want to learn how to browse the Internet.

Like a tree, the Library is firmly rooted in its surroundings as it branches...
upwards to pursue serious, uncensored scholarship in a competitive, globalized world. Its dedication to this ideal is manifest in a wide array of projects and programs, including one supported by Carnegie Corporation that aims to spotlight neglected works of important Islamic thinkers.

The Library’s commitment to academic freedom makes it a leader among indigenous intellectual institutions in the Arab world. And in promoting the values that its backers say are necessary for academic excellence—rationality, curiosity, tolerance and openness to others—it offers a challenging alternative to the anti-intellectual religiosity that has dominated Middle Eastern clerical and political circles in recent times.

Still, Library critics say that no matter how sincere its commitment to free speech may be, its close alignment with the Egyptian establishment—the Library is “attached to the President” of Egypt by official decree and the government is a major contributor to its budget—means that there are limits to this commitment.

Nevertheless, in a region where freedom of expression is in constant struggle with authoritarian governments, the Library is providing a much-needed platform for pushing the limits of debate and intellectual exploration. Saudi Arabia’s King Abdullah University for Science and Technology (KAUST), a graduate-level research center that opened in September, also has declared its intention to be a supporter of unfettered scholarship. But KAUST is brand new, so its promise of academic freedom remains untested.

An Ancient Center of Creativity

The first Library of Alexandria was founded by Ptolemy I, one of Alexander the Great’s generals who ruled Egypt after the death of his commander. Ptolemy’s ambitions were to create a repository of all the knowledge in the empire created by Alexander. Stretching from Greece to India, that world was centered on the Mediterranean and dominated by Hellenistic culture.

The Library that Ptolemy and his successors built—believed to have been located about 200 meters west of the current library—is thought to have held 700,000 papyrus manuscripts, which were catalogued into about 10 subjects, arranged alphabetically by author and stored on shelves. Many scrolls in Babylonian, Sanskrit, and Persian were translated into Greek.

But the Library was more than a collecting place. Its Mouseion, a top-notch research center, attracted some of the best minds of its time, turning the
Library into a hothouse of debate and empirically based scientific inquiry.

Some of its famous alumni include geometry whiz Euclid and the library’s third director Eratosthenes, who proved the earth is a sphere centuries before Columbus sailed to the Americas. Others included mathematician Archimedes, Herophilus, who advanced medicine with dissections of the human body, and Aristarchus, an early promoter of the idea that the earth revolved around the sun. Callimachus, a Greek poet, is regarded as a founder of library cataloguing because he sorted the library’s manuscripts according to subject matter and author.

“It is no exaggeration to say that for the first time, the principles of scientific methods of research were developed in the various disciplines, with impressive results in mathematics, physics, medicine, astronomy, geography, etc., as well as in textual criticism,” wrote Alexandria University history professor Mostafa El Abbadi, author of The Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria.

The Library of Alexandria was also where Jewish scholars produced the first Greek translation of the Old Testament, the Septuagint, which has been a key text for untold numbers of biblical scholars. At the time, Alexandria’s cosmopolitan population included a significant Jewish community.

One reason for the ancient Library’s abundant output, some historians say, was its drive to catalogue and organize the written works in its collection. This synthesizing of contemporary knowledge facilitated its transmission to upcoming generations, thus stimulating new discoveries.

The Library suffered a major blow in 48 BCE when much of its collection was burned during a Roman attack on the city. It recovered, however, and prospered for some time until a slow decline set in, with no record of its existence after 415 CE.

A Dream of Revival

Sixteen centuries later, historian Abbadi came up with the idea of reviving the library. First proposed in the 1970s, his dream was taken up by the University of Alexandria, and then the Egyptian government, with Egypt’s First Lady Suzanne Mubarak taking a special interest in the project. Egypt worked with UNESCO and other governments to raise funds for the new Library’s construction. Its unique design, created in Norway, was chosen by a UNESCO jury from more than 500 entries.

Unlike much of the Middle East’s modern architecture, whose stark, Stalinist lines and heavy bulk are out of sync with their settings, the new Library fits snugly into Alexandria’s skyline along its semi-circular corniche. And yet, the Library is immediately recognizable because of its eye-grabbing appearance.

Shaped like a cylinder, the building’s circular roof slants downwards until part of it disappears below ground. This design is meant to replicate the disk of the rising sun, evoking the important role the sun has played in this country’s culture. A curved granite wall around part of the building is engraved with one letter from 120 different alphabets, symbolizing the library’s openness to all cultures. A planetarium, 3,000-seat conference center and open-air plaza complete the Library’s complex.

The Library itself has 11 stories, four of them underground. Inside, an atmosphere of openness is accentuated by the design of the reading rooms, which cascade from the seventh to the first floor and are all visible at once. Overhead, the slanted disc-like roof, which is really a latticework of windows, lets in natural light.

Altogether, the reading rooms can accommodate up to 2,000 readers, making them “the largest open reading area world-wide,” said tour guide Miral Kamel. Visitors can use more than 350 Internet-connected computers stationed around the library. And the stacks, which can hold up to 8 million books, so far have about 650,000 volumes in 20 different languages. Books are available to anyone but only for in-house use. Guides escort throngs of tourists through the building every day, and the visitors quickly discover that it offers far more than a library. It houses several museums and art galleries, an historical archive of 70 billion Internet pages going back to 1996, a rare book collection, a manuscript museum with a copy of the only known papyrus from the ancient Library (the original is in Vienna). There also is a supercomputer for advanced work in such fields as linguistics, and equipment to create three-dimensional simulations of research.

In a small theatre, Egypt’s history is unfurled in 180-degree panoramic view, using an interactive projection system developed by the Library.
And the Arts Center boasts a 14-string chamber orchestra.

**The Director:**

Leading the Library’s 1,988 full-time staff in its multiple missions is its Egyptian-born director Serageldin. Educated at Cairo and Harvard Universities, Serageldin worked at the World Bank from 1972 until 2000, serving as a vice president in his last eight years with the organization. A prolific writer, Serageldin, 65, has eclectic interests ranging from architecture to water resources to urban planning to anti-poverty programs. He speaks fluent Arabic, English and French.

In a recent interview in his 10th floor office, Serageldin was oblivious to a black-clouded thunderstorm raging outside his window as he described his vision for the Library. Its “biggest accomplishment...so far,” he said, “has been its ability to be faithful to the ideals of the ancient Library...[which] means a commitment to excellence and openness to the other.”

The library is viewed as both an Egyptian and an international institution, and “has emerged as arguably the strongest advocate of free speech—in Egypt, certainly,” Serageldin said. “I do not believe in banning books of any kind...They tell me, ‘Could you half-way decent institution that prides itself on being open to thought.”

Serageldin is also adamant about the Library’s need to be in the catbird seat when it comes to going digital, and he likes to say that it was “born digital.” Its efforts in this regard were recognized in 2005 when it was invited to become a “strategic partner” in the Louvre, but its digital copy is now accessible online through the Library’s web site.

Digitizing a book is a two-part operation, lab director Rami Rouchdi explained. Once scanned, it must go through a second, laborious process called optical character recognition (OCR) in order to make the text searchable.
The lab’s growing proficiency with this technique has allowed it to produce highly accurate online versions of Arabic language books—so much so that other libraries are using the services of Rouchdi’s lab to digitize their Arabic collections. “It’s because of our experience here,” he said.

“The Library is also using its digital capabilities to contribute Arabic content to the “Million Book Project,” a cooperative venture of Carnegie-Mellon University, Zhejiang University in China, and the Indian Institute of Science in India. The project has already digitized more than 1.5 million books, making them accessible online at the Universal Digital Library, www.ulib.org. Under Serageldin, the library sees itself not only as a vehicle for resurrecting “the spirit” of the ancient library, but also as a catalyst for social and political change in the present.

In 2004, it sponsored the Arab Reform Forum, which issued a blue-print for economic, political and social reforms in the Arab world. Entitled the Alexandria Document, it was signed by more than 160 leading figures from 18 Arab countries.

“We were extremely instrumental in pushing the reform agenda in the Arab world,” Serageldin said, adding that he “was very proud” when the Economist magazine called the Alexandria Document something that forum for debate,” and “does not like to engage in any kind of political activism.”

Excavating a Heritage

Serageldin is candid about contemporary political discourse in Muslim societies and not shy about criticizing what he calls “the currents of obscurantism and fanaticism and xenophobia and bigotry that we have to fight in our society.”

“The extremists and the Islamists dislike the Library very much,” he said. “But that’s okay, that’s normal, because we stand for exactly the opposite of what they stand for.”

Calling extremist thinking “a disaster,” he asked, “I mean, can you imagine in this day and age... [there are] people whose political program, officially, is no women and no non-Muslims will be allowed to high office?”

Serageldin said he has turned aside “an ongoing request” from some conservative Islamist groups to add a mosque to the Library. “I don’t think the Library is an appropriate place to have a religious facility,” he said. “Secondly, I can use the space much more effectively for other things...And thirdly, I also know what they would use it for, which wouldn’t be just to pray.”

Like many other Muslim intellectuals, Serageldin is driven to distraction by the perception that a literalist, ultra-conservative version of Islam is the only one sanctioned by its holy book, the Qur’an. Lamenting that young Muslims seem ignorant of the diversity of thought that has always characterized their faith, he believes it is the Library’s “duty” to make young people aware of Islam’s multi-faceted tradition.

To that end, the Library has initiated a project called “Reissuing Modern Classics in Islamic Thought and Culture.” In a move reminiscent of the original Library’s synthesizing of contemporary knowledge, the aim
is to reissue between 100 and 150 classic works by Muslim writers that were published roughly between 1850 and 1950, a period historians sometimes call the “modernist” era.

“My aim is to redress what I see as a totally and thoroughly wrong situation in many parts of the world where the Islamic tradition has been presented in a thoroughly biased fashion by systematically promoting extremist literature and systematically underplaying other types of literature,” Serageldin said.

Most importantly, he added, the three-year project intends “to address the younger generation by saying, ‘Look, here is your tradition and there are fascinating things in that tradition that you are probably not aware of.’”

Salah Eddin El Gawhary, who has worked with Serageldin to create the project from its earliest stage, said that when people talk about Islamic heritage, they usually hark back to the Abbasid Empire in Baghdad, and Muslim-ruled southern Spain, known as Andalusia, from the 8th through the 13th centuries.

“But Muslim thought and culture and contributions to civilization continued throughout history,” El Gawhary said. He and Serageldin chose to focus on the modernist era because that was when European colonization presented Muslims with tremendous challenges.

As such, modernist era writings often dealt with issues that are still controversial or unresolved in many Muslim societies today, such as the public role of women, freedom of conscience, and the legitimacy of political systems. They also wrestled with the conflict between science and faith, and the role of secularism.

Serageldin has set up a 20-member advisory board of Muslim academics—three are women—to choose the 150 books. So far, they have come up with about 85 titles. Some are well-known works widely recognized, if not read, by many Muslims. Others are relatively unknown, either because they are out of print, were never translated into other languages, or were ignored by historians.

Given the project’s purpose of bringing attention to what the Library regards as neglected mainstream works, it will not include many well-known writings that have come out of the strongly politicized current of Islamist thought of recent decades. Most of those works are already widely available, Serageldin said.

“There are umpteen zillion editions of Ibn Tamiyya’s fatwas...for heaven’s sake,” he said, referring to the 14th century Islamic thinker whose writings have become an uber-source for contemporary extremist ideologies. “But you can’t find Qasim Amin? The guy who wrote in 1898 The Liberation of Women from an Islamic perspective?”

And Serageldin said he’d like to see Qutb’s Artistic Representation in the Qur’an, which discusses how the Qur’an uses imagery, on the list because “it shows a facet of Sayyed Qutb that is totally ignored by the extremists today,” Serageldin said.

The 85 books selected so far are predominantly by Sunni Muslim authors. But the list also has several titles by Shiite Muslims from Yemen, Iran and Lebanon, El Gawhary said.

Each reissued book will have “an objective introduction,” said Olfat Gafour, director of publishing at the

The same goes for works by major 20th century Islamist thinkers such as Syed Abul A’ala al-Maududi, a Pakistani author who promoted a type of Islamic theocracy, and Hassan al Banna, founder of the Muslim Brotherhood. Their writings don’t need to be reissued, Serageldin added, because they are easily located.
Library. It will cover the author’s biography, major intellectual movements at the time he or she lived, a description of their relationships with students, mentors and other scholars, an explanation of why they wrote the book, its main themes, and finally, the responses it drew, both adulatory and critical. Also, the text of the book will be indexed and footnotes will explain archaic or difficult terms.

The first reissues will come out this year, Gafour said. The long-term plan is to print 1,000 copies of each work in its original language, and 1,000 each of translations into English and French. A digitized copy will be available online.

Serageldin said he also intends to launch a series of public seminars to discuss the ideas in each book in order to “give a lot of young people from the university a chance to...be exposed to a different kind of Islamic thinking.”

Raising Awareness of Diversity

Carnegie Corporation is contributing $1 million over three years toward the project’s costs, which are also being borne by the Library and a grant from the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation.

The project is in line with the Corporation’s Islam Initiative, a multi-sided effort aimed at raising awareness, particularly in the United States, of the diversity within Islamic thought and cultures, according to Hillary Wiesner, the Initiative’s program director.

“We’re trying to increase the accessibility of academic knowledge in the United States about Islam and Muslim societies...to show the diversity of thought and traditions in Muslim societies,” said Wiesner. The works to be reissued by the Library, she added, represent an “important period in history which is not that well-known.”

Carnegie Corporation’s president, Vartan Gregorian, is an international trustee of the Library, which he calls “a symbol of inclusion.” He has long sought to address Western misperceptions about Islam. His 2003 book, Islam: A Mosaic, Not a Monolith, is a survey of Islam’s history that highlights its complexity, including a long-established tradition of rationalism.

“We generally would like to simplify things,” said Gregorian, but “as an historian, I was interested to show...not the diversity of the faith, but the diversity of its institutions, poets, architecture, literature and philosophy.”

In a recent phone interview, Gregorian said that several years ago he became aware of “the paucity of material that is in circulation from major nineteenth and early twentieth century scholarly books on Islam.”

As a result, the Library’s decision to revive modernist classics drew his
immediate support. “The goal of this project is to have both the West and Muslim societies become aware of a major scholarly heritage that dealt with important issues still being dealt with now,” Gregorian said.

“For those who want to fight extremists, it allows them a source of information, especially in some societies that have censorship,” he added. And making such works more accessible to the public, he said, will ensure that contemporary debates in Muslim societies do “not become dominated by those who speak the loudest.”

**Serving Everyone**

But even as the Library hefts its intellectual legacy into the global debate of ideas, it does not forget those directly underfoot. Another of its duties, staff librarians said, is to serve the people of Egypt, including its disadvantaged.

“One of our goals is inclusion of people with disabilities,” said special libraries director Lamia Abdel Fattah. The library’s annual calendar includes programs to raise consciousness about challenges faced by the physically handicapped, she added, noting that people with disabilities are always invited to participate.

Heba Kholaif can attest to the Library’s impact on blind people like herself. Kholaif, 30, is a librarian in the Taha Hussein Library for the Visually Impaired. It is named for a blind Egyptian scholar whose pioneering form of Arabic literary criticism raised questions about how to read the Qur’an. He was expelled from his post at Cairo University and labeled an apostate. Today, Hussein’s works are essential to Islamic intellectual history; two of his books are among the classics essential to Islamic intellectual history; and now in Alexandria, there are more than three places that do the same as us.”

A screen reader, Kholaif explained, “just reads what is on the screen... whether a book or an Internet page.” Most visually-impaired Egyptians “didn’t use the computer because they didn’t know that such technology exists. When we opened in 2002 we offered something very new for them.”

Kholaif, who got some of her librarian training in the United States, said that most visually impaired visitors ask for assistance in surfing the Internet, using the screen reader, or printing out a document on one of the center’s Braille printers. Some students “don’t have computers at home so they just come here and write any assignment they want and we help them put it on a memory stick drive,” Kholaif said.

The Library also offers computer and Internet training courses for the public five days a week, all day long, according to Omnia Mounir Fathallah, director of the Library’s public services directorate.

“We are the only organization in Alexandria that offers this type of training to the public for free,” said Fathallah, adding that the courses fill up rapidly once their schedules are posted on the Library’s web site.

“They are one of the least broadcast activities of the Library, but they are one of the highest in attendance,” Fathallah said.

The Library’s reading rooms, open all week long, overflow with students from the nearby University of Alexandria, who pay a nominal access fee of about $5 a year.

“This is most of my life,” said Islam Abdelsalam, a 20-year-old medical student who was poring over a book one recent day. “I sit here more than I sit at home. I study here, go home to sleep, and come next day to study.”

Besides its fast Internet access, Abdelsalam said he likes the Library because it “is very calm, and quiet.”

Indeed, the Library’s sunny atmosphere is a stark contrast to its surroundings. Egypt is noted for its gregarious people and horn-honking, clamborous streets. Cairo has been called one of the world’s noisiest cities. And in the Library’s early days, this tumult made its way inside the building.

Reference librarian Ayman Saleh said that when he began working at the Library three years ago “people had different manners, they used to speak in a loud voice, they used to use their mobile phones...The idea of a library wasn’t in their minds.”

But gradually that changed. “Little by little now they start to understand that this is a library and I shouldn’t be doing that,” said Saleh. Now people “have the concept of a library and they come and respect the library.”

Security guards patrolling the reading rooms help visitors remember where they are, tsk-tsking those who put a cell phone to their ear.

But enforcement is only part of the reason for the public’s respectful response to the Library. As a capably run public service, whose mission is to foster knowledge for its own sake, the Library of Alexandria is an uncommon institution in the Middle East.

And this novelty is not lost on Egyptians. “When people get engaged and see it’s an Egyptian institution... they say they are so proud to see how well-maintained and efficiently run it is,” said Hala Abdelwahab, head of resource development. “We receive a lot of thank you letters.”

As medical student Abdelsalam noted, “The library is a big thing in Alexandria that doesn’t occur any other place in the world. I’m very proud to have this library in my city.”
For example, over the ten years ended September 30, 2009, the Corporation awarded 5,636 grants totaling over $1.1 billion.*

Given the Corporation’s long history of engagement with the most pressing issues of the times, we certainly do not have an identity crisis or a craving for status. But neither are we resting on our proverbial laurels. In his November 10, 1911 letter of gift to the Corporation, providing the foundation’s endowment, Andrew Carnegie wrote that, “Conditions upon the [earth] inevitably change; hence, no wise man will bind Trustees forever to certain paths, causes or institutions…” This additional gift of flexibility has proven that its value is arguably as consequential as the money Mr. Carnegie gave the Corporation as it has provided us with the impetus to constantly review, reevaluate and revitalize our work and our grantmaking strategies.

The vitality of Carnegie Corporation, embodied in Mr. Carnegie’s foresight about how the road into the future cannot always be precisely charted by those living in the present, is evident in the intertwined strands of continuity and change that are the hallmark of our work. Today, Andrew Carnegie’s lifelong concern with education lives on in our support of strengthening American democracy by funding new pathways both to educational and economic opportunity and to citizenship, civic participation and immigrant integration in a pluralistic society. His fervent desire to contribute to building a peaceful world is reflected in the focus of our international grantmaking on reducing direct threats to international peace and security while also investing in international development by supporting individuals and institutions such as universities and libraries in sub-Saharan Africa and academic centers in Eurasia, two regions of long-standing Corporation involvement.

Certainly, using what we’ve learned from the past to craft strategies for our present-day grantmaking while also looking forward is what Andrew Carnegie would have wanted. Standing still, being self-satisfied or content with accepting the status quo was never his way. Eager for knowledge, passionate about ideas—he once wrote, “You may prevent me from writing but you can’t prevent me from thinking”—and convinced that human beings could always improve themselves while also helping their fellows and in the process, bring greater light into the world, he remains an inspiration to us as our centennial draws near.

Mr. Carnegie closed his letter of gift to the Corporation with these words: “My chief happiness [is that] even after I pass away, the [wealth] that came to me to administer as a sacred trust for the good of my fellowmen is to continue to benefit humanity for generations untold.” —Andrew Carnegie

*This includes grants made possible by an anonymous donor who has worked through the Corporation since 2002 to support arts and social service organizations in New York City.
Introduction
As more African nations emerge from post-colonial turmoil, most of their leaders have agreed on the importance of strengthening their own science, technology and innovation capacity. As in other societies around the world, such capacity is rooted in the knowledge embodied in universities and their students, faculty and graduates who use and disseminate this knowledge to develop food security and innovate ways of increasing food production, as well as energy resources, public health skills, and economic growth.

For many years, the universities of Africa have struggled to maintain, let alone increase, their ability to provide quality education and training in science- and technology-related areas. Among the many challenges are the scarcity of public funding for graduate study, the shortages of incoming doctorate-level faculty, the small number of scholars in any given field, and pervasive lack of even basic laboratories and lab equipment.

For over a decade, Carnegie Corporation of New York has been involved in working to strengthen a number of African universities in selected sub-Saharan countries. However, the Corporation also believes in the capacity of individuals, given support, training and opportunity, to help bring about not only institutional change but also contribute to national development. For example, in...
2007, the Corporation joined with the Science Initiative Group based at the Institute for Advanced Study to explore these challenges. The Science Initiative Group, an international team of scientific leaders and supporters dedicated to fostering science in developing countries, proposed the creation of the Regional Initiative for Science and Education (RISE) to support capacity building through regional networks of universities.¹ The emphasis in this initiative, though focused on university collaborations, is on the end product: furthering the ability of talented men and women to advance in the science and technology fields by helping postgraduate students and faculty to gain increased access to colleagues, mentors, instrumentation and the team-level research habits on which modern scholarship is based. In addition, RISE has emphasized participation by African women who have long been underrepresented in the sciences.

A few of the people who have benefitted from the work of RISE are profiled in this article but so are two other individuals: Lillian Tibatemwa, a leading role model for women in academia and Bridget Omafuvbe, a professor of microbiology, both of whom received funding from Carnegie Corporation to attend leadership programs that strengthened their ability to network with colleagues and set their own course for their careers.

From the sampling of experiences in these pages, it is clear that even small programs, if carefully targeted, have the potential to transform both lives and careers. But even more, each individual who has the advantage of participating in science, technology and leadership training also has the potential to act as a mentor to their colleagues and to provide incentives for others to make their own contributions to science, technology, and innovation capacity in Africa—and that may be the most impactful benefit of all.

Francis Arimoro: Passing Along Knowledge and Training

Dr. Ofurum Francis Arimoro developed his interest in stream biology in his home country of Nigeria, in the rich aquatic habitat where he grew up on the Niger delta. His primary interest was in using aquatic insects as indicators of water quality, but he also enjoyed teaching the growing numbers of students interested in water issues and advising the public on issues of local concern—for example, how to use certain mites to rid waterways of invasive water hyacinths.

However, the institution where he earned his Ph.D. and spent years teaching, Delta State University in Abraka, had virtually none of the instrumentation he needed to fulfill his research dreams. He lacked even such a basic tool as a bifocal microscope, for example, indispensable for biologists who study macro-invertebrates. A simple bench microscope costs only a few hundred dollars in the U.S., but import duties and other restrictions can raise the cost to prohibitive levels for African institutions with scarce funding. Although Arimoro had published papers on aquatic insects, he could seldom identify them below the family level without a microscope, which limited both his research and teaching abilities.

Thanks to all he had accomplished despite such technical obstacles, he was invited last fall by the South Africa National Research Foundation to give a talk in Grahamstown on the biomonitoring of rivers. He spoke at the South African Aquatic Biodiversity Institute, located near Rhodes University, and as a result of the talk, an expert from Rhodes invited him to work at the university for a month. He leapt at the chance to use the lab’s modern instruments and immerse himself in insect taxonomy.

While at Rhodes, Arimoro heard about RISE, and was again able to capitalize on a lucky coincidence. He was ______

Alan H. Anderson, Research and Editorial Consultant for the Science Initiative Group (SIG) of the Institute for Advanced Study, has worked for SIG since its inception. He also works for other organizations, including the National Academy of Sciences, where he has written reports on science policy, science education, science and the law, and other topics. He has worked in science and medical journalism for over 25 years, serving as a reporter, writer, and foreign correspondent at Time magazine, Saturday Review, Psychology Today, and other publications; edited several newspapers; and written or edited five books on scientific topics. He holds a BA in English from Yale University and an MS in Journalism from Columbia University.

¹ The regional networks created by RISE are: AMSEN: African Materials Science and Engineering Network; AFNET: African Natural Products Network; SABINA: Southern African Biochemistry and Informatics for Natural Products; SSAWRN: Sub-Saharan Africa Water Resources Network; WIO-RISE: Western Indian Ocean Regional Initiative.
accepted by the Sub-Saharan Africa Water Resources Network program (SSAWRN) as a postdoc, and quickly returned to Rhodes to continue the work he had begun.

His first task was to develop a stream bioassessment protocol for Nigeria based on an existing South African scale called the SA Scoring System. This system is based on the varying resistance of certain aquatic insects to pollutants, especially those that are sensitive to any changes in their environment. For example, the presence of insects from the families Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Tricoptera (the so-called EPT group) usually indicate clean water. (Ephemeroptera, widely known in the U.S. as mayflies, are so named because their adult life usually lasts less than a day.) The presence of hardy Chironomid insects, by contrast, indicates water with some degree of pollution; the greater the proportion of Chironomids, the more polluted the environment. After shifting the South African indicator species to match those from his home region, he has renamed his new version the Nigerian Scoring System.

Thanks to the resources available to him in South Africa, his study and research accomplishments have been considerable. He learned modern experimental and field sampling techniques, trained school groups and postgraduate students, and advanced his technical writing skills. He has written four papers for peer reviewed journals, two of which have been published, with two in press. He has also written a book review on fresh water invertebrates and a chapter in a textbook. He presented a paper on his work at the University of Johannesburg, which resulted in an invitation to lecture at the University of Namibia for two weeks.

Now that Arimoro’s RISE post-doctoral year is complete, he has other goals he hopes will benefit not only his career but also his home country. He hopes to develop a taxonomic key to help students learn identification of important indicator groups. “We have a lot of scientists coming up in this area, and I want to be able to help them,” he said. He wants to continue his field work to refine the biomonitoring methods for Nigeria and eventually to develop a full water quality monitoring program that provides information on riverine water quality.

“It is very important,” he said, “to pass along the knowledge and training I received courtesy of the RISE program and urged her to apply, she had no more reason for optimism than she had had in the past. Nevertheless, she sent in the required documents and did her best to brace for another “regret.” She did learn that the program would be based at the Institute for Marine Sciences (IMS) in Zanzibar, part of the University of Dar es Salaam in neighboring Tanzania. This was promising, since the IMS research agenda closely matched her own interests in aquatic biology. So she applied for an interview and agreed to provide a description of her study objectives if accepted.

Among the available topics, she chose natural products from the

Seaweed farming has improved life in Zanzibar. A significant industry has evolved, providing many women in coastal areas with better lives.

Grace Mutia: The Seaweeds of Zanzibar

Several years ago, as a faculty member at the University of Nairobi, Grace Mutia had achieved unusual success in the realm of academic science in Kenya; among women she was even more of a rarity. She had earned a master’s in hydrobiology, aquatic resources, and management. She was eager to reach the Ph.D. level and complete her dream—to teach and do research on the path toward full professor.

Unfortunately, she stalled at the same point where so many promising African students languish—at the threshold of PhD field work where personal or family resources run dry and no public or foundation funding is available. She resigned herself to an indefinite future at the School of Biological Sciences, applying for every scholarship she could find. “I was being turned down every time,” she said. “I got only ‘regrets’.” When her professors heard about the Western Indian Ocean WIO-RISE program and urged her to apply, she had no more reason for optimism than she had had in the past. Nevertheless, she sent in the required documents and did her best to brace for another “regret.” She did learn that the program would be based at the Institute for Marine Sciences (IMS) in Zanzibar, part of the University of Dar es Salaam in neighboring Tanzania. This was promising, since the IMS research agenda closely matched her own interests in aquatic biology. So she applied for an interview and agreed to provide a description of her study objectives if accepted.

Among the available topics, she chose natural products from the
initiated by a puckish but dedicated biologist named Keto Mshigeni, who has long championed the nutritional and medical uses of seaweeds, mushrooms, and other natural products throughout Africa. Despite being born in a highland village near Mt. Kilimanjaro, Professor Mshigeni was able to understand the plight of coastal women, who for generations had used sticks to plant maize and cassava in the rocky coral soil and buckets to carry water to their plots. He helped them learn a new way to farm by tying seaweed plants to twine that is strung between sticks at low tide on the Zanzibar flats, then harvesting, drying, and baling them for sale. The two most widely grown species are *Kappaphycus alvarezii* (locally known as *cottonii*) and *Eucheuma denticulatum*, both red algae that are rich in carrageenans and in high demand worldwide as a commercial gelling, thickening and stabilizing agent for toothpaste, food products, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and many other products.

Time passed slowly for Mutia as she waited to hear from WIO-RISE. She could see that the large number of applicants listed on the web site would reduce her chances. She heard nothing for two months, then three. After four months, when she had all but given up hope, she received an e-mail from the program director: she had been chosen after all, and would have the support she needed to do her Ph.D. field work.

Soon after arriving at the IMS she could see that seaweed farming had already improved life on Zanzibar. A significant industry had evolved, visible almost daily in the port of Stone Town, where men stagger under huge bales of dry seaweed, dumping them aboard coastal freighters that informally beach themselves near the tourist hotels. She visited the women at their seaweed plots and learned that they now had some cash to spend; many owned 20 or 30 outfits of Kenyan clothing and were able to send their children to school. But she also saw many challenges. *K. cottonii* is vulnerable to monsoon currents that wash away the strings and sticks, predation by sea urchins, and die-offs when the beach is not flushed by enough water. The women’s work is hard, drying is slow in the rainy season, and die-offs can set back seaweed growth by months. The low prices

---

3 Both species, despite their classification in the phylum Rhodophyta (red plants), are highly variable in both form and color, ranging from greens to reds to browns.
received by the women are dictated by a single company that controls the market; they receive about 200 Tanzanian shillings (15 U.S. cents) per kilogram of dried, baled product.

However, Mutia quickly learned of some local customs that can be exploited to improve livelihoods. For example, local fishermen crush certain seaweeds and place them in hand-woven traps as bait for parrotfish, a common local food. But they sail all the way to Bagamoyo to collect this seaweed, a 50-mile round trip by dhow. She believes that if she can isolate and produce the fish-attracting chemical, she can improve the lot of the fishermen and reduce the heavy demand on seaweed. She also hopes to teach women to grow this seaweed for sale to the local fishermen.

“We have many opportunities,” she said. “What are the nutritional properties of the seaweed? Why do the fish choose them?” She is also studying a new floating line system developed to grow *K. cottoni* in water about 10 feet deep. Although this depth seems to prevent the die-offs, it is difficult for the women, who are not good swimmers.

“If the men can work there too,” concluded Mutia, “they could all benefit. They can help with the seaweed and also catch more fish in their basket traps without having to maintain a boat or work all night. It would push the fishermen farther out from the beach, which is good because there they won’t take so many juvenile fish. So we have many benefits to work for.”

**Irene Naigaga: A Long-Term Goal to Help Other Women**

Irene Naigaga has wanted to help others from an early age. Her family long assumed that she would seek a career in medicine; after all, her mother was a midwife and her father was director of a medical center. “In fact,” she remembers, “I hated medicine. At home a little girl with mental problems used to burn herself, and the only person she would let clean her wound was me. I didn’t like doing it.”

Instead she was strongly drawn to the activities of a veterinary field center where a neighbor worked amid numerous needy animals. As early as the second grade she would hurry through her homework so she could rush to the center to sort slides and do other chores. “One day I saw someone counting lots of money, and I thought to myself that this must be a good place to work!”

She remembers the excitement of a campaign to eradicate trypanosomiasis in cattle. She was eager to help, and one day a veterinarian showed her the squiggly shape of the organism itself under a microscope. She was hooked. “The sight of the money was nice,” she said, “but the sight of that little creature is really what set my mind. My teachers tried to talk me out of it, and told me to go into medicine instead, but I had had enough medicine around my house.”

Following her dream, Naigaga enrolled in Makerere University’s Faculty of Veterinary Medicine and graduated with the help of a government scholarship. There she found her interests to be broad. A postgraduate diploma allowed her to do research on pollution in a lake in western Uganda, where she also became interested in wildlife. Eventually, she was hired by the Department of Wildlife at Makerere, which allowed her to complete her master’s at Rhodes University in South Africa under the supervision of Professor Denis Hughes and his colleagues.

When it came time to search for a Ph.D. project, she found one that was challenging, useful, and—again—different from her previous work: the need to develop an inexpensive but accurate technique to monitor water quality in Lake Victoria and its wetlands. “Uganda had no regular water monitoring of this important lake,” Naigaga said, “because the techniques were too expensive.” She knew she could not expect to produce a highly sophisticated technique while keeping expenses low, so she turned to her veterinary background. She chose an animal high in the food chain that might be expected to accumulate pollutants over its lifespan: the Nile perch, or tilapia, the most important commercial fish in the vast lake. “I wanted to be able to identify the water quality ‘hot spots’, ” she said, “at least qualitatively. And I found I could do that with the fish. It turned out that when the water quality goes down, we can see lesions in the tilapia tissue.” This was a new technique for Uganda and an excellent match for Naigaga, because her background in veterinary medicine prepared her to recognize the histopathology of the fish.

By that point, however, she had used up her available funding and her project skidded to a halt. “I had finished sampling the fish, but I was really stuck. The technique was inexpensive, but I still needed to pay for several
thousand dollars in lab charges. I also needed tuition to finish my degree in South Africa. We don’t have a good enough library in Uganda for the work I was doing, and the collection at Rhodes would allow me to do better work.” Then she heard about RISE, applied, and was accepted into the Sub-Saharan Africa Water Resources Network (SSAWRN). “I have really, really appreciated RISE,” she said. “It was like God answering my prayers.”

What will be next? Says Naigaga, “After I get my Ph.D. I would like to do more data collection. Then I’d also like to encourage women. Women are vulnerable to pollution. They actually know the environment is polluted, but they go anyway to wash their clothes or draw water because they have no choice. I’d like to link my science of environmental health with the communities of people. I also want to be a teacher. Students need direction, and I think I can give that. Some of them are really lost; they don’t even know why they are coming to class.”

Bernard Odera: Finding Success—and Reward—in the Laboratory

For a fortunate few students, RISE has brought opportunity to advance their careers after many years of unexciting and yet exhausting duties as a junior faculty member. This was the case for Bernard Odera, who has toiled for two decades as an underpaid lecturer at the University of Nairobi, teaching in overcrowded classrooms with little time or support for research. Since earning his masters in mechanical engineering at the University of Lagos, Nigeria, in 1987, he never had the opportunity—or the funding—to complete his Ph.D. and pursue his academic dreams.

But Odera’s chance finally came last year when he heard from a colleague that a new program called the African Materials Science and Engineering Network (AMSEN) was requesting proposals. He was then collaborating with colleagues at the University of Namibia, with whom his department had joint funding for some work in materials science. He quickly pursued this opportunity, with the assistance of his advisor, Professor G. O. Rading at the University of Nairobi, and was accepted into the program.

Bernard’s special interest—design and production engineering in the field of metallurgy—turned out to be fortuitous. The founding head of the new engineering school in Namibia, Professor Frank Kavishe, was already collaborating with renowned metallurgist Professor Lesley Cornish, director of the Centre of Excellence in Strong Materials at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Her own expertise in superalloys coincided neatly with his own special interest in metallurgy, and he was admitted into her research group in Johannesburg.

Far from the overcrowded classrooms, he now finds himself immersed in a cutting-edge laboratory environment of great complexity and importance to the world of engineering. Superalloys are advanced materials used in high-stress, safety-critical environments, such as nuclear reactors, aircraft turbines, and rocket engines. Engineers have worked for half a century to design alloys that can hold their strength and resist corrosion at ever-higher temperatures—in applications where failure can be catastrophic. Working with Professor Cornish, her colleagues, and fellow RISE students, Odero will attempt to design a new formulation for platinum-aluminum-based alloys. Early two-element formulations using these metals proved too brittle, but the addition of a third element has shown promise. Bernard and his group will attempt to add fourth and fifth elements—niobium and vanadium—to improve both durability and toughness.

His placement at the University of the Witwatersrand has been ideal for him. The Centre has the advanced instrumentation his home institution lacks. A close working relationship between the Centre and Mintek, a leading South African company specializing in mineral and metallurgical products, has brought him access to the small but pure samples of platinum, aluminum, and other metals he needs for his work. While RISE covers the modest tuition of the program, the Centre has agreed to cover the surcharge for international students.

With more than half a year’s work behind him, he has won the respect of his advisors and made excellent professional progress. In July he discussed his work at the Advanced Metals Initiative Student Seminar sponsored and hosted
The youngest of five girls and three boys, she was born into a family with high standards. Her late father was the sabalangira, or head of the princes’ clan, in the traditional Ugandan kingdom of Busoga. (The largest city in Busoga is Jinja, which sits adjacent to the site where the White Nile pours out of Lake Victoria.) Her parents treated the female children just like the males, sending them to one of the most demanding high schools in the country.

In other words, for the first time in two decades, Bernard has the luxury to work as hard as he can in the field he loves.

**Lillian Tibatemwa-Ekirikubinza: A Woman with “Permission to Succeed”**

Being a woman, Professor Lillian Tibatemwa is a rarity among academic leaders in Uganda and indeed, in Africa. She not only rose through Makerere University’s academic hierarchy to become the first full professor of law in East Africa, but was more recently named first deputy vice-chancellor for academic affairs, the first woman to hold that post at Makerere.

The road to her current post was not without its bumps. When she entered the faculty of law it was assumed by her male colleagues that she would be the one to teach family law. “No one else wanted to,” she recalls during an interview in her office, “and everyone looked right at me.”

When she moved higher into university leadership she encountered a few more bumps. At her first meeting with fellow members of the university council, the men were all introduced as “Dr.,” while she was welcomed as “my sister Lillian.” At a subsequent meeting of the council, she was again singled out—this time as “Mrs. Lillian.”

“I had to say, I’m not here because of my marital status,” she notes, though she is happily married to an engineer, Paul Ekirikubinza. “But I also knew I’d have to work a little harder than anyone else.”

Her determination and dedication have paid off: though still faced with some of the opposition to women in power that has marked the rise of women in many traditional societies—both in Africa and elsewhere—Tibatemwa has arrived at the top echelon of leadership in a major university. She is also a respected researcher with interests in comparative criminal jurisprudence, gender and the law, human rights perspectives of criminal law, and juvenile justice. All three of her textbooks are available on Amazon (Criminal Law in Uganda, Offences Against the Person, and Women’s Violent Crime in Uganda), and she has published numerous articles and book chapters.

She has also emerged as a compassionate defender of the underdog. “It seems that when I was little, I had a sense of justice I wasn’t really aware of,” she explains. “My friends told me about this later. They said I used to argue a lot and take the side of anyone who was being harassed. Later I learned that a judge had the ability to defend people from being oppressed, and I suppose that is one of the reasons I went into law.”

When the time came to decide what she would study in college, her most immediate influence was a sister who had entered the study of law. Also, when Tibatemwa was ready for university in 1980, the government was giving scholarships to those majoring in legal studies. “It was assumed in those days that if you were good in the humanities, the field to study was the law,” she says. “Just as if you were brilliant and went for science, you went to medicine. It was almost automatic. So it wasn’t a difficult decision.”
After earning her bachelor’s in law at Makerere, she took a master’s in the field at Bristol University, in the United Kingdom, and then a Ph.D. at the University of Copenhagen. But unlike many of her classmates, she always knew she would return to her Ugandan roots—and responsibilities. “It never crossed my mind to stay abroad,” she offers. “I have a lot of family here. Even when my colleagues were thinking of staying in Britain, it was never one of those things for me. It was really Makerere that made me who I am, and I’ve been here all my career.”

When she returned to Makerere, she began her climb from teaching assistant to assistant lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer, and finally professor of law. During this long journey she gained an intimate view of not only academic law, but also of the rarity of women in academia. “As you go up the ladder in the law,” she says, “you see fewer women at every rung. It is true for the sciences, too; even at the teaching assistant stage, the numbers are dismally low.”

As she gained expertise and seniority, she had the option of becoming a judge, which would have allowed her numerous opportunities to bring justice to the oppressed. But the university faculty made it clear that her talents were desired at Makerere, and, for her part, she knew that she loved the academic disciplines of “reading, being analytical, and doing research.” As she applied these disciplines, her interests drew her again and again toward a cluster of overlapping interests: gender and crime, gender and the law, human rights perspectives of criminal law, children’s and women’s rights. She began to use her academic position to encourage younger women to pursue advanced degrees and to combine significant research with their classroom studies.

Two areas in which she champions research today are the codes and rituals that slow the progress of women in their careers and, more specifically, the informal hierarchies and norms of academic institutions that thwart the upward movement of women. She notes, for example, that as of September 2009, only 4.4 percent of academics at Makerere holding the ranks of associate professor and professor were women. To address this imbalance, she has taken a growing interest in mentoring younger women through both the Mentoring of Women Initiative and the Makerere University Women and Leadership Forum.

“The value of mentoring,” she explains, “is that it can increase the participation of socially marginalized groups in leadership positions. It helps a less experienced person climb the ladder and reach her full potential.” She notes, however, that traditional models of mentoring are based on male relationships: in Greek mythology, Odysseus left his wise friend Mentor to look after his son Telemachus when he left home for the Trojan war. Mentoring of females, she argues, needs its own model that is based on the perspectives and experiences of women. She also sees the need for an “Africanization” of mentoring: Is the modern concept of mentoring alien to African culture, or part of it? Is it a universal or culture-specific activity?

“We must answer all such questions,” she says, “if we are to use mentoring as a mechanism for ensuring women’s visibility in high echelons of the universities.” Several years ago she received a leadership grant from Carnegie Corporation of New York that allowed her to attend the Leadership Foundation of the International Women’s Forum, a competitive non-residential fellowship program for women from all sectors. “The wonderful thing about this Forum is that it brings together women who have made careers in many different fields,” she said. “You learn that you are not alone at the top, and it allows you to share experiences of mentoring and leadership with your peers from the business world, academia and other fields; from the U.S. and Asia and Africa. We had so many issues in common, and could discuss freely how gender issues affect our lives.”

She believes that increased participation of women is central to whether Makerere continues to lead in academic excellence. She points out, for example, that the university is not benefiting from female talent in many fields, especially science. As of fall 2009, for instance, only one faculty member at the level of professor was female.

“Every woman who has made it,” she recently told The Observer of Uganda, “needs to mentor younger girls. The young should look at you

---

The Mentoring of Women Initiative and the Makerere University Women and Leadership Forum aim to help academic women overcome barriers and advance their careers.
and want to become like you.” She notes again the expectations set by her own parents, including their “permission” for her daughter to succeed. “At a personal level,” she says, “I thank my father and mother for having valued me as a girl child. It is because of this that I grew up confident, with self-worth and self-love.”

Bridget Omafuvbe: Achieving Much While Hoping to Inspire Others

Editor’s Note: This profile was written by Susan King, Carnegie Corporation of New York Vice President, External Affairs; Director, Journalism Initiative, Special Initiatives and Strategy

What gives a young girl growing up in a village in Nigeria a sense that she wants to be a scientist? A chance encounter with the world of medicine perhaps, but clearly it’s more: a personal drive to find a place that most African girls couldn’t even imagine and a university plan to invest in women in a way unknown in the past.

Bridget Omafuvbe seems headed for the top of any academic pyramid. She was just promoted to associate professor of microbiology at Obafemi Awolowo University in Nigeria in a year that sees her traveling the world as part of a competitive leadership program established by the International Women’s Forum (IWF) Leadership Foundation of Washington, DC. Bridget was chosen as a member of the Class of 2009-2010 for this year-long program of intensive study in London and at the Harvard Business School that includes mentoring and international seminars. She was chosen because of her academic achievements and her personal potential as a university leader. Along with a few dozen other women professionals from around the world, Bridget embarks on a program that has transformed many women’s careers.

Her rise to the top sounds easy, but education was not a given when she was growing up in rural Nigeria, a college education was a distant dream, and she the first in her family—male or female—to attain an education, let alone earn a Ph.D.

Becoming a scientist was an idea that took hold when she was ten, in primary school, and her aunt took her to a hospital. She was amazed at how smart the doctors and nurses were and found herself attracted to this institution dedicated to helping care for sick people. She was a gifted student and won high grades. So the aunt, who filled the void left when Bridget’s mother died and her father remarried, insisted a girl with such good grades couldn’t waste them and simply get a job like most girls in their Nigerian community. Bridget notes that her aunt told her, “Your marks are too good,” and insisted that her niece change her plans to study rather than work. “I’m more moored to Africa than the United Kingdom, because I know in Nigeria I can inspire young women to pursue careers like I have. If everybody leaves who will be left to teach the next generation?” —Bridget Omafuvbe

“...” —Bridget Omafuvbe

Bridget’s academic work continued with stellar grades. Early in her research career she won a Commonwealth Fellowship Award that offered her the chance to study in England for six months. The state-of-art equipment and labs she encountered in England opened up opportunities for Bridget’s research, but they never became a temptation to remain outside her country. “I’m more grateful,” says Bridget, With that challenge from her father’s sister, Bridget focused on finding a way to get a university education. But of the 65 students in her secondary school, only three would find their way to the next step and acceptance at a university.

It was a professor in the only university she has attended (Bridget is a product of Obafemi Awolowo University where she earned all three degrees and where she has seen continuous promotions) that kindled her interest in microbiology. “I liked this professor’s style and she made the course so interesting,” Bridget explains. It was also a science with real implications for day-to-day life in Nigeria, where scientific advances relating to food, nutrition and agriculture can stem poverty and offer citizens a better quality of life.

Bridget notes that her aunt told her, “Your marks are too good,” and insisted that
But her personal strategic plan also calls for focusing on the number of researchers, especially women, who are attracted to the field of microbiology and food development. “Women are the ones who are doing most of the farming in local areas,” she explains, and more female researchers and better discoveries around agriculture, seeds and production will directly affect women’s lives in towns and villages like the one where Bridget began her dreams.

Vartan Gregorian, president of Carnegie Corporation, whose own vision was to deepen scholarship in Africa and to offer women financial support to enter universities in order to increase the number of women students, has a saying: “You educate a man and you educate a gypsy. He will often leave. If you educate a woman, you educate a nation.” Bridget Omafuvbe is a young woman already proving Gregorian’s point.

But, she also has a longer reach. Along with investing in her university and her community, Bridget has become a key member of the IWF’s Leadership Class meeting in Harvard this spring. Overcoming obstacles are part of any leader’s story. But abandoned by her father after her mother’s death, without financial backing and armed only with her smarts and dedication to studies, Bridget has been the 2010 class’s most inspiring student according to all accounts. She has been able to share her vision of success with the global class and describe the personal loss and pain she has endured during this journey as an African woman.

Bridget Omafuvbe is a scholar and university leader on her way up. But for her, success won’t be measured in degrees, promotions and research grants alone. It will be measured in how many other young students—particularly women—she can inspire to follow her into educating a nation.

Obafemi Awolowo was one of the Nigerian universities involved in Carnegie Corporation’s ten-year focus on systematic and institutional change in higher education. Creating a long-term strategic plan that would grow the university and better serve its students was a key ingredient in becoming one of the Carnegie Corporation-supported African universities. Bridget sees her promotion and her chance to spend a year enhancing her leadership skills as a Leadership Fellow as a direct way to build on this Carnegie Corporation strategy. “They will help me with my plan to reach a higher position in the university so that I can be where decisions will be taken. I want to offer my perspective on strategies for the university and its future.”

Part of her personal strategic plan is to grow professionally in order to reach higher levels of respect in the area of microbiology within the university. She wants to deepen her research, which has won peer review respect because of her findings in food and industrial microbiology. Already her study on the fermentation of oil-seeds has revealed that the nutritional and sensory value of soybean and African locust beans does not differ significantly. These studies may lead to reduced production time and guarantee consistent and improved flavor of these critical foodstuffs.
By Karen Theroux

100 YEARS
Carnegie Commissions put the best minds to work on the toughest problems of their times

"No man will make a great leader who wants to do it all himself or get all the credit for doing it," Andrew Carnegie famously said, providing an apt quote for a century of leadership seminars. When he established Carnegie Corporation in 1911, the self-made millionaire might not have known what it would take to reach his ambitious goals, but he realized his mission could not be accomplished alone. Endowing the Corporation with $135 million—the largest philanthropic trust of its day—Carnegie assumed its presidency and appointed a group of close associates to help carry out the foundation’s mandate, which, until his death in 1919, meant giving grants mainly to causes dear to the founder’s heart.

By 1923, when Frederick Keppel was appointed Corporation president, grantmaking had become more ambitious and complex. Keppel developed a philosophy for how the Corporation should work, one that signaled an evolution in approach, moving away from staff specialization toward “a correspondingly greater reliance upon outside advice.” Consequently, as his plans took shape for a study in South Africa, Keppel formed the first Carnegie Commission—a strategy that came to characterize the foundation in the years ahead.

Current president Vartan Gregorian notes that he “knew of Carnegie Commissions long before coming to the Corporation. They existed to deal with major societal issues that required deliberation by experts in order to..."
South African communities. In 1927, Frederick Keppel, the fourth president after Carnegie, and James Bertram, Corporation secretary, traveled to South Africa to explore possibilities for future grantwork there—returning with recommendations for $5 million (about $60 million today) in projects. On the journey they were shocked by the impoverished condition of many Afrikaners. These descendents of the country’s original Dutch and Huguenot settlers, many of whom had moved into the interior of the country when the British took over in the early nineteenth century, had fallen further into poverty with each succeeding generation. On returning to New York, Keppel received a plea from South Africa’s Dutch Reformed church, backed by government officials and other civic leaders, for the Corporation to underwrite a study of the plight of these Afrikaners. Keppel agreed and established the Carnegie Commission of Inquiry into the Poor White Question in South Africa.

The Poor White Commission (as it came to be called) comprised South African academics, members of the clergy and political and welfare activists, and was led by two well-known American sociologists. For several years they gathered statistics and personal stories from all over the country, publishing a five-volume report in 1932 that spelled out the dire conditions of the nearly 300,000 Afrikaners. The Commission recommended widespread changes, many of which were made by the South African government. Meanwhile a movement arose that aimed to solidify Afrikaner economic and political dominance—ultimately contributing to the institution of apartheid in 1948. Although Carnegie Corporation leaders deplored the terrible living conditions of black South Africans, these problems were not dealt with by the Commission, which unintentionally provided the rationale for helping poor whites at the expense of blacks. This unforeseen outcome haunted the Corporation for decades.

Teaching with TV

Given the impact of the Great Depression and World War II, along with the troubling South African experience, it took until the 1960s for a Corporation president to set up another commission. John Gardner joined Carnegie Corporation soon after World War II, becoming its ninth president in 1955. A psychologist, Gardner’s enduring passion was education, which he saw as reaching far beyond formal learning in schools and universities. One promising development in the field was educational television (ETV), which in the 1960s had great potential for reaching broad audiences but skyrocketing costs. At a joint meeting of the Educational Broadcasters and the U.S. Office of Education in 1965, Ralph Lowell, head of WGBH, proposed a commission to study how the field’s financial needs could be met, “to make the most effective contribution to our society.” Lowell contacted Gardner, who had been appointed Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under___

Karen Theroux is an editor/writer in the Corporation’s public affairs department with many years’ experience in educational publishing.
Lyndon Johnson, and was just about to leave the Corporation.

Gardner agreed that Carnegie Corporation would create and fund the commission, which would undertake a comprehensive appraisal of educational TV including technical, organizational and programming considerations along with long-term financing. He assembled a group of educators, artists, scientists, industrialists and media specialists, including James B. Conant, past president of Harvard University, author Ralph Ellison and classical musician Rudolf Serkin, appointing James R. Killian, Jr., president of MIT, as chairman. Once Gardner left for Washington, acting Corporation president Alan Pifer took over the project.

Two days before the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television was to be announced to the press, a letter of endorsement came from President Johnson, stating in part, “From our beginning as a Nation, we have recognized that our security depends on the enlightenment of our people; that our freedom depends on the communication of many ideas through many channels. I believe that educational television has an important future in the United States and throughout the world.” —Lyndon B. Johnson

The Commission worked for two years to come up with a dozen recommendations for improving ETV. As the work was coming to its conclusion, Pifer, now officially Corporation president, became concerned about its long-term impact and held press conferences and meetings with legislators and officials to build public will. In 1967, the final report, Public Television: A Program for Action, was published in paperback and widely disseminated, while The New York Times also printed the Commission’s findings in detail. Briefly, the report concluded that a well-financed and led system, substantially larger and more effective than as yet existed, was needed to serve the American public. Most important, the Commission called on Congress to authorize the Corporation for Public Television to manage the sector’s funding. Many key recommendations were enacted in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, which was signed into law by President Johnson. However, protected funding and several other seminal ideas were lost along the way.

Elevating Higher Ed

American higher education in the 1960s experienced change like never before. Institutions went from serving the elite to welcoming the masses, as enrollments multiplied due to the postwar baby boom. There was political activism on campus and demand for curriculum reform. Across the country the pressure was on for colleges and universities to transform, expand programs, promote innovation and become instruments for social change. With the field confronted by so many daunting challenges, Alan Pifer decided to sponsor a large-scale study of the structure, function and financing of American higher education conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Pifer, like other past Corporation presidents, also headed the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT), established by Andrew Carnegie in 1905 to provide free pensions for college teachers and their widows. The Foundation had subsequently supported education policy research—most notably the 1910 Flexner study leading to the restructuring and standardization of medical education in the United States. But by 1966 it was out of money and lacked both program and staff. Pifer, believing there was still an important role for the organization to play, put the Foundation in charge of managing the Commission on Higher Education, with total financial support coming from Carnegie Corporation.

Clark Kerr, then president of the University of California, agreed to be part-time unpaid chair. Early the next year pressure from newly elected governor Ronald Reagan and conservative members of the University of California Board of Regents led to Kerr’s dismissal as university president. “I leave the university as I entered it, fired with enthusiasm,” he commented, assuming the Commission leadership full time, and serving for over ten years.

Nineteen experts made up the Higher Education Commission—mainly college and university presi-
What Children Need

Carnegie Corporation has traditionally had a deep concern for children’s welfare. President John Gardner, who believed scientific research into learning could be used to improve education methods, focused the Corporation’s work on preschool education led by program officer Barbara Finberg at Gardner’s request. An authority on international relations, Finberg didn’t jump at the assignment. “But he told me I could learn,” she wrote in an article for American Psychologist.1 Finberg “became captivated by research on child development and its possibilities for application, especially to the education of children who were born to parents in poverty or who were socially disadvantaged.”

Alan Pifer had been researching the changing status of children in the United States and foresaw the national debate on how to meet children’s needs intensifying in the near future. In 1972 he responded by launching the Carnegie Council on Children to examine growing up in America. Council Chairman Kenneth Keniston, a professor of psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine, as well as the members, were intentionally not specialists in early childhood, and were chosen because they would be more likely to come to the project fresh, without preconceived ideas.

The Council’s eleven members and seven associates were diverse in race, gender, age and geography and they represented the fields of law, medicine, anthropology, history, economics and social work. Lawyer and Children’s Defense Fund founder Marian Wright Edelman served on the Council and Hillary Rodham was an associate – which is mentioned in her book, It Takes a Village. The Council’s six-plus years of exploration was summed up in the book, All Our Children: the American Family Under Pressure (the most prominent of five books it produced) which got front-page coverage in The New York Times and was discussed from the Today show to the White House. Children have rights, the book insisted, and these rights are best secured by families. The council called for family empowerment, asserting that, “the development of a vital, resourceful, caring, moral generation of Americans must become the nation’s highest priority.”

1 Support for Science from a Foundation Perspective; Barbara D. Finberg; American Psychologist; January 1990.
direct financial aid to students (as the GI Bill had successfully provided) rather than the grants to institutions that were sought by university and college presidents. Insisting that block funding was bound to turn political, Kerr wanted to empower students to choose the institution that met their needs and pay their own way. This recommendation won the day, leading to programs that eventually became Pell Grants and Perkins Loans.

“The effect on higher education was tremendous,” says Ellen Lagemann, education historian and author of The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy and Public Policy. “There had been great turbulence in higher education and no one really knew what to do. People were asking, ‘What’s a college education really worth?’ The Commission was a stabilizing voice of authority providing guidance to higher educational institutions,” according to Lagemann. “Pell grants came straight out of their work—a switch in the way aid is given that reflects understanding of the ‘student as consumer’ and recognition that institutions had to be more responsive to the market.”

**Public TV’s Turn for the Worse**

The Carnegie Commission on Educational Television set a high bar for public broadcasting: to be the essence of creativity and freedom, and well funded besides. But by the time the Commission’s analysis was a decade old, and despite public radio and TV having become well-established forces in American life with audiences in the millions, it was obvious to the public that their broadcasting system was still plagued by its age-old problems, mostly financial, and other new ones as well.

When the Public Television Act was passed in 1967, Congress and the President put together an official framework to support its operations and programs, and unwittingly created a political football—a competition between a highly visible creative and journalistic enterprise on one side and the government on the other. Public broadcasting was a truly radical idea: an instrument of mass communication that would respect the artistry of individuals, the needs of the public and the political funders. But the invention did not work, or at least not very well. So, in 1977 several influential citizens, including the chairman of the earlier Commission, urged Alan Pifer to take action. He agreed, and brought together 20 media experts headed by Columbia University president William McGill to form the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Public Broadcasting. They spent the next 18 months trying to figure out how to set things right.

This time around the Commission’s recommendations—replacing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting with a new Public Telecommunications Trust; an endowment to support creative projects; increased funding, especially for programming; expanded service, particularly public radio; improved quality of educational programs and greater public accountability—seem to have borne little fruit. The
independence from colonial rule, South Africa’s apartheid laws kept blacks—the majority of the country’s population—living separate and unequal, impoverished lives. Alan Pifer had worked on the Corporation’s various programs in other African countries for over 20 years and he felt strongly that reinstituting Corporation involvement in South Africa would help in the fight to eliminate racism and achieve justice there. He went to South Africa in 1973 and met with black leaders to formulate a plan for how they and the Corporation could work together for peaceful change, which they did over a period of years, while challenging apartheid in the country’s courts.

In 1982 Pifer established the Second Carnegie Inquiry into Poverty and Development in Southern Africa to essentially close the books on the first study and shine a light on life under apartheid. He had seen for himself that, fifty years after the first study, black South Africans were still subjected to far worse conditions than the Afrikaners had suffered. The Second Inquiry, a broader, less conventional undertaking than the first, covered the effects of poverty on all groups within the southern African region including Botswana, Lesotho and Namibia. It involved nearly 300 academics and activists of all backgrounds and ethnicities and established a model for multiracial cooperation that influenced many future international commissions at the Corporation and elsewhere.

Although Pifer had formed the Commission, David Hamburg assumed the presidency of the Corporation during the project’s early stages, and at first he was doubtful about continuing. “As a result of the Poor White Study, the beneficiaries became oppressors. When I inherited the commission, it was just beginning; there was the inclination, but also uncertainty,” he explains. When the decision was made to proceed, the second survey put the “center of gravity” in the black community and involved a number of outstanding black leaders, including Desmond...
At first it wasn’t easy for the Corporation to get permission for the project from the white government or buy-in from the black activists, Vartan Gregorian points out. “But having dealt earlier with the whites established us as objective, and the next time, we applied the process to studying blacks. We were seen as unbiased, which was important.”

“The second inquiry was published at a critical turning point in the region,” Avery Russell adds. It was certainly influential at the time. Desmond Tutu, Mandela and other liberals backed Carnegie Corporation because they knew it was the same group with the first Carnegie study behind it, and so could not be accused of taking sides.”

The final report, “Uprooting Poverty: The South African Challenge,” used personal testimony to recount the devastating effects of conquest, slavery and political repression as well as day-to-day struggles. Its impact was felt throughout the country and internationally, and many of the people involved went on to become leaders in the post-apartheid government, which had embraced the fight against poverty as a critical part of its agenda.

Adolescents at Risk

President Hamburg, a psychiatrist, had a professional interest in adolescence as a critical period of biological and psychological change with enduring significance, a time when high-risk behaviors are commonplace. He created the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development in 1986 to place the compelling challenges of these years higher on the nation’s agenda. The 27 members of the Council, which Hamburg himself chaired, included experts in adolescent health and development as well as education specialists, governors, members of Congress and leaders in law, religion, media, industry and youth services.

The Council focused its attention on the challenges of early adolescence, ages ten to fourteen. This stage, which Hamburg believed had been neglected in terms of scientific inquiry, policy formation and public understanding, had recently become the subject of a growing body of research. A consensus was emerging that the problems of early adolescence could not be viewed in isolation, but were part of a child’s continuing experience. In addition to synthesizing existing research, the Council commissioned papers and interviewed experts in relevant fields to fill the public knowledge gap about this vulnerable age group.

To succeed in adulthood, the Council concluded, all adolescents, no matter how diverse, share the need to earn respect, forge close and enduring...
relationships and develop a sense of personal worth – all the while learning to get along in our increasingly diverse society: no simple agenda. To disseminate its findings, between 1989 and 1995 the Council produced three major reports: Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century; A Matter of Time: Risk and Opportunity in the Nonschool Hours; Great Transitions: Preparing Adolescents for a New Century (the concluding report), which are still regarded as valuable references in the field.

“Adolescence is a stage in life about which the U.S. professional community had been obsessing for over 100 years,” Avery Russell observes. “Various theories were at work, and the Council drew together the best thinking and theory and progressive research; their work helped to crystallize the knowledge of the day. My sense is that Carnegie Corporation statements on early adolescence definitely affected the thinking out in the field.”

Zero to Ten

“If there is anything more fundamental than a decent start in life, I wonder what it could be,” Hamburg wrote. Recognizing that pressures throughout society were making it increasingly difficult for families to nurture their youngest members, he launched the Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children in 1991. Its mission was to provide a framework of scientific knowledge and an action agenda to ensure the healthy development of children from the prenatal period to age three—which he saw as the most persistently neglected stage of children’s lives.

The members of the multidisciplinary task force, again chaired by Hamburg, considered the many ways American children were at risk – weighing the potential impact of this “quiet crisis of families with children under three” on our future as a nation. Their two years of work ended with a comprehensive set of recommendations for action in four key areas: responsible parenthood; quality child care choices; good health and protection; and community support for young children and their families. The task force’s findings about the importance of ages zero to three were spelled out in detail in their 1994 report, Starting Points: Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children, which received greater than expected coverage in the country’s news media.

In 1994, having considered the first three years of life and early adolescence, the Corporation ultimately turned its attention to the developmental and learning needs of children’s middle years. The Carnegie Task Force on Learning in the Primary Grades comprised 23 leaders from various sectors of American society. For two years they trained their sites on this age group’s “trajectory of underachievement,” focusing on the family and on community-based organizations, early care and education programs, elementary schools and the media – the core institutional influences that would lay the foundation for children’s success and development.

The Task Force’s report, Years of Promise: A Comprehensive Learning Strategy for America’s Children, was published in 1996, and represented the culmination of the Corporation’s special initiatives in the field of children and youth. Its recommendations include better parental education and support for families in their role as children’s first teachers, as well as greatly expanded child care and early learning opportunities to boost the chances of success in school. The report states in no uncertain terms that a child’s fundamental sense of worth as a person depends substantially on the ability to achieve in school, and that self-defeating attitudes can lead to diminished prospects over the entire life span. It also insists that all children can learn to levels that surpass expectation. The report was generally well received throughout the education community, as expressed in an editorial in Science Magazine: “Unless our educational system is substantially improved, the U.S. economy and national security will deteriorate. The education of all children from their early years through adolescence should have a long-term high priority.”

David Hamburg came to the foundation with a deep interest in the prevention of damage to children and in the promotion of their healthy development, and his interest led to groundbreaking research with broad
and lasting impact. According to Barbara Finberg, Hamburg’s experience reshaped the foundation’s style of operation: “In his previous positions, he learned how useful it can be to bring together groups of persons from different disciplines, each excellent in his or her own field, to focus their knowledge on solving a problem. He learned that there are effective ways to make the link between policymakers and experts, and the linkage of scientists and policymakers is now an integral part of each of the Corporation’s programs.” Nowhere was this approach more in evidence than in its ambitious work in science and technology.

**Strengthening Science Policy**

In 1988, Hamburg organized the Carnegie Commission on Science, Technology and Government to explore what he and other Corporation leaders considered critical terrain. The project’s initial grant set out to assess (and ultimately improve) the mechanisms used by the federal government and the states to incorporate scientific and technological knowledge into policy and administrative decision making. From this seemingly straightforward set of goals sprang over 20 reports aimed at major institutions of government and areas of public policy. “There were a lot of publications, mostly by people on the commission, because the members simply knew so much,” Hamburg says. “And the work had interesting consequences—right up to the White House.”

Half the 22-member Commission was made up of prominent scientists, and the other half educators, journalists, attorneys and political and business leaders. The co-chairs were Joshua Lederberg, president of Rockefeller University, and William T. Golden, president of the New York Academy of Sciences. For over five years, the group maintained its high level of activity, completing a series of studies that evaluated an extraordinary range of sweeping issues from “Science & Technology and the President” to “Enabling the Future: Linking Science and Technology to Societal Goals.”

When George H.W. Bush and Michael Dukakis were running for president, the Commission made presentations to both candidates, expressing his hopes that President Woodrow Wilson would find a way to prevent the impending war. “It mocks our claim to civilization and brands us as beings still in the barbaric stage.”

The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict aimed to address the threat to world peace posed by intergroup conflict, and to advance new ideas for averting mass violence and achieving just and humane solutions to fundamental problems. Spurred by the growing strife in Yugoslavia, the commission studied violence from political, economic, military, social and psychological perspectives, and looked for ways to deal with emerging crises as well as long-term structural issues.

**The Quest for Peace**

The last Commission on David Hamburg’s watch was arguably the most far reaching and the most closely linked to his personal mission of “avoiding rotten outcomes.” The endeavor was also rooted in the spirit of founder Andrew Carnegie’s quest for peace in the early part of the twentieth century. “The killing of one man by another is assuredly the greatest curse of our time,” Carnegie wrote in 1913,
Sixteen international leaders and scholars in the field were on the Commission, which was co-chaired by David Hamburg and former Carter administration secretary of state Cyrus Vance. In addition, a 42-member advisory committee contributed their efforts to the more than 30 publications, including the comprehensive final report, which was disseminated to the highest level of governments and international organizations. In the simplest terms, the Commission maintained that deadly conflict is not inevitable, that the need to prevent it is increasingly urgent, and that prevention is possible. Effective preventive action calls for international commitment, investment, arms control, legal standards and consensus among governments, the report stated; the difficulty is not lack of knowledge, but lack of will.

“The final report had an impact on the United Nations, particularly Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghali,” David Hamburg says. “And Kofi Anan’s final report to the UN years later cited it as being very influential. The report brought the UN back to its charter, to the goal of prevention.” (To read more of David Hamburg’s thoughts on commissions, go to www.Carnegie.org and click on Centennial Moments.)

Opportunity Equation

Vartan Gregorian became Carnegie Corporation’s 12th president in 1997 and waited ten years to establish a commission. The cause was advancing math and science education in the United States and, characteristically, Gregorian sought a partner for the project. As he explains, “Many fine commissions were started by us, but they are not exclusive to us. We are known for the quality of our commissions, and a number of them have had a major impact. But we should not do this alone. Other foundations should run commissions based on their specialty, such as economics or physics. For this reason I was reluctant to go too fast.”

In 2007, Carnegie Corporation teamed up with the Institute for Advanced Studies (IAS) to form the Commission on Math and Science Education—the first such endeavor in the Princeton-based organization’s 75-year history. “America risks jeopardizing its prosperity, security and indeed its very way of life if we do not improve the math and science literacy of our students,” Gregorian warned. “As our global economy becomes ever more reliant on a workforce with technological know-how, we must be steadfast in our commitment to provide the kind and quality of science, math and technology education that our students need, and our nation demands.”

The commissioners included representatives from government, academia, industry, cultural organizations and education; Phillip Griffiths, former director and professor of mathematics of IAS, and Michele Cahill, vice president, National Programs and program director, Urban Education, Carnegie Corporation of New York, served as co-chairs. The situation was urgent, Cahill stressed, and “excellent mathematics and science learning for all American students will be possible only if we place math and science more squarely at the center of the educational enterprise.”

In June 2009 the Commission kicked off a national mobilization coinciding with the release of its report, The Opportunity Equation: Transforming Mathematics and Science Education for Citizenship and the Global Economy. The report recommended concrete actions for organizations from labor and business to colleges, universities and nonprofits as well as federal and state government, who must coalesce to “do school differently.” The Opportunity Equation has received the solid backing of the educational and policy communities, with substantial commitment of funds for innovation from the Obama administration, private industry and numerous foundations.

The Big Picture

Tracing the history of Carnegie Corporation’s many commissions reveals both their potential and their pitfalls, and tells us something about the culture of the foundation itself. Barbara Finberg, who as a 38-year veteran of the Corporation knew its ways as well as anyone, wrote that, “to understand a foundation’s perspective, it is necessary to know at least a minimal amount about that institution as a system.” For better or worse, she believed “the knowledge, experiences, skills, interests, beliefs, visions, and values of the people who manage the foundation shape and give meaning to its grant making. Above all the chief executive is the major influence on the selection of the foundation’s areas of activity and the kinds and amounts of support it will provide.” This was certainly the case for commissions, where the Corporation’s presidents have called the shots and borne the consequences.

Through the years, the commissioners and those who appointed them aspired to act in the best interests of society—albeit with mixed results. “For any foundation to establish an important commission, with national significance, a leader should think carefully about the immediate effect,” Avery Russell concludes. “Realistically, a commission cannot influence the creation of the wave, but it can influence the direction of the wave. These undertakings are incredibly expensive, and they draw off resources. There have been many debates over whether it is worth it,” she says. “You need a very long timeline to see what the outcome really has been.”

Spring 2010 — Carnegie Reporter
After Dick Clark lost his Senate campaign for reelection in 1978, he could have earned a huge income by hobnobbing with his former colleagues as a Washington lobbyist. But former university professor Clark is perhaps more of an academic than a politician at heart, which led him to establish an innovative program that, over more than two decades, has arguably not only enriched and expanded the knowledge of congressional policymakers about critical issues affecting the nation but also encouraged bipartisanship—a value that certainly seems to need some shoring up these days.

The former Iowa Democrat was almost an accidental senator. He won the seat after his employer, Rep. John Culver, made a late decision not to run for the Senate. Clark had left his university professorship to serve as Culver’s top aide. “I’d been in the academic world and never intended to leave, and then for some reason ran for the Senate and got elected. I never ran for any other office,” Clark explains.

Following his defeat after a single term, “I had several chances to be a lobbyist like any other member of the Senate.” But for Dick Clark, “it just didn’t fit. I just didn’t want to do it,” he recalls. After a brief stop at the State Department, where he was appointed by then-President Jimmy Carter as ambassador-at-large for refugee issues,
Clark wound up at the Aspen Institute, a well-respected Washington, D.C. think tank. His mandate was to establish a congressional program.

“I thought, well I’ve been a scholar most of my life,” Clark observes. “I had taught Russian studies. I thought about what I might do.” Having served as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Dick Clark was “dumbfounded” by the lack of Russia expertise there. “I was struck by that fact there were really no staff members on that committee or senators who knew very much about Russia and the Soviet Union in spite of the fact that this was the height of the Cold War.”

As Clark was pondering how to resolve the lack of knowledge about Russia in Congress, Carnegie Corporation’s then-president David Hamburg was thinking along the same lines. Hamburg’s particular interest, Clark recalls, was providing schol-
ars with an outlet to policymakers. After Carnegie Corporation provided an initial grant to launch the program, “I didn’t know long I would do this,” recalls Clark. “I didn’t think of it as a short period or a long period.”

It was a marriage of scholarship and policy that has passed its silver anniversary. As Carnegie Corporation of New York approaches its centennial year, former Senator Dick Clark has been funded by the Corporation for more than a quarter of the way. Last year brought the 25 year-mark for Aspen’s Russia congressional program. His congressional program on education has been going strong for more than 15 years. Both programs are funded by Carnegie Corporation. Over the years, Clark has also used the initial base to start programs in several other subject areas.

The Aspen congressional programs that Clark created are celebrated by members of Congress for their in-depth content, erudite discussions and model organization. “Dick Clark has not only made a difference, but he’s really formed a program that is truly remarkable,” declares longtime senator Richard Lugar (R-Indiana). Richard “Dick” Lugar credits the Aspen conferences with helping him formulate the concept and congressional passage of the bipartisan Nunn-Lugar Act nearly twenty years ago to safeguard nuclear weapons materials in the former Soviet Union. On the education side, the Aspen program is linked to the landmark No Child Left Behind legislation.

“Dick, through the environment he creates at the Aspen meetings, and the trust he inspires that helps motivate key players to attend, has helped engender some very useful, lasting initiatives,” says George Perkovich, Vice President for Studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington. Those key players are a lure for scholars and experts like Perkovich who want to have an impact on legislation and U.S. policy. While congressional debates and hearings can spin into theatrics, “this is like a graduate seminar where everyone is actually interested in listening, learning, asking questions rather than reading talking points and scoring points,” notes Perkovich. “It is a unique chance to take the world seriously with congressional decision-makers.”

Dick Clark’s moderating skills are noted by all of those who attend the meetings. The former senator is both “a convenor and a traffic cop” of the Aspen programs, says Perkovich. “Dick will enforce the rules and protect the integrity and high level of the discourse. He does this without raising his voice, in a matter-of-fact Midwestern manner. So he brings out the best in everyone.” The seminars are so popular that they are often oversubscribed: in advance of one conference, Clark wound up with too many legislators who wanted to attend, which is often the case. “We have 21 members of Congress signed up. We budgeted for 17,” he notes. “I’m hopeful that we lose three or four.”

Aspen’s breakfasts in the Capitol building regularly draw members of Congress eager to soak up information from scholars and experts in a precise one-hour format starting at 8 a.m. More than one-third of the current membership in Congress has attended one of Clark’s Aspen programs or breakfasts. And in an era in which Aspen’s paid congressional travel is routinely scrutinized, including by Carnegie Corporation grantee The Center for Public Integrity, top members of Congress shrug off any criticism of taking a costly overseas trip with the Aspen program. They point to Clark’s substantive policy education format that includes working meals.

What separates Clark’s programs from others attempting to reach members of Congress is the lack of an ulterior motive. “He’s not lobbying,” explains Rep. Mel Watt (D-N.C.), who has been attending Clark’s programs and breakfasts for more than 15 years. “The good thing about Dick Clark...is he is not trying to work toward some legislative objective. He’s just trying to prepare us to do our jobs better.”

A Scholarly Senator Figures Out His Next Move

In the Senate, Clark was known for using his academic inclination to
research policy issues. “When he was in Congress, he was seen as a very thoughtful member who tried to put together scholarship and policymaking,” notes former Maryland Democrat Paul Sarbanes, who served with Clark in the Senate.

“He was interested in issues,” recalls Carol Lancaster, who served as a congressional fellow in Clark’s Senate office. “There are politicians who come to decisions on issues because it’s politically expedient. There are politicians who ask first ‘What’s the substantive argument?’ Dick Clark was the latter.”

Senator Lugar points to former colleague Clark’s academic background. “He had been a professor at Upper Iowa University and he had a scholarly manner. He was not overbearing in that respect but still had a very well-organized presentation, his side well supported by evidence he would produce,” Lugar remembers. “I heard him during the debates on African subjects when he was on the floor frequently and he spoke very eloquently. He really brought the attention of members to Africa in a number of ways.”

Clark served on the foreign affairs committee, as a junior senator chairing the subcommittee on Africa. The Iowa Democrat was known for his Clark Amendment on barring U.S. assistance for anti-government forces in Angola. Passage of the measure was seen as a limitation of presidential power in the post-Watergate reform era of the 1970s. *Time* magazine later described it “as a post-Viet Nam measure that prevents the president from sending military aid to Angola.”

In 1978, with polls showing he was 24 points ahead at one point, Clark remembers, he was stunned when he was defeated on Election Day. In addition to several hot-button issues, Clark’s interest in Angola and the rest of Africa was used by his opponent to portray him as out of touch with Iowa. He was derided by his opponent (and successor) as “The Senator from Africa,” an insult that didn’t help with voters.

Dick Clark left the Senate “discouraged that kind of approach would seem to work.” He had seen such a populist effort also claim former chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in their bids for re-election.

“What separates Clark’s programs from others attempting to reach members of Congress is the lack of an ulterior motive. “He’s not lobbying,” explains Rep. Mel Watt (D-N.C.), who has been attending Clark’s programs and breakfasts for more than 15 years. “He is not trying to work toward some legislative objective. He’s just trying to prepare us to do our jobs better.”

Dick Clark left the Senate “discouraged that kind of approach would seem to work.” He had seen such a populist effort also claim former chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in their bids for re-election.

“You know there is a thing that goes along in the Senate and even more in the House perhaps,” Clark says, “Senators come to realize that if all they talk about is trying to help their state, that it’s very good politics. And that...worrying about the nation is even second politically to worrying about the state. And of course, worrying about the world is a distant third.”

After his brief State Department stop working on refugee issues, Clark wound up at the Aspen Institute at the start of the 1980s. As he thought about his charge of creating a program to educate members of Congress on policy issues, Clark’s own disappointing experience spurred him to create a program so other politicians could be respected for their international knowledge.

“One of the motivations behind starting the program was to help people see the importance of having knowledge and expertise and familiarity with the most fundamental issues of American foreign policy,” Clark relates, “which is really what we focus on.”

**Building a Program for Scholars and Lawmakers**

Clark’s true post-Senate calling became apparent after he met with then-Carnegie Corporation president David Hamburg in New York. They discovered they both shared similar thoughts on creating a new program, with Hamburg seeking to improve scholars’ access to Congress and Clark wanting to expose members of Congress to top scholars.
“I was very lucky because I went to talk to David Hamburg, who said, ‘Look, I’ve been thinking about the same thing for a long time myself, even though I’ve been focusing on scholars mostly. But I think bringing these two together, it’s a terrific idea.’”

For the scholars, Clark also recalls Hamburg pointing out “this would give them an opportunity to see the level of information and knowledge that these policymakers have and the kind of information they are most in need of. Not just for your meetings, but for their scholarly work and education and knowledge. If they came to know each other, this would really mean a lot for the scholars,” Clark remembers Hamburg saying. “It would become a meeting of the minds for the future.”

As a former senator, Clark realized “the people who are making the decisions did not really know the scholarship or the scholars...and there ought to be a way to bring the best scholars in contact with the members and the members in contact with them so they can have an ongoing relationship to stay informed.”

“That’s what I put in my proposal to the Corporation,” explains Clark, “to develop a cadre of people who knew about” what was happening in the secretive Soviet Union and “its motivation and intention” during the Cold War.

Over the years, as the program developed into an important and respected tool for enriching the knowledge of congressional members, it received funding from other foundations including the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, and The Henry Luce Foundation. The program also began to focus on other issues that came to the fore from time to time. For example, during the apartheid era, Clark added a South Africa program to deal with the inevitable changes that would take place in the racially divided nation. Nelson Mandela later participated in Clark’s program. China, energy and climate change, and at one point, Latin America, have all been on the agenda. And with massive U.S. military and political involvement in the Islamic world, Clark has focused on political, governance and other issues in recent years, before returning to a Russia focus in 2010.

**Learning from the Scholars**

One reason for his success is that Clark selects nationally known scholars and experts to sit around the table with members of Congress. Working with his funders, “Clark has made it his business to meet and find the very best scholars that are available in each of the fields we have engaged in,” Lugar says.

“People want to do these seminars because it’s Aspen and Dick Clark brings together members of Congress, sometimes senior members of Congress. He is known to be the organizer of these very important conversations...The people he asks to do these things are first-rate in their fields.”
Lancaster is proof of this willingness to participate. A Carnegie Scholar in her own right (class of 2002), she also has provided scholarly work for Clark at Aspen. Lancaster says that despite her busy schedule, she would be glad to assist the program whenever Clark calls on her.

Longtime aide Bill Nell observes Clark “has a unique credential of being both a peer with the members and a peer with the scholars. That gives him a dual credibility” in the conferences. Scholars are drawn by the intellectual substance, not fine accommodations, according to Perkovich. “The to him after about five or six of these, ‘Lee, you never say anything at these meetings!’ He said, ‘No, I come here to listen and learn—that’s it. I come here to get ideas about what we ought to be doing. I’m a good listener.’” Hamilton was legendary for his intellectual appetite and interest in policy issues. But others are greatly encouraged by Dick Clark to participate in the discussion.

Bringing Both Houses Together
Dick Clark’s style offers a comfort level for lawmakers of all political stripes. In the Senate, Clark was not the type of legislator to “bang on a podium,” notes Lancaster. “With a “low-key” persona, “he made people comfortable around him. This served him very well in the Aspen business. He can pull people together: Republicans, Democrats, the right and the left and people think this is someone who is not going to [give] me a lot of trouble or burn me.”

Another divide that the program bridges is between members of the House and Senate. One thing that Clark realizes from his time in Congress and decades of holding conferences is that legislators in Washington don’t necessarily know each other, especially House members and their Senate op- sites on the other side of the Capitol. “I’ve had more members of Congress, say, ‘Gee, I never really met Dick Lugar or so-and-so before. He’s a great guy,’” Clark says.

The native Iowan notes, “I’m sure people on the outside who live in my state, would think that all of these people know each other very well, that they talk to each other. But that isn’t the case. They’re very busy for the three days they’re [in Washington] and running and running.”

“People think we are all one big family up here, but the House is the House and the Senate is the Senate,” observes Rep. Watt. For representatives, “we almost never come into contact with members of the Senate. It’s like another world over there.”

One trademark of Dick Clark’s programs is that spouses are encouraged to come. It is an “incentive” to participate, Watt notes, since members of Congress don’t get to spend much family time between frequent travel to Washington and back to their districts.

Rather than go touring or to other events, congressional spouses are welcome at the actual policy discussions, as well as working dinners and lunches. “We felt a part of it,” notes Ann Simpson, wife of former Wyoming Republican senator Alan Simpson. “If we had a thought, we were welcome to contribute.”

Rep. Watt points out that his wife is able to add real-life experience to the education program. Eulada Paysour Watt is a former elementary school principal and also served as a Department of Education official. “She knows a lot more about education than I do,” he says, and contributes to the discussions.

Some of the most powerful names in Congress participate in Clark’s programs. Congressional participants “are usually people who are instrumental in formulating legislation,” notes Lugar.
“A motivating principle for my going to begin with is these persons are likely to be influential in their committees in their respective houses.” That is critical for a senator seeking to get a version of legislation through the House as well, so it can become a law. Clark’s programs serve to help find “somebody to carry the ball over there in a parallel way.” Lugar calls the legislative connections made during the programs “very important in the sophisticated art of trying to put together a coalition.”

**A Master of Discussion**

Clark is known for timing and pacing the conversation during discussions, keeping Congressional egos and ideological speeches in check while maximizing participation from both Republicans and Democrats.

Alan Simpson changed from a senator reluctant to participate in the meetings to actually addressing the Council on Foreign Relations several years later, according to Clark “The meetings were spectacular,” declares former senator Simpson. “The real thing was how Dick Clark could guide the discussion...He could defuse a heated discussion with a gentle authority.”

A major reason for the success of the conferences, according to congressional attendees, is Clark’s “tried and true” format. “He sets the ground rules at the beginning that these are not partisan issues,” says Rep. Watt. “Everybody knows that if you’re going to these things, you ought to respect that as priorities that Dick has.” Clark’s aim, he says, “is trying to bring light, not fire.” Individual time limits are observed, so no one makes speeches or monopolizes the discussion. Bill Nell notes Clark carries his timer on the plane for program trips. “I’m continuously worried the TSA [airport security] is going to confiscate it one day,” he jokes. But turning serious, Nell says Clark’s sessions “work well because he’s a master at it. There’s a lot of personalities there to corral together.” Sessions are run by what Lugar terms the “Dick Clark formula of the meeting. It is very simple and yet profoundly successful.”

Scholars used to 50-minute university lectures must pare their presentations down to 15 minutes to allow time for questions and discussion. Members of Congress raise a finger for brief interventions or a hand for longer comments, which are usually limited to three minutes before the timer rings. That allows everyone an equal say during a session.

“Dick is a great moderator,” Perkovich states. “He has rules from which he does not deviate. Each member knows that Dick will protect him or her from someone else who would inject partisan posturing or ad hominem remarks, which allows everyone to take the high road. Dick is not pushing a policy agenda.”

“I think it’s one of the most productive kinds of discussion that we can have,” Watts says. In Congress, “it’s shouting at each other rather than discussing the issues.” In Clark’s programs, “you don’t have to listen to political speeches.”

Instead, with the exposure to “intelligent questions” and the opportunity to have unlimited access to scholars and experts, “these are luxuries we don’t have in the regular legislative process,” Rep. Watt declares.

Clark rotates table seatings at meals to expose the members of Congress to different scholars, as well as legislative colleagues they might not normally see. Because of this, “cliques didn’t develop” and political barriers are overcome, Ann

---

**The Nunn-Lugar Act designed to safeguard weapons material in the former Soviet Union is a landmark piece of legislation with roots in the Aspen programs. Lugar, who teamed up with his then-Democratic counterpart Sam Nunn of Georgia, notes Clark’s Russia conferences provided assistance in both the underpinning of the idea for the legislation, as well as its passage.**

---

**Results Include Celebrated Legislation**

Clark’s Aspen programs are known not only for spurring two of the most well-known pieces of legislation in recent decades, but also affecting the congressional record in day-to-day issues.

The No Child Left Behind Act is known as a product of the Aspen education conferences. Rep. George Miller (D-Ca.), a main sponsor of the legislation, said he used to consider co-sponsor Rep. John Boehner.
“a radical...I spoke against him. I wouldn’t know anything about him.” But after spending time at an Aspen conference, “we got to know one another and we decided we’d give it our best effort to see if we could have a bipartisan bill that is the most dramatic reform of education policy piece of legislation with roots in the Aspen programs. Lugar, who teamed up with his then Democratic counterpart Sam Nunn of Georgia, notes Clark’s Russia conferences provided assistance in both the underpinning of the idea for the legislation, as well as its passage. “There were ideas that background at least led to bipartisan success very quickly”

Clark’s congressional breakfasts have provided ongoing assistance in the nearly twenty years since the landmark legislation’s passage, Lugar points out. “There has been considerable support through the breakfast meetings. Dick Clark has brought in people who have been giving information about how the Nunn-Lugar program has worked out.” That includes, Lugar notes, support for later extending the Nunn-Lugar principles to other nations that have nuclear and other dangerous weapons material.

In another development toward making the world more secure from weapons of mass destruction, Perkovich recalls that the establishment of centers to redirect Russian weapons scientists was inspired by Clark’s meetings. “I saw, for example, at a meeting in Jamaica,” he recalls, “how Sam Nunn, Dick Lugar, and Bill Perry [who later became Secretary of Defense] could quietly pick up on an idea mentioned at the meeting to support former Soviet nuclear scientists in the closed Russian cities to do peaceful work—rather than be tempted to sell their deadly knowledge for money to other countries or terrorists. They heard...the idea of creating the International Science and Technology Centers at an Aspen meeting and then worked on it collaboratively after that.” (See http://www.ransac.org and Carnegie Results¹ for more information on Russian closed cities and nuclear scientists.)

A Question about Junkets

Dick Clark says he long ago made a decision to hold the programs overseas for reasons that range from congressional rules limiting the amount of time for domestic congressional trips to gaining the undivided attention of

busy lawmakers. Because of the cost of hosting the seminars internationally, the number of Congressional programs and their locale in desirable areas and hotels, the Aspen program is often a leader in congressional travel expenditures. That fact is regularly noted in newspaper and web site articles.

“I think some members have been deterred from participation in the program because of newspaper articles,” Lugar says. But when an article mentions his frequent travel, especially with Aspen, “it doesn’t usually have an accusation that I was doing something wrong or in error.”

The Center for Public Integrity, in its “Power Trips” series that raised questions about congressional travel, noted “no other sponsor’s spending came close” to the Aspen program. But in a section discussing Lugar’s travel, it also termed Aspen “a Washington-based nonprofit whose well-regarded seminars are attended by lawmakers from both parties.”

Fear of being criticized for foreign travel among members of Congress has run so deep at times that some legislators made a point of saying “they deliberately did not have a passport so they would not be accused of this,” Lugar observes. But particularly since 9/11, “we are engaged with the rest of the world and need to be paying attention.”

There is no question among attendees about whether the Aspen gatherings are working or sightseeing trips. Lugar notes there are papers and books to read before and during the conference. In fact, participants are asked to bring 50 copies of any suggested reading.

“All the members attended all the sessions and paid close attention and participated intently,” Carnegie Endowment’s Perkovich says of the Aspen program. “People didn’t go in and out of the room, or display the other sorts of multi-tasking distractions that happens in Washington. They worked hard, listened hard, asked hard questions. It was not a vacation [or] a junket—people worked seriously. This is one reason why I am dismayed when I read occasional mentions of the Dick Clark meeting... in the [Washington] Post, or Politico articles on foreign travel of members of Congress,” Perkovich remarks. Perkovich terms “bizarre...the assumption in this sort of ‘gotcha’ reporting... is that somehow members of Congress should not travel.”

Attendance at seminars is mandatory, a fact pointed out in the invitations. Clark says only one lawmaker in roughly a quarter of century played tennis rather than attend a session. That legislator and others who don’t carry their educational weight are not invited back. “It’s a serious business and people who think that it is just a luxury trip are wrong,” Dick Clark declares. “It’s a meaningful experience in which they’re learning, learning, and learning.”

To comply with new congressional ethics rules, Clark has reluctantly eliminated side trips during the program, even if they shed light on the lessons of history. One trip to the site of the Auschwitz concentration camp remained memorable in lawmakers’ minds long afterward, particularly in light of renewed anti-Semitic threats by Iran’s president. But Clark reluctantly notes “we couldn’t do that now,” because congressional rules have made such historical and cultural side trips impossible. Clark testified before Congress in favor of ethics restrictions, “but I just think in that regard, they went too far.”

Most members of Congress, particularly veteran influential lawmakers, are more than willing to participate in one of Clark’s conferences. “I’ve never apologized for going to an Aspen conference,” Watt says, “because I know how valuable they are.”

As Dick Clark looks back at the program he created decades ago, he is proud of its impact. “It is certainly a goal and clearly an achievement of the conference in that it does bring people together. Particularly,” Clark observes, “sitting around a table and talking about issues and hearing other people’s views. And doing it in a non-partisan way.”

At the age of 81, Dick Clark had contemplated retiring by now. “I keep extending it every year,” he says. Last year, his Aspen conferences passed the 100 total mark, with Clark in attendance at virtually all of them. But as of this winter, Clark was still looking forward. He has made a commitment to continue his work through 2010 and isn’t ruling out a longer tenure.

Dick Clark has been able to keep his staff together for an extraordinary length of time in the transient work world of Washington. Senior aide Nell has worked for him more than 22 years, with other staff members’ longevity ranging from roughly 15 to 21 years of working with Clark. “There’s no turnover,” comments Nell. “We trust and respect each other. That’s the secret to a great working relationship.”

Last year, octogenarian Clark’s program conducted a record number of 29 breakfasts, Nell points out. “He still has his energy for sure.”

Regular Aspen participants realize that Dick Clark will ultimately surrender his timer and stop leading their policy forums. But they are eager to keep sitting around his discussion table as long as possible. “We hope he doesn’t retire,” says Senator Lugar.

“I hope he keeps going on and on like the Energizer Bunny” in television commercials, declares Congressman Watt. “He doesn’t seem to be slowing down,” Watt noted at the start of 2010. “And we are grateful for that.”
As Carnegie Corporation of New York approaches 2011, its centennial year, staff members such as myself, since I am involved in compiling and disseminating information relating to our grantmaking during the past 100 years, have been researching the foundation’s history. In the process, we have come upon many interesting grants and projects. From this review, it is clear that throughout the Corporation’s history and up to the present, successive cohorts of program staff, administrators and Trustees, led by twelve presidents—Andrew Carnegie himself was the first president of the Corporation; Vartan Gregorian, the foundation’s current president, has served in that position since 1997—have focused primarily on supporting efforts to further Andrew Carnegie’s fundamental concerns, the advancement of education and international peace. In this connection, we have funded projects ranging from Sesame Street to international Track II negotiations, from adult education to higher education in Russia and sub-Saharan Africa. (A visit to our web site, www.carnegie.org, where you will find both our continually updated feature, “Centennial Moments” and a timeline highlighting the impact of a century of Corporation grantmaking, will provide a more complete picture of our work.)

Even the unexpected grants we have been reading about in our archives—unexpected, at least to us, from this vantage point in time—still fit well within the mandate that Andrew Carnegie gave to the Corporation: to “promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding.” A case in point are grants totaling $62,000 made between 1924 and 1935 to our sister organization, the Carnegie Institution for Science (then called the Carnegie Institution of Washington), that supported the excavation of Chichen Itza in the Yucatan region of Mexico. It is fascinating to note that aviation pioneer Charles Lindbergh also plays a role in this story. In 1929, Lindbergh and his wife, along with archeologists from the Carnegie Institution, made a number of flights over the area, a trail-blazing step forward in mapping the parameters of an archeological site, in this case one that stretches from the Yucatan to Guatemala. The ruins of four major Mayan cities lie in this area, but Chichen Itza is by all accounts the most spectacular and remains, even today, both a tourist attraction as well as a still-vital center of archeological study.

A 1934 “report on grant” titled Report Upon Further Clearing, Digging and Restoring at Chichen Itza, Yucatan, During the Season of 1934, and submitted to the Corporation by the Carnegie Institution, details how the Corporation funds were being used:

The first aim of the Mexican Government and of Carnegie Institution in the work they have been carrying on at Chichen Itza has been, by excavation of buried structures and by study of those still standing, to learn as much as possible regarding the history of the city and as to Maya architectural practice. Concurrent objectives have been: strengthening and repair; to keep the temples from further disintegration; and, when it could be done with assurance of accuracy, replacement of fallen elements for the purpose of rendering the buildings more easily understandable to the many persons who visit this outstanding and most readily accessible of New Empire centres.

A few photos taken during the time of the grant and sent to then-Corporation president Frederick Keppel have been reproduced on this page. We have learned from letters in our archives that President Keppel was considering having them framed. We think that they are still extraordinarily evocative and serve to remind us that unlocking history—whether of a foundation’s work or, on a much larger scale, of an entire civilization—always serves to advance the cause of knowledge and understanding. ■
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Report by Economic Bloggers Tells a Dismal Story

This past February the inaugural Kauffman Economic Outlook came out with a troubling observation: Despite promising growth numbers in the last quarter of 2009 from the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, economics bloggers are telling a different story.

The report, A Quarterly Survey of Top Economics Bloggers, was based on questionnaires sent by the Kauffman Foundation to the top 200 economics bloggers. Their responses revealed some insightful views, chief among them that 48 percent of bloggers surveyed viewed the economy as “worse than official government statistics showed.” Many stated that the overall condition of the economy was mixed or still facing recession.

The participating bloggers, who were identified primarily through Palgrave’s econologue, net rankings, expected the greatest growth prospects over the next three years to be in interest rates, inflation and the budget deficit. U.S. output and jobs are expected to increase but with about half the intensity of growth in global output.

Bloggers assessed conditions as “bad” or “very bad” for small businesses and banks lending to business as well as to individuals. Seven out of ten bloggers thought the federal government was too involved in economic matters. Surprisingly, there seemed to be a relatively clear consensus for action within the next few years: tax cuts, especially on payrolls, and efforts to cut down on the deficit through decreased medical entitlements, social security and defense spending.

As the Foundation moves forward in gauging the economy, bloggers will be surveyed on their views of the economy, entrepreneurship and innovations every quarter to provide their views of the nation’s fiscal health. “As independent thinkers who are immersed in discourse through the innovation of blogging, these economic writers have a unique voice and perspective, and potentially profound influence,” said Tim Kane, senior fellow at the Kauffman Foundation and author of the study.

To view the full report, please visit the Kauffman Foundation at http://www.kauffman.org/news-room/economics-bloggers-share-bleak-outlook-according-to-kauffman-foundation-survey.aspx

Emergency Health Care for Haitian Women

According to the Foundation Center, as of February 9, 2010, over $222 million had gone toward the Haiti recovery effort from 295 grant makers around the United States. Among the donors is the Hewlett Foundation, which is putting its efforts into providing much needed basic health care services for the people of Haiti.

The $500,000 emergency grant from the Foundation to the International Planned Parenthood Federation will provide reproductive and primary health care to Haitians affected by the earthquake. Key services in trauma care and reproductive health care for women, who in times of crisis are often at risk for increased sexual violence, sexually transmitted infections, unwanted pregnancies and unsafe abortions, will be provided through Association pour la Promotion de la Famille Haitienne (PROFAMIL).

Haiti historically suffers from shortages of reproductive health care, and earthquake damage resulted in the loss of two critically needed family planning clinics serving 750,000 women of reproductive age in Port-au-Prince and another 15,000 in Jacmel. PROFAMIL will work with its counterpart in the Dominican Republic, which has been coordinating with the United Nations and other Dominican relief agencies to deploy mobile health units to determine the immediate needs of the hardest hit communities for staff, services and supplies.

Mobile units will bring primary health care, obstetric care, family planning and HIV prevention services to tent cities and shelters.

“It means a world of difference,” said Dr. Carmen Barroso, director of the Western Hemisphere Regional Office of International Planned Parenthood Federation, praising the Hewlett Foundation grant.

For more information on the Hewlett Foundation please go to: http://www.hewlett.org/

Bankers without Borders®

Grameen Foundation is offering new opportunities for bankers and other professionals to support the world’s poor and the institutions serving them. The Foundation is expanding its Bankers without Borders® initiative which taps senior working professionals for short-term, field and skills-based projects supporting microfinance and technology for development initiatives. Since its inception in late 2008, the program has built a reserve corps of over 3,000 professionals, many of whom have already provided on-site and remote technical assistance in the U.S. and overseas.

The Foundation is at the forefront of helping the world’s poorest people become financially self-sufficient by working with local organizations to improve access to financial services, information technology and micro-business opportunities.

High priority projects many of the volunteers have worked on include: portfolio risk management, human capital development and social performance management, as well as information and communication technology innovations. By offering their skill sets, volunteers in the program are able to help organizations serving vulnerable populations in Haiti, China, India, Ghana and Tunisia improve their financial infrastructure and operations. It currently has more than 50 active projects.

The JP Morgan Chase Foundation, an inaugural sponsor of the program, recently cemented that support with a three-year $3 million grant that will enable Grameen Foundation to further build the capacity of the microfinance institutions and also advance broader private sector support for volunteerism that is geared towards improving the lives and livelihoods of the poor.

The Grameen Foundation hopes to transform Bankers without Borders® into a permanent solution for recruiting specialists into some of the world’s neediest communities.

For more information on the Grameen Foundation and its work, please visit: http://www.grameenfoundation.org. For
more specific information on the Bankers without Borders® program, please visit: www.BankerswithoutBorders.com.

“Glass Pockets” Helps Move Foundations Toward Greater Transparency

The term “glass pockets” was coined more than fifty years ago by Chairman of the Board at Carnegie Corporation of New York, Russell Leffingwell. He used the term at a congressional hearing to show support for the sentiment that organizations receiving tax exemptions for serving the public good should be transparent in their methods of giving. Heeding a call to promote and facilitate greater openness and transparency among private foundations today, the New York City based Foundation Center along with the Center for Effective Philanthropy, the Communications Network, the Global Philanthropy Forum, Grantmakers for Effective Organizations and the One World Trust in London have developed Glasspockets.org, a web site designed to openly highlight and share foundations’ successes and failures in their grant making processes.

The site offers essential facts about all 97,000 U.S. foundations, including illustrations of philanthropy’s impact on issues and the ways in which foundations are currently trying to become more transparent through real-time foundation Twitter feeds, the Transparency 2.0 section that showcases the growing number of foundations using social media and a “Who has glass pockets?” section that provides at-a-glance profiles of foundations’ online communication practices, performance metrics, governance, finance and grant making processes.

The impetus for the project stems from the recognition that there is a freedom given to foundations that allows them to be innovative, to take risks and to work on long-term solutions, but “to preserve this freedom, foundations must tell the story of what they do, why they do it and what difference it makes,” says Bradford K. Smith, president of the Foundation center. Please visit the site at: http://glasspockets.org/

New Program Seeks to Build a Smarter System for Economic Security

Responding to the current economic crisis, the Ford Foundation announced a five-year $80 million initiative to help American workers stabilize family incomes, cope with unemployment and keep the jobs they have.

The initiative is an attempt to address both the immediate and long-term challenges faced by families in the U.S. as unemployment and household economic stress reach the highest levels in decades.

Led by Helen Neuborne, Ford’s director of Quality Employment, the program will focus its efforts on two key areas: (1) strengthening policies that improve job quality for all U.S. workers, with a focus on low-income workers and (2) helping states modernize the delivery of public support programs.

The foundation has a track record of working on building economic security for U.S. families. In the 1990s, Ford supported research that helped place the needs of the working poor on the public agenda for the first time, igniting a national movement and laying the groundwork for this current effort and the organization’s work on economic fairness.

The new program will address factors that have an enormous bearing on the ability of low-wage families to maintain household stability, including existing programs such as unemployment insurance and newer policies including paid sick leave.

“There is a new momentum among Americans who say that the rules of the workplace ought to fit the realities of their lives. We want to grab this momentum and promote progress in communities across the country,” said Neuborne.

For more information on this program please visit: www.fordfound.org

Global Grassroots to Train Rwanda’s Vulnerable Women as Change Agents

Started by a woman for women in Rwanda, Global Grassroots is a small nonprofit established in 2004 by Gretchen Wallace to support conscious social change among vulnerable women in post-conflict countries. The organization has been awarded $100,000 from NOVO Foundation to advance its Academy for Conscious Change—a 12 to 18-month incubator offering nonprofit management skills, leadership training, personal transformation practices, seed grants and high-engagement support to help disadvantaged women launch their own grassroots civil society organizations.

In partnership with the NoVo Foundation, a nonprofit that supports investment in women and girls globally, socio-emotional learning techniques will be explored as approaches that foster compassion and advance a just society. Global Grassroots employs a range of practices including mindfulness, meditation and breathing to cultivate empathy, support self-understanding and prompt responsible leadership.

“We are experts in their own experiences, but often have the least access to the resources necessary to create change,” said Wallace. With this grant, the largest the organization has ever received, Global Grassroots will be able to not only expand its mission in Rwanda but also act as a springboard for further global endeavors.

For more information on this program please visit: www.globalgrassroots.org

To read about the foundation’s century of accomplishments, visit www.Carnegie.org and click on Centennial Moments.
Common Cause Honors Vartan Gregorian

Vartan Gregorian was named the recipient of Common Cause’s first annual Andrew Heiskell Lifetime Achievement Award in December 2009. Presented by Thomas Kean, former Governor of New Jersey, the award recognizes Gregorian’s “inspirational leadership in advancing the cause of education and promoting its importance to the successful functioning of democracy.”

“I am deeply grateful for this award, but it is not about me: it celebrates two outstanding individuals, John Gardner and Andrew Heiskell,” said Gregorian. He praised Gardner, past president of Carnegie Corporation of New York, as the father of Common Cause and a great American citizen. Andrew Heiskell, who was the publisher of Life magazine and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees during Gregorian’s presidency of the New York Public Library, was, Gregorian said, “a man of remarkable intelligence, culture, accomplishment and passion…. I am humbled to be honored in the name of these two remarkable Americans.”

The award was endowed by Mrs. Marian Heiskell in honor of her late husband, a founder of Common Cause, a nonpartisan, grassroots organization dedicated to restoring the core values of American democracy.

Women Leaders Gather in South Africa

“I am so fired up I cannot wait to go back and start spreading the word. Now I know I have the confidence to make decisions to start acting with knowledge. Not even the sky is the limit now.”

“I am leaving the ACADEMY with a fresher approach to being an excellent manager in my present position and a mentor to my team.” These comments and others like them appeared on the attendees’ feedback forms when Women employed in Higher Education in Africa met in Cape Town, South Africa in September 2009.

An intensive week of sharing and learning, the seventh annual HERS-SA ACADEMY, which focuses on the development of women leaders, was attended by delegates from all over South Africa as well as Uganda, Tanzania, Ghana, Nigeria, Botswana, Lesotho and Malawi. Twenty-four universities were represented by women chosen mainly for their potential to hold senior positions, now or in the future. Carnegie Corporation funded the attendance of a number of the delegates from outside South Africa. A total of 36 speakers and facilitators, including many senior education leaders, shared their time and experience in a variety of forums, providing information, mentoring and offering exposure to role models —critical elements of the academy experience.

All the Presidents’ People

In November 2009, Natasha Davids, Carnegie Corporation Executive Assistant to the President, hosted a luncheon meeting focused on issues affecting the foundation world and the unique experience of working with foundation presidents. The Peer Group for Executive Assistants was founded by Bridget Massay of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund (far left), shown with members (l. to r.) Gary Reed, The Commonwealth Fund; Natasha Davids; Monique Nishikawa, Ford Foundation; Leslie Glauberman, the Atlantic Philanthropies; Vartan Gregorian; Ulrica Fredsvik-Konvalin, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; Tasha Washington, The Surdna Foundation. (Missing from photo: Kate Amendola, The Nathan Cummings Foundation)

Building Education Entrepreneurship

Corporation funding has enabled The Mind Trust, an Indianapolis-based nonprofit, to plan and create a multi-city network of organizations to support and expand education entrepreneurship. The goal of the project is to connect entrepreneurs with city-based partners who will provide technical and policy guid-
ance, help forge relationships and foster a climate in which education ventures can take root and thrive. These networks will encourage innovation nationwide and expand the reach of effective education reform efforts. In November 2009, Talia Milgrom-Elcott, Program Officer, Urban Education, hosted a working session for a small group of government, education, foundation and nonprofit leaders—including Michele Jolin, The White House Office of Social Innovation; John Luczak, Program Manager, Education, the Joyce Foundation; Chester E. Finn, President, the Thomas B. Fordham Institute and Ariela Rozman, Chief Executive Officer, The New Teacher Project (another Corporation grantee)—to facilitate the designing of strategies for the project, known as the Cities for Education Entrepreneurship Network.

No University is an Island

The Corporation-supported Talloires Network, based at Tufts University, is an international association of institutions committed to building a global movement to strengthen civic engagement and social responsibility within higher education institutions. Members believe that these institutions do not exist in isolation from society, nor from the communities in which they are located, and they envision universities around the world as a vibrant and dynamic force promoting mutual respect, high standards, service and diversity.

In November 2009 the Corporation hosted a meeting of Network participants that gathered presidents of both U.S.-based and international member universities, foundations, representatives of UNDP, USAID, the State Department and other public and private organizations to discuss strategies for going forward with these efforts. Tufts president Lawrence Bacow, predicted the meeting would “turn out to be a pivotal moment in the global movement of engaged universities.”

Andrés Henriquez Takes his Literacy Message to Congress

“From Kindergarten through the end of 3rd grade, kids are learning to read. But beginning in 4th grade, they are reading to learn,” Andrés Henriquez, program officer, Adolescent Literacy Initiative, told the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education in November 2009.

We must re-engineer our schools to ensure that literacy instruction extends to middle and high school students, Henriquez said. “Students who are not proficient at understanding what they read and in communicating what they have learned are also at a tremendous disadvantage when it comes to succeeding in college and in competing for success in what is becoming an increasingly knowledge-based global economy.”

Henriquez cited Carnegie Corporation’s five-year Advancing Literacy Initiative to gather knowledge and ideas from experts nationwide on topics ranging from linguistics to the social science of teaching, summarized in the Time To Act report, which delves deep into how to advance literacy and learning for all students. Henriquez concluded his testimony with a series of recommendations for the Subcommittee.

Qatar’s Sheika Comes to Town

In September 2009, president Vartan Gregorian hosted a reception for Her Highness Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al Missned of Qatar. The gathering, held at the landmark Harold Pratt House, headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations, drew many leaders of the diplomatic, philanthropic and educational communities.

Within Qatar Her Highness plays a prominent role in supporting education through the Qatar Foundation and its... (Continued on page 46)
innovative Education City campus. She also works toward education for economically under-privileged students and children with special needs and, as UNESCO Special Envoy for Basic and Higher Education, endeavors to raise standards of education around the world.

**U.S.-Russia Policy Review**

In response to emerging opportunities to reshape the U.S. policy toward Russia, the Corporation recently commissioned an assessment of the relationship between our two nations by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, under the directorship of Robert Legvold. An article by Legvold in the July/August 2009 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, “What’s at Stake With Russia” as well as memoranda and meetings with high-level administration officials resulted from the project. In January 2010, a conference featuring Thomas Graham, former Senior Director for Russia at the U.S. National Security Council, served as the final outreach event. It was followed by a workshop, co-hosted with Harvard and Columbia universities, on “The Policy World Meets Academia: Designing U.S. Policy toward Russia,” which brought together Russia experts and former policy officials with junior scholars.

**Armenian Professionals Honor Gregorian**

Vartan Gregorian was named Professional of the Year for his significant and lasting accomplishments as a leader in higher education, libraries and foundations by the Armenian Professional Society of Los Angeles. The award was presented at a banquet in Los Angeles in November 2009, where Gregorian delivered a speech on the future of public education in the United States. The present economic crisis, he believes, requires an investment in human capital—a fundamental part of which is an excellent high school education that prepares all students to succeed in postsecondary education. Every high school graduate should be prepared for upwardly mobile employment and to participate effectively in our diverse democracy.

“I am deeply grateful to the Armenian Professional Society of Los Angeles for honoring me,” said Gregorian. “The award is particularly meaningful to me because I believe so deeply in the organization’s mission of serving as a bridge between Armenia and the Armenian community in the United States. Armenia is a country with great potential, but it needs equally great expertise if it is to thrive in our increasingly knowledge-based, competitive world.”

**Africa-America Institute Award Goes to Gregorian**

In September 2009, Vartan Gregorian was recognized by the Africa-America Institute (AAI) for his steadfast commitment to strengthening higher education in Africa. The Institute’s Chairman Kofi Appenteng presented the award to Gregorian at the AAI’s 25th Annual Awards Gala. The people of Ghana were presented with the organization’s Award for African National Achievement, accepted on behalf of the country by John Evans Atta Mills, President of...
the Republic of Ghana. Nicky Oppenheimer, Chairman of De Beers, received the AAI’s Award for Championing Corporate Social Responsibility.

“By investing in higher education, we are helping to nurture a rising generation of women and men who will contribute to the continued development of democracy and civil society on the African continent,” said Gregorian. “While Africa’s challenges are complex and manifold, the knowledge and innovation within its universities are more than equal to the task of addressing those challenges, on Africa’s terms.” Africa has been an important focus of Carnegie Corporation since the foundation initiated work on the continent in the 1920s to address the challenges of economic and social development.

I Love My Librarian Award

Celebrating America’s Librarians

Carnegie Corporation of New York and The New York Times announced the ten winners of the I Love My Librarian Award, jointly sponsored by the two organizations. More than 3,200 library users nationwide nominated a librarian for service to their community, school or campus. Each of the 10 winners received a $5,000 cash award and was honored at a ceremony and reception in New York, hosted by The New York Times in December 2009.

The 2009 award winners are: Sol A. Gomez, Tucson, Arizona; Laura Grunwerg, River Edge, New Jersey; Lucy Hansen, Mercedes, Texas; Alice K. Juda, Newport, Rhode Island; Karen E. Martines, Cleveland, Ohio; Dwight McInvaill, Georgetown, South Carolina; Seamus O’Scanlain, New York, New York; Dana Thomas, Fort Myers, Florida; Carolyn Wheeler, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; Oceana Wilson, Bennington, Vermont.

“In a world that is increasingly oversaturated with a torrent of disconnected information, more and more we look to librarians as our guides to the truth,” said Vartan Gregorian “They are the guardians of history and the true keepers of the flame of knowledge.”

“The ‘I Love My Librarian’ program demonstrates how vital libraries and librarians are to our communities and the people they serve,” said Janet L. Robinson, president and chief executive officer of The New York Times Company.

Exploring the News Frontier

Deans and students from the twelve journalism schools supported by the Carnegie-Knight Journalism Initiative were among those invited to The Paley Center for Media in New York City in February 2010 for a look into the profession’s future. The event, “A Way Forward: Solving the Challenges of the News Frontier,” which was hosted by the Corporation in partnership with the Paley Center, began with a discussion between Alberto Ibargüen, president and CEO of the Knight Foundation and Vartan Gregorian, moderated by Lorraine Branham, Dean, SI Newhouse School of Public Communications, Syracuse University. A series of panel discussions and presentations followed, featuring leaders of some of the news industry’s most influential organizations, including AOL, CNN, Google, Politico, The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal and others. “The News21 Experience” presented highlights from the revolutionary reporting project involving students from leading journalism schools, who experiment with new forms of in-depth and investigative reporting. Find out more at http://www.news21.com/.

(Left to right) Carolyn Wheeler, Lucy Hansen, Sol A. Gomez, Dana Thomas, Seamus O’Scanlain, Laura Grunwerg, Dwight McInvaill, Alice K. Juda, Oceana Wilson, Karen E. Martines.

With America and the world gradually recovering from the economic crisis, philanthropy is poised to grow in size, in scope, and in service across our nation and the world. This trend will continue as individuals seek impact where government seems paralyzed, and as demographics and tax policy encourage such philanthropic investments. Amidst this growth, a new generation of technologies will expand philanthropy’s structure, taking us from individual grantmaking to both a national and a global movement.

So, it is time that those of us who work in philanthropy—who are engaged in strategic giving—see ourselves as part of a sector and a movement.

We must no longer view ourselves simply as members of individual foundations or as a collection of like institutions. We are part of a noble sector engaged in positive change. We must learn from each other. We must collaborate with each other. We must speak together, through both the collective impact of our work and the collective power of our voice.

Philanthropy is not the domain of any one purpose, any one political view, any one people, or any one nation. It is the tool for pursuing common social good. It is our shared set of values embracing our global community, beginning in our neighborhood and ending in a far-away land. It moves beyond yesterday’s boundaries to serve today’s needs and tomorrow’s dreams.

Technology and media show us every crisis, so we can no longer say “we did not know.” We know, for example, that graduation rates in American cities constitute a scandal. We look up and see that Haiti and Chile are in our living room, and Darfur is still on the front porch. AIDS has left a quarter of the families in Zambia led by an orphan under the age of 12. Detroit’s future will be built as much by philanthropy as by government or the private sector.

The global landscape—shaped more by technology and economics than by politics and government—is the common philanthropic workplace. The tragedy in Haiti has affected the neighborhoods of Miami and New York City as new immigrants seek refuge and those already here seek ways to help their homelands.

These are our common challenges of mission, no matter our location. We also face common challenges in the mechanics of our work: transparency, governance, communications, effectiveness, and diversity regardless of our legal structure or our geographic location.

Up until now, we have tended to see what divides us rather than what unites us, leaving us with a world of philanthropy defined by its differences. Those days are ending. They must end.

My friend and predecessor at the Council, Ambassador James Joseph, once said that “philanthropy’s vision for the future should be to help move [us]...beyond the tolerance of difference to valuing diversity, to an understanding that opportunities and outcomes are interrelated and to a commitment to give new life to the promise of...the workplace, the schoolhouse, and our civic institutions.”

With insight and grace, Jim Joseph pointed us to what has for too long divided us into groups too small, too insular, and too self-absorbed. We can only claim a common vision for philanthropy when we first reach out to those most unlike ourselves, to learn from them in humility, and to embrace with them new ways of “voluntary giving of private wealth for the public good.”

The Council on Foundations and our colleague organizations seeking to serve this noble sector represent its diversity. Private independent foundations (like Carnegie Corporation) working with family foundations, community foundations, and corporate grantmaking organizations characterize today’s philanthropy. But to the rest of the world our varying legal structures are a distinction without a difference.

Our neighbors cannot distinguish between the good works of a community foundation’s scholarship program, a family foundation’s gift to the local hospital, or a corporate giving program’s investment in the local workforce. To them, a foundation is a foundation. Philanthropy is philanthropy—no matter what legal structure provided the investment of dollars, skills, or strategy.

And in most nations served by philanthropic giving, the aver-
age citizen does not know philanthropy at all. This will change first as foundations around the world continue to develop global aims and global partnerships. Second, global citizens will come to know philanthropy because of its democratization. Today’s philanthropy is not the domain of just the wealthy.

However, while U.S. foundations—and their annual giving in excess of $45 billion—will long serve as the primary tool for philanthropy, a new generation of givers relies on more loosely defined tools that can enable almost all citizens to become philanthropists. Among these tools are donor-advised funds, venture philanthropy, giving circles, and e-philanthropy in its varying forms.

Our global colleagues and those designing new forms of philanthropy here at home may use different legal forms of giving, but their purpose reflects our purpose. We are all colleagues—leaders who share a common vision.

Social movements reflect a large number of individual actions focused upon a common goal. The Civil Rights movement and the Women’s Suffrage movement come to mind. In both cases, a steady series of actions focused on a common goal, over a sustained period of time, achieved historic transformation. This same dynamic of multiple players—foundations and philanthropic initiatives—focused on a common goal is making social history now.

Consider these examples.

When natural disasters strike, philanthropy recognizes the value of collective action. Five years after the devastation in America’s Gulf Coast, we can look back on $3.3 billion of American philanthropic dollars dedicated to rebuilding the region. Within the first two months of 2010, this same philanthropic community directed more than $1 billion to our Caribbean neighbors in Haiti. Our European philanthropic colleagues donated their Euros to one common recovery fund to enhance the impact of their philanthropic investment in Haiti. In 2004, Americans sent $1.8 billion to Indian Ocean Tsunami recovery efforts. Such an emerging global philanthropic response is not new. But, the global response represented a doubling of U.S. giving at $3.6 billion.

Here at home, American philanthropy is gradually recognizing the greater impact of collaboration in addressing our own nation’s social and cultural needs. In 2007, philanthropic institutions made more than 30,000 grants totaling $4.9 billion, to support education. In the same year, the most recent for which data is available, more than 19,600 grants totaling another $4.9 billion went to enhance health care.

Movements need not recognize the boundaries of law, geography, or ethnicity that often divide us. Movements are equally at home in the basement of a ghetto church, the steps of a great memorial, and the quiet prison cell where a human rights activist suffers in stubborn courage. The power of a movement is found not in its checkbook, but in its compelling vision, its collective action on behalf of a higher ideal. We are becoming more than the legal structure of our organized giving. We are becoming a movement called “philanthropy.”

The word “philanthropy” is derived from the Greek language, meaning “love for mankind.” Historians may differ on when or where philanthropy became a common virtue in civilized society. In 1601, our English neighbors enacted the Statute of Charitable Uses, often considered the cornerstone of Anglo-American laws related to philanthropy. Great religious traditions called their flocks to pursue the common good in even earlier times. Islam honors the stranger, and the Jewish tradition pursues tikkun olam, the “healing” or “restoration” of the world. Christians have known that “faith without works is dead.” The movement of philanthropy bridges civil and religious territory with comfort because we pursue a common good limited to no faith, no tradition, and no nation.

It is not merely idealistic to invest in this common good. It is also imperative. Yet, in doing so, we must change where we give, what we give, and how we give. Today’s giving begins at home but extends across the globe. Today’s philanthropy goes beyond competitive grant-making to philanthropic leadership in creating positive social change. Today’s work expands beyond traditional foundations to new forms of strategic investment from micro-lending to global collaboration.

History will record that during the first decade of the 21st century there may not have been the growth of democracy around the world in ways America’s political leadership had hoped. But there can be no debate that global markets and economic growth have produced a new era of individual and corporate resources or wealth in Russia, China, India, southern Africa and Latin America. Despite the economic challenges of the past two years, most of the world’s economies are significantly larger and significantly more integrated than at any time in history. These market economies are best when combined with a strong philanthropic sector.

I have had the honor of meeting many international colleagues in their homes as well as on their visits to America. Over time, I’ve asked each of them the same question: “What is the greatest challenge facing philanthropy today?” Without exception, every person has defined our common challenge as the creation of a more “civil society.” America suffers a lack of civil discourse; governments at all levels are so polarized, they are paralyzed. In emerging nations, the values of civil society struggle to breathe the air of freedom.

Today, with leadership and encouragement from the Obama administration we are seeing a new era of public-philanthropic partnerships at the federal level in ways similar to traditional public-philanthropic collaboration at the local levels. In the first year of these new partnerships, the administration has called upon philanthropy to provide innovation to the traditional public-sector funding streams. The President is calling upon philanthropy to provide new solutions to old problems, with the hope that public sectors can bring such solutions to scale. Collaboration with the public sector is creating a new social dynamic in American society. Our collective efforts give the sum of our work greater impact.

There is a wonderful African proverb that defines philanthropy when it says, “To go quickly, go alone. But to go far, go together.” Today’s philanthropy is increasingly defined by its collaborative work. We are becoming more than the combined impact of our individual efforts. We are becoming a sector and a movement that promotes innovation and impact through investing in positive social change.

That’s why I’m proud to work in philanthropy!
Margaret Carnegie Miller remembers...

The only child of Andrew and Louise Carnegie, Margaret Carnegie was born in 1897 and served as a trustee of Carnegie Corporation from 1934 to 1973. When the Corporation celebrated its 50th anniversary on November 14, 1961, she shared her memories of the day it was created. Her handwritten remarks, filed away in the foundation archives at Columbia University, are excerpted here.

“I feel like a great grandmother to Carnegie Corporation because I was there when it all began in the mind of a wise father. ...

“It is a long time ago since that afternoon at 2 East 91st Street, November 10, 1911. Mother came up to my room and said, ‘Your father has done something important this afternoon. He has set aside a large sum of money and has asked some of his best friends to be responsible for it and to find ways to make it best work to help other people. They would like you and me to be photographed with the new trustees.’ We went down to the drawing room together. Ever since then my ties with Carnegie Corporation have been close and happy. ...

“In his Letter of Gift, ...Andrew Carnegie voices his faith in his trustees and in their successor who, I quote, ‘cannot fail to be able and good men.’ Tonight we may say with sincerity that the last fifty years have proved him right.”

The photo Margaret Carnegie refers to in these remarks is on page 22 of this magazine.