

BUYING OPEN BORDERS *

Foundations play a major role in the immigration debate, but none more so than the Ford Foundation, one of the largest in the U.S. (or in the world, for that matter). The foundation has long bankrolled some of the main opponents of immigration reform. Below is the record of grants to immigration-related recipients.

Ford Foundation Funding of Anti-Immigration-Reform Organizations

(Source: Ford Foundation Annual Reports, 1968-2002)

| Year | La Raza ^a | MALDEF ^b | LULAC ^c | NIF ^d | NIP-NLG ^e | Year Total |
|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1968 | \$630,000 | \$2,200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,830,000 |
| 1969 | \$21,595 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$21,595 |
| 1970 | \$1,953,700 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,953,700 |
| 1971 | \$150,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$150,000 |
| 1972 | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$800,000 |
| 1973 | \$485,000 | \$415,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$900,000 |
| 1974 | \$425,000 | \$825,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,250,000 |
| 1975 | \$339,996 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$339,996 |
| 1976 | \$271,984 | \$750,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,021,984 |
| 1977 | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$200,000 |
| 1978 | \$300,000 | \$887,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,187,200 |
| 1979 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 1980 | \$232,500 | \$742,425 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$974,925 |
| 1981 | \$240,000 | \$391,660 | \$15,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$646,860 |
| 1982 | \$375,000 | \$900,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,275,000 |
| 1983 | \$162,732 | \$822,350 | \$0 | \$152,110 | \$0 | \$1,137,192 |
| 1984 | \$500,000 | \$1,400,000 | \$0 | \$142,290 | \$0 | \$1,042,290 |
| 1985 | \$0 | \$1,256,000 | \$0 | \$55,600 | \$15,000 | \$1,326,600 |
| 1986 | \$25,000 | \$1,300,000 | \$0 | \$84,000 | \$0 | \$1,409,000 |
| 1987 | \$110,000 | \$630,000 | \$0 | \$517,030 | \$0 | \$1,257,030 |
| 1988 | \$830,000 | \$1,350,000 | \$0 | \$235,000 | \$0 | \$2,415,000 |
| 1989 | \$452,000 | \$295,000 | \$134,000 | \$435,000 | \$48,000 | \$1,364,000 |
| 1990 | \$262,000 | \$1,575,000 | \$145,000 | \$0 | \$100,000 | \$2,082,000 |
| 1991 | \$1,250,000 | \$792,000 | \$330,000 | \$460,000 | \$50,000 | \$2,882,000 |
| 1992 | \$109,300 | \$1,545,000 | \$0 | \$175,000 | \$100,000 | \$1,929,300 |
| 1993 | \$2,850,000 | \$850,000 | \$300,000 | \$567,900 | \$100,000 | \$4,667,900 |
| 1994 | \$0 | \$1,525,000 | \$0 | \$535,000 | \$0 | \$2,060,000 |
| 1995 | \$3,535,000 | \$995,000 | \$450,000 | \$130,000 | \$0 | \$5,110,000 |
| 1996 | \$757,000 | \$2,325,000 | \$0 | \$800,000 | \$100,000 | \$3,800,000 |
| 1997 | \$1,315,000 | \$1,200,000 | \$0 | \$770,000 | \$0 | \$3,285,000 |
| 1998 | \$1,950,000 | \$2,900,000 | \$0 | \$500,000 | \$100,000 | \$5,450,000 |
| 1999 | \$1,190,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,190,000 |
| 2000 | \$842,000 | \$6,915,000 | \$0 | \$1,094,000 | \$0 | \$16,435,915 |
| 2001 | \$400,000 | \$600,000 | \$0 | \$95,000 | \$0 | \$1,095,000 |
| 2002 | \$425,000 | \$200,000 | \$0 | \$700,000 | \$100,000 | \$1,425,000 |
| Total | \$30,785,807 | \$35,586,635 | \$1,374,200 | \$7,447,930 | \$613,000 | \$75,914,487 |

^a National Council of La Raza

^b Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund

^c League of United Latin American Citizens

^d National Immigration Forum, formerly National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum

^e National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild

This chart originally appeared in the Spring 1994 (Vol.IV, No.3) issue of *The Social Contract*, and was updated by researcher Joseph Fallon as of May, 2000. Further updating through 2002 has been researched by Ed Rubenstein.

The Fun in Fund-raising

Book Review by Lee A. MacVaugh

A foundation is a large amount of money completely surrounded by people who want some. –Dwight MacDonald

Philanthropy may be a subject too dangerous to touch, precisely because it is so revealing of individual motives and social preferences. –Stephen Graubard, *Daedalus*

The system that makes the foundation possible is probably worth preserving.
–Henry Ford II, Former Chairman, Ford Foundation

People rarely argue with you when you are handing out money. –John Gardner

Investigative reporter Mark Dowie mentions that although philanthropy has been a key component of American history from colonial times, foundations are not an American invention. Accumulated private wealth developed institutional methods to place excess profit to work for society in ancient Persia; in 15th century England; and in pre-revolutionary France, where there were many large foundations.

Large trusts, many with 10- to 20-billion dollar endowments are, however, uniquely American. They originated in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as wealthy American industrialists sought ways to avoid taxes and to “put their wealth to use in new and imaginative ways.”

The central thesis of Mr. Dowie’s book is that “foundations do deserve to exist; but only if they evolve swiftly” from essentially private institutions to ones more open to the public. Foundations need to become less elitist, less secretive, and less arrogant. They need to

Lee A. MacVaugh is Director of Development at FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform, Washington, DC.

become more democratic, more transparent, more accountable, and more progressive if they are to ward off Congressional scrutiny and threats of federal government intervention.

Taxpayers are realizing “that approximately half of foundation assets,” which would have flowed into state and federal treasuries if they had not been protected by trusts, in effect belong to the public. These massive private, corporate, community, and operating foundations, numbering almost 50,000 in the United States today, have combined assets that approach \$425 billion. “About 40 foundations each boast endowments greater than \$1 billion.”

Dowie asserts that prior to 1910 only 18 American foundations existed. And then, only Russell Sage held an endowment of over \$10 million. Margaret Olivia Slocum Sage, Russell Sage’s widow, was, in the early 20th century, the wealthiest woman in America. Her giving favored the social sciences.

Many impulses created American philanthropy, according to Dowie. Some of them: religious fervor/conviction, guilt, narcissism, paternalism, greed, a sense of justice, tax avoidance, family preservation, indoctrination of children, noblesse oblige, a quest for immortality, generosity, and, of course, a genuine love of humanity (the definition of philanthropy). The

fact is that no two philanthropists have the same motives, drives, or intentions or the same imaginations or hopes. Yet, according to Dowie’s research, at some level all of the aforementioned forces are at work in most of these altruists: John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Howard Hughes, Julius Rosenwald, Olivia Sage, Doris Duke, Irene Diamond, Ted Turner, George Soros, Bill Gates, the Astors, the Fords, the Mellons, and the Packards.

Most of the secrets of the rich and famous, as Dowie notes in a particularly interesting chapter, went to their graves with them. Thus, it is difficult to discern what their deepest philanthropic motives were. The actions of early donors funding scientific and medical research, for instance, range from a true love of humanity to base

American Foundations: An Investigative History

by Mark Dowie
Cambridge MA: MIT Press
320 pages, \$18.95 paper

