

**(Play Follows . . . .)**

Lemmons at the Catholic Spirit. As Ast Lemmons wrote, "It's hard to decide what leaves a bigger impression ... the story itself or the artful, personal way the story is told."

The story itself is familiar to One Percent Club members, since—in Papatola's words—it's a tale of Joe, "the erstwhile Roman Catholic priest [and] tireless go-gooder," as well as founder of the One Percent Club. Playwright Jim Stowell told the story, which, Papatola says, includes "how research "inexorably pulled [him] into what he calls 'Joeland.'"

The story is told "in a multi-layered technique that makes it part documentary and part personal reflection," Ast Lemmons wrote. She said that Stowell tells the story in the third person, "from his own point of view, only briefly stepping into character as Selvaggio and other people he encounters throughout his life." The critics all describe how it covers Selvaggio's life, association (and disassociation) from the Catholic priesthood and his work in the charitable arena—including Project in Pride for Living and the One Percent Club.

The Great American History Theatre, 30 E. 10<sup>th</sup> St., St. Paul 55101 ([www.historytheatre.com](http://www.historytheatre.com)), mounted the production with no hope of converting red ink into black, managing director Virginia Nugent said. "It's important to produce shows like this one, because Joe's story is a once-in-a-lifetime inspiration [and] an effective way to present Joe's and the One Percent Club's message of

**(Play Follows . . . .)**

philanthropy," she explained.

**Like Joe and his own projects, Nugent and the theatre are looking for backing. The goal: \$30,000 in underwriting contributions "to help offset costs of nearly \$150,000." The play opened Jan. 10 with \$8,000 in underwriting. In addition to the theatrical presentation, funding goes for educational outreach programs "to encourage the philanthropists of tomorrow," Nugent said.**

Royce's review says of the play, "what emerges is less biography and more an amusing roast of Selvaggio, with some hilarious anecdotes, jokes and images. Stowell uses detail beautifully to paint mental pictures."

Papatola observed, "Stowell brings a pulpit-pounding preacher's fire to his telling, interpolating his own life experiences with those of Selvaggio." He offered, "Kudos to [the theatre] for putting the two men together to form a potent combination and an effective evening of theater."

Nugent put into a personal perspective the theatre's goal with the play: "We know and like Joe, every one of him, from demon fund-raiser Joe to saintly and generous Joe—and all the Joes in-between, including organized but forgetful Joe, protestor and rebel priest Joe and, let's not forget, bad-joke-telling Joe."

This and other theatres need our support.

**The One Percent Club**  
2516 Chicago Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
Tel. (612) 813-3240  
Fax (612) 874-6444  
[www.theonepercentclub.org](http://www.theonepercentclub.org)

Giving  
**111111%**  
of Net Worth  
Back to the Community

The One Percent Club News  
Edition #56 February 2004

**111111%**

The mission of the One Percent Club is to increase charitable contributions in our community by engaging people to commit to a minimum standard of giving: the greater of 1% of net worth or 5% of income annually.

**Play Follows an Act That's  
Hard to Follow**

By Henry Owen

Like Joe Selvaggio's efforts to serve the commonweal, the Great American History Theatre's play, "Joe," combines zeal and the need for support in the wake of the production, which concluded its run on Feb. 1 at the History Theatre in St. Paul.

The play drew favorable reviews from critics Graydon Royce at the Star-Tribune, Dominic Papatola at the Pioneer Press and Emille Ast (*continued on 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> columns, far left*)

**Andrew Currie, 1% Club member and contributor to the Great American History Theatre, attended the "Joe" Play last January 16.**



## Striving to Achieve Less Bang for His Buck ...

By Henry G. Owen

It was Sunday, Nov. 24, 1963, two days after Lee Harvey Oswald killed President Kennedy. Like many Americans, Bill Strang and his wife, Lee, watched on television as Oswald was being walked down a hallway in the Dallas city jail for transport to the county jail. When Jack Ruby stepped out of the crowd and shot Oswald, “We were quite taken aback,” Strang said.

Later that Sunday, the Strangs were at the Old South Church in Boston, for a service commemorating its 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary. With TV cameras present to note the tri-centennial, the pastor had planned a homily about what Thanksgiving meant to the Pilgrims. To everyone’s surprise—and some consternation—he shifted from historical Thanksgiving to current events—calling out passionately for gun control.

That sermon—which television gave a wide audience—“caused an uproar, because of the feeling of separation of church and state,” Strang said, but “it made quite an impact on me, having to do with guns.” It also caused him to do research where he learned that, among all consumer products nationwide, only motor vehicles outpace guns, particularly handguns, as a cause of fatal injury. The impact of all this is demonstrated most profoundly by his chairmanship of Citizens for a Safer Minnesota (CSM). It’s a focal point of his philanthropy, along with aggressive support of public education and the arts.

Now in the third year of a five-year term as CSM chairman, Strang leads “a nonprofit, member-based advocacy organization dedicated to ending gun violence” by promoting public policy at the state and federal level. It was founded in 1990, in opposition to efforts to amend the state’s constitution to include a right to keep and bear arms.

Subsequent CSM issues have included safety requirements, such as childproof gunlocks and an indicator that tells whether a pistol has a cartridge in the chamber. The group also has promoted regulation of gun-show sales and background checks for purchase of firearms.

CSM cites several successes—including a law that holds an adult responsible if an improperly stored firearm harms a child, and another that bans firearms ownership by anyone convicted of domestic abuse. They were unsuccessful, however, in opposing the newly enacted concealed-carry law. Strang attributes that to a lack of attention, caused by disbelief that Minnesota “... a leader in business and political activities, education, medical advances and women’s rights would pass such a lenient bill.”

As for his philanthropic interest in education, that seed was planted when, growing up in Boston, he spent four years in the city’s premier school—Boston Latin. Founded in 1635, it’s the first U.S. public school. “After 8<sup>th</sup> grade, every teacher had a Ph.D. and was really dedicated to see that we learned,” he noted. Today that early appreciation drives his giving of

time and resources to support educational improvement in Minneapolis—with an emphasis “on kids from low-income families.”

Strang attended Boston University and received a degree in political science from the University of Colorado. Afterward, he joined Tennant Co. in Boston in 1966 to begin a 33-year career with the firm. He moved to Minneapolis in 1970 and held a variety of sales and marketing jobs before retiring as vice president in charge of exports and businesses in all regions outside North America and Europe.

He also served as a director of the Tennant Foundation for five years, which reinforced his interest in education through contacts with Minneapolis Schools. This led to personal support for activities aimed at helping pupils from low-income families. They include promoting quality teaching and providing “stable housing for families bouncing around the city, with the kids in a different school every four and five weeks.”

Together, Bill and Lee Strang support the Walker Arts Center, Guthrie Theater and St. Paul Chamber Orchestra, as well as The Loft, several dance groups and Pen Pal lectures at Hennepin County Library. Lee has been active in Habitat for Humanity locally and nationally. This includes joining several Habitat Blitzes that her husband describes as “800 people show up and build 25 houses in a week.”

It’s all part of a simple philosophy of philanthropy which, Strang says, is just “being there when they need you,” whether it’s for financial or hands-on support.



**CSM chairman and 1% Club member, Bill Strang leads a nonprofit, member-based advocacy organization dedicated to ending gun violence.**

# Caux Round Table

## For the One Percent Club

### Ownership, too, has its Responsibilities

Stephen B. Young  
Global Executive Director

Last month, Andy and Lea Fastow pleaded guilty to criminal malfeasance. Andy considered himself to be a “social-Darwinist” – a “Master of the Universe,” in author Tom Wolfe’s terminology, blessed with the right to do as he pleases with the money of others. Since only the fittest deserve to survive in Darwinism, he or she who dies with the most toys, so to speak, wins. Andy and Lea took all the money they could from Enron and ran – telling investors, customers and employees to “eat cake,” if they could. Only a few crumbs were left after the debacle.

The mutual fund industry - custodian of the assets of average Americans – was bribing brokers to divert funds into favored accounts and was paying insiders higher returns than offered to “Mr. and Mrs. America.”

Is capitalism really only a system of rapacious greed that knows no limits? Is wealth earned in business, or inherited from business, tainted money, undeserved and a source of personal guilt?

After all, as some have said after the scandals of the last two years, with Andy Fastow and Dennis Kozlowski in mind: “How many yachts can you ski behind at any one time?”

My organization, the Caux Round Table, believes that there can be redemption in capitalism, because those who own wealth can chose between moral capitalism and brute capitalism.

In his two books – *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* and *An Inquiry into the Origins and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* – Adam Smith outlined the rules of moral capitalism. Meanwhile, Herbert Spencer and his intellectual descendants (espousing rational-choice theory and Libertarianism) advocate social Darwinism or brute capitalism.

The difference between moral capitalism and brute capitalism lies in values and principles. Advocates of the former honor the moral sense within them; while those acting out a brute capitalism reject the moral sense in favor of greed and power.

A decade ago, the Caux Round Table codified guidelines for activating a moral sense in business, as Adam Smith recommended. We call these guidelines the Principles for Business. They can be found on our website: [www.cauxroundtable.org](http://www.cauxroundtable.org). These principles also are explained in my new book, *Moral Capitalism*, published in December by Berrett-Koehler in San Francisco.

One Percent Club members, such as Chuck Denny, took the lead with Japanese and European colleagues in drafting and publishing these Caux Round Table Principles for Business in 1994. They now are recognized globally as the most comprehensive business guidelines for corporate ethics and social responsibility.

The core moral philosophy supporting the principles is “self interest considered upon the whole” – the intuitive first principle that we can, in this life, both do good and do well. Pursuit of excellence in capitalism does not require us to forget our moral sense and turn into aggressive, cold-hearted Napoleons of the corporate board room who only stop when their Waterloo overtakes them.

In brute capitalism, the victory sought by selfish ambition is often stolen away by Nemesis, as Andy and Lea Fastow and the others have discovered to their great discomfort.

If principles of responsibility should govern our behavior in business, what values should govern the use of accumulated capital? Are the individual owners of wealth, like the members of the One Percent Club, immune from choosing between moral or brute capitalism?

Of course not! Not making a choice is also making a choice. Passively letting investment managers seek out the highest financial return so that we can accumulate as much money as possible is a choice in favor of the more brutish forms of capitalism.

It follow that, if principles are good for companies, they are good for the owners of companies and those who provide their firms with financial where-with-all.

The fundamental principle for ownership of wealth is stewardship - fiduciary responsibility and accountability. Wealth is to be used wisely and for good purposes; it is neither a toy nor an indulgence, but a power. And, with power, comes responsibility.

In the Judo-Christian tradition, Cain asks, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” Those who own wealth might ask: “For whom am I responsible”?

For whom must I care?

The correct response must be to respect the values and people that permitted the accumulation of wealth that has come into your hands and is under your power.

Pursuit of self-interest and provision for family needs and wishes, of course, are part of the system of private property and wealth accumulation that drives capitalism. These personal interests are morally sound, when guided by sound principles of proportionate allocation.

We must not forget that, under the principles of a moral capitalism, wealth is a social product. These principles recognize the reality of capital accumulation. Individual initiative drives the vehicle of good fortune, but roads, bridges, and fuel are equally necessary to reach the desired destination.

A system is required to create wealth. Animals cannot create capital and individuals and societies living in states of war and barbarism are seriously limited in the amount of wealth they can create. Consider Sierra Leone, Liberia, Afghanistan, and North Korea or less recently, Cambodia under Pol Pot and China during Mao's Cultural Revolution.

A recommended set of Principles for the Ownership of Wealth is as follows:

Fundamental Principle:

**The ownership of wealth entails stewardship.**

Holding wealth encompasses more than meeting self-centered desires for dominion and indulgence. There is a fiduciary aspect to the ownership of capital. Wealth also is to be consciously devoted to meeting the needs of society, of others, and the challenges of the future. Wealth should be of benefit to society, as well as to the accumulators of wealth in due proportion to each.

General Principles:

**1) Wealth should be used to enhance other forms of capital: finance, physical, human, reputational, and social.**

First, wealth should be used to sustain and improve institutions that permit the creation of wealth. Wise use of wealth avoids immediate consumption and invests in the creation of better outcomes for future generations. When wealth is invested in the creation of additional finance capital, it should invest in those businesses and productive enterprises that adhere to the Caux Round Table Principles for Business. In particular, the current wealth of advanced industrial countries (some US\$79 trillion) should be directed increasingly toward the creation of conditions for sustained economic growth in poor, developing and emerging market nations. Wealth should be used to enhance all forms of capital formation in nations that adhere to the Caux Round Table Principles for Governments.

**2) The desires of owners for self-satisfaction should be balanced against society's need for robust accumulation of new capital in all forms.**

Philanthropy is incumbent upon those who possess wealth. The social function of wealth is to finance a greater good. Those who are to inherit wealth should be expected to

assume the fiduciary responsibilities of stewardship that accompany the possession of wealth.

**3) Wealth must support the creation of social capital.**

Social capital – the reality of the social compact incubating successful wealth creation and

permitting the actualization of human dignity – is created over time by governments and civil society. From the rule of law to physical infrastructures, from the quality of a society's moral integrity and transparency of its decision-making to the depth and vitality of its culture, social capital demands investment of time, money, imagination and leadership.

Wealth should pay its fair share in taxes to support public programs enhancing social capital and should invest in the private creation of social capital through philanthropy.

**4) Wealth should be invested in institutions enhancing human capital.**

Education and culture can be funded from public budgets on a consumption basis, but wealth should shoulder the principal responsibility in a society of providing permanent endowments for institutions of education and culture.

**5) Private wealth should supplement public expenditures for the social safety net.**

Private charity and philanthropy should respond to the health and human services needs of the less fortunate.

*No one is morally entitled to the use and enjoyment of wealth procured by fraud, corruption, theft, or other abuse of power.*

Those who control wealth should make restitution of such wealth to public bodies or civil society. Use of private property rights to shelter such wealth is ethically suspect.

These guidelines serve as an antidote to those who oppose capitalism on principle and, therefore, seek government control over business, because they object to the life-styles of those who see capitalism only in terms of avarice and not the affiliated responsibility toward society as a whole that secures a future for capitalism.



**Stephen R. Young**  
Global Executive Director



**1% Club and Caux**  
Roundtable member  
**Chuck Denny**