The alternative to a left/center/right continuum may be to construct a bull’s eye in which the center of the target is the concept of “minimum necessary social intervention”. This is a dialectical concept which embodies and makes historically specific the kind of social intervention is needed. By using the word ‘social intervention’, it doesn’t assume that the source of the intervention is state intervention. Social intervention may emanate from institutional sectors other than government. It may arise from religion, from the nonprofit sector, etc. This leaves room for “thinking with the box” of the kind provided for in my other work about about the various sectors or mix of sectors to fund and deliver social interventions. In some ways, this makes the distinction between pragmatic liberalism and progressive pragmatism less relevant. In a period of minimum capacity for state intervention (such as early American states), the principle may have made reinforced classical liberalism’s belief in unfettered markets. But the fact is that in the current particular historical period we have that capacity and, moreover, many necessary social interventions are called for. However, it may also have been the case that markets and institutions were more closely intertwined all along, even in early American states. We have always had a “mixed economy” of public, nonprofit/religious and market organizations and institutions. The question is what mix do we want, who decides and what principles govern our choices? *Typological elements provided by Mimi Abramovitz (2007), “Ideological perspectives and conflicts,” Chapter 5, pp. 126-183 in Joel Blau (with Mimi Abramovitz), *The Dynamics of Social Welfare Policy*, Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.