

Something Smells At Pew

Inside Its Manipulative, Big-Money Campaign for “Campaign Finance Reform”

by David Hogberg

Summary: A bombshell revelation by a former officer of the Pew Charitable Trusts revealed the charity giant’s surreptitious but successful effort to manipulate the Congress into passing the McCain-Feingold Law. Here’s how they did it.

The March 12, 2004 seminar panel at the University of Southern California’s Annenberg School for Communication had a very dull title: “Philanthropy and Public Policy: Foundation Strategies for Social Change.” But the remarks by Sean Treglia were incendiary.

Treglia, a former vice president of the Pew Charitable Trusts, was supposed to be addressing a roomful of reporters attending an academic seminar on how the news media should cover issues in philanthropy. But a year later, courtesy of the Internet, the nation was learning a lesson in how big foundations use money to influence politics. Treglia revealed how the Pew Charitable Trusts distributed over \$20 million in grants to a network of twenty-two tax-exempt nonprofits. Their assignment? Promote new legislation to stop tax-paying individuals from spending their own money in order to participate in the political process.

On a streaming video that is available online (http://www.rhsager.com/mo/2005/03/full_treglia_vi.html), Treglia can be heard saying, “The reason why I’m telling you this—because I’m gonna tell you a story I’ve never told any reporter. And now that I’m several months away from Pew and we have campaign finance reform I can tell this story.”

Treglia had no idea that his comments would create a firestorm of controversy. In an



Sean Treglia, ex-vice president of the Pew Charitable Trusts, dropped a bombshell when he revealed the tax-exempt charity’s behind-the-scenes machinations to push campaign finance reform

exclusive interview with Capital Research Center, he argues that he has been intentionally misrepresented. “I made some remarks that were purposefully taken out of context by a group of individuals opposed to campaign finance reform to advance their political agenda. I have maintained all along that they are at best confused in their interpretations of my remarks.” (A portion of the interview appears on page 6. The full interview is available at the Capital Research Center website, <http://www.capitalresearch.com>, under “CRC Highlights.”)

However, at the seminar Treglia was not shy about describing the foundation’s efforts to spur passage of the 2002 McCain-Feingold law against “soft money.” He described what might be dubbed the “Grassroots Potemkin Strategy,” a deliberate effort to fool

members of Congress into believing that there existed broad grassroots support for specific legislation. Treglia stated, “The idea was to create an impression that a mass movement was afoot. That everywhere they [members of Congress] looked, in academic institutions, in the business community, in religious groups, in ethnic groups, everywhere, people were talking about reform.”

Without violating the tax laws requiring that its grants be publicly disclosed, how would Pew make this movement appear genuine and spontaneous? Said Treglia, “The strategy was designed not to hide Pew’s involvement... This strategy, I advised Pew that Pew should be in the background. And by law, the grantees always have to disclose. But I always encouraged the grantees to never mention Pew, and I’ll explain why in a second.”

Treglia never did say why he discouraged mention of Pew’s name, but perhaps that was obvious to the reporters.

The campaign finance incident gave Pew a big black eye. But it was hardly the first effort by the charitable behemoth to sway politicians by using its grants to create an impression on them and the news media.

June 2005

CONTENTS

Something Smells At Pew

Page 1

CRC’s Interview with Sean Treglia

Page 6

Briefly Noted

Page 8

Foundation Watch

Hijacking a Conservative Charity

The Pew Charitable Trusts is today a single 501(c)(3) public charity with total assets of \$4.1 billion. However, until last year it was comprised of seven legally separate private foundations operating under a unified administration. The four largest were the Pew Memorial Trust (2003 assets: \$2.7 billion; grants: \$175 million), the J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust (2003 assets: \$561.1 million; grants: \$37.5 million), the **Mabel Pew Myrin Trust (2003 assets: \$345 million; grants: \$25.7 million), and the J. N. Pew Jr. Charitable Trust (2003 assets: \$270.6 million; grants: \$19.7 million). Three other foundations— the Medical Trust, the Mary Anderson Trust, and the Knollbrook Trust—make few substantial grants.**

Two women were instrumental in creating the Trusts: Joseph N. Pew Jr. (1894–1963) and J. Howard Pew (1882–1971), sons of the founder of Sun Oil, Joseph Pew Sr. Both men were ardent Republicans, opponents of FDR's New Deal and firm believers in capitalism. When J. Howard Pew established the J. Howard Pew Freedom Trust in 1957, he left specific instructions that it be used to "acquaint the American people" with "the evils of bureaucracy" and "the values of the free market."

Editor: Robert James Bidinotto

Publisher: Terrence Scanlon

Foundation Watch

is published by *Capital Research Center*, a non-partisan education and research organization, classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity.

Address:

1513 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1480

Phone: (202) 483-6900

Long-Distance: (800) 459-3950

E-mail Address:

rbidinotto@capitalresearch.org

Web Site:

<http://www.capitalresearch.org>

Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

The Pews would spin in their graves if they knew what their Trusts support today. As Martin Morse Wooster observes in his book, *The Great Philanthropists and the Problem of Donor Intent* (Capital Research Center, 1998):

With the possible exception of the Barnes Foundation, the foundation that has committed the gravest violation of donor intent is the Pew Charitable Trusts. The Pews believed in free markets, limited government, and traditional virtues. They practiced their charity quietly, without any desire for publicity or fame. The professional philanthropists who succeeded them believed in self-promotion, big government, and communitarianism.

At least six Pew offspring (J. Howard Pew II, Arthur E. Pew III, J. N. Pew III, Mary Catherine Pew, R. Anderson Pew, and Richard F. Pew) are members of the Trusts fifteen-member board of directors. Anderson Pew, a nephew of Joseph Pew, is by most accounts the most active Pew family member on the board. In a 1990 interview with the *New York Times*, he claimed to be "mystified" by the Pews' conservative reputation, claiming that an aunt once participated in the Underground Railroad during the Civil War era. That she had nothing to do with establishing the Trusts was apparently immaterial. He conducted damage control for what was then the new left-wing direction in the Trusts' giving, observing that Pew grantmaking generated an "unwarranted degree of fear, which only time will cure." However, he warned that the traditional recipients of Pew largesse could expect to find themselves on the short end: "Organizations can no longer expect grants to be continued automatically and will have to demonstrate competence or get bumped by others that are better."

Yet most Pew family members are publicity shy. In 1997, when *National Journal* attempted to interview them for an article on Pew, the Trusts released a statement on the family members' behalf: "We believe it is most effective to speak with one voice. We have asked Rebecca Rimel...to speak with that voice. When she speaks, Rebecca speaks for the board as a whole."

Rebecca Rimel, the president of Pew Charitable Trusts since 1994, acquired her position by hitching her wagon to the star of former Pew president Thomas W. Langfitt. According to Wooster, it was Langfitt who set about turning Pew to the political left when he became president in 1986. Within two years he had fired most of the Pew staff and hired Rimel to be executive director. Rimel was a perfect fit. A self-described "cheerleader turned executive feminist," her goal was to infuse Pew's grantmaking with "the spirit of the 60's" and boost "access and justice for disadvantaged groups in our society." She cemented Pew's new leftist bent by hiring, among others, former Cesar Chavez activist Joshua S. Reichert to direct Pew's grants to environmental groups and former Michael Dukakis advisor Robert B. Schwartz to handle its education programming.



Rebecca Rimel, president of the Pew Charitable Trusts

That Pew should be involved in controversial grantmaking should come as little surprise to those who have watched Rimel's tenure. Writing in *Philadelphia Magazine* last year, Noel Weyrich described her as "the most feared woman" in Philadelphia with a "reputation as a thin-skinned, insecure bully with an agenda as inscrutable as she is." In local affairs Rimel has embroiled Pew in controversies by discontinuing funding for the Philadelphia Orchestra and threatening to do the same with the Kimmel Center for the Performing Arts.

But it is Pew's efforts to influence national affairs that has created the greatest controversy. For instance, in 1993 the Trusts set up the Washington, D. C.-based Pew Center for Civic Journalism, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit that received over \$12 million in Pew grants from 1991-2001 for its efforts to redirect the attention of the nation's news media to what Pew considered significant public issues. This often involved hiring a "consultant" who would "advise" a newspaper on how it should report on a story.

In one instance in 1996, Pew funded a coordinator for the *Boston Globe* whose job was to arrange community meetings providing input for the *Globe's* coverage of the presidential campaign. But according to *Globe* executive editor Helen Donovan, the Pew coordinator "assigned the stories, assembled the people for forums, dealt with polls, [and] worked with the copy desk." Incidents such as this led critics to charge that Pew was trying to direct the press to cover stories of which it approved.

Since Rimel's ascendancy, Pew has made itself the Bigfoot of environmental grantmaking. Under her guidance, Pew established the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, the Energy Foundation, the Business Environmental Leadership Council and the Heritage Forests Campaign. In 2002 Pew gave out more than \$39 million in grants to environmental groups. (See "The Pew Charitable Trusts: Global Warming Power Nexus," by Ron Arnold, *Foundation Watch*, May 2004).

Pew has been criticized for being heavy-handed in this effort, demanding that grant recipients follow its dictates—and the criticism comes from unexpected sources. Sierra Club director Carl Pope complained, "I don't think you make social change happen on the basis of paid staff in Washington and paid ads anywhere." Beth Daley of the left-leaning National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy said, "Some of us were joking that we should have a Pew liberation front committed to getting environmental organizations off the Pew dole."

Before the recent Treglia affair, Pew was last caught up in controversy when it decided to reorganize itself into a 501(c)(3) charity. Pew persuaded the IRS that its seven separate trusts met the law's requirement that a

charity have a broad base of public support. In other words, it made itself its own beneficiary. A *Wall Street Journal* editorial quoted the Foundation Management Institute's Neal B. Freeman on the irony of the transformation: "It's the perfect vicious circle. With this tax change, trusts that were set up with money from the Sun Oil Company will now be used to lobby for a Kyoto Treaty whose primary victims will be America's energy companies."

As a (c)(3) nonprofit, Pew is now free to spend its own money directly, as well as to dole out grants to other nonprofits. In addition, unlike private foundations, it can legally engage in lobbying and devote substantial sums to direct lobbying (influencing legislators) and grassroots lobbying (organizing citizens to pressure legislators.)

Given the tenor of Rimel's tenure at Pew, a scandal like the Treglia affair seems, in hindsight, to have been inevitable.

"We just never released press releases saying that we were funding these grants at the time," Treglia said. "If any reporter wanted to know, they could have connected the dots. But they didn't."

"The Stench From Pew"

New York Post columnist Ryan Sager was first to expose Pew's attempt to deceive the public on the source of support for campaign finance reform in a March 17, 2005 article. The news snowballed through the blogosphere (PennyWit called it a "well-orchestrated scam," while RedState.org wondered, "How can such a discredited measure continue as the law of the land?") and major news organizations soon picked up the story. There was a report on FoxNews, and editorial writer John Fund wrote a scathing piece, "Astroturf Politics," in the *Wall Street Journal*. The *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review* editorialized that "Congress must demand that Pew's tax-exempt status be revoked for engaging in politics." The *New York Post* followed up its Sager report with a withering editorial, "The Stench From Pew."

Treglia claimed his remarks were misconstrued for political purposes, while Rebecca Rimel loftily asserted that Pew's

actions and motives were, as always, unsailable. In an indignant letter responding to Sager's *New York Post* column, Rimel dismissed the brouhaha as an attempt by opponents "to reverse the demonstrable positive progress that has been made to improve campaigns in the United States."

Rimel's statements do not reassure. To assess whether the campaign finance controversy rises to the level of scandal, three questions must be addressed:

- First, did Pew attempt to create a false impression among members of Congress that a grassroots movement existed for campaign finance reform?
- Second, did Pew attempt to conceal its efforts from the media?
- And third, if Pew did create a false impression, was it crucial to the passage of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance law?

In his recorded remarks at the Annenberg School, Treglia indicated that Pew was worried that the best-known advocates of campaign finance reform were not politically powerful enough to achieve their goals. He said, "the old advocacy groups, the Common Causes, the PIRGs who were calling for reform, had lost legitimacy inside Washington because they didn't have a constituency that would punish Congress if they didn't vote for reform." Treglia then described his plan to deal with the problem:

We wanted to expand the voice calling for reform to include the business community, to include minority organizations and to include religious groups, to counter the Christian Coalition. The target audience for all this activity was 535 people in Washington. The idea was to create an impression that a mass movement was afoot. That everywhere they

[members of Congress] looked, in academic institutions, in the business community, in religious groups, in ethnic groups, everywhere, people were talking about reform.

Surely Pew's grantmaking was designed to achieve that result. Between 1996-2001, Pew gave academic institutions, minority and religious groups, business organizations and civic groups a boatload of money to promote changes in campaign finance law.

Pew grants went to Brigham Young University (\$3,052,000), Colby College in Maine (\$2,796,000), George Washington University (\$1,711,000), the University of Southern California (\$1,955,000), University of Utah (\$1,248,200) and the University of Virginia Law School (\$500,000). Via the Colby College grant, Pew gave money to a minority nonprofit, the Greenlining Institute, and a religious nonprofit, the Interfaith Alliance Foundation. Pew grants went to the Committee for Economic Development (\$1,200,000), the Alliance for Better Campaigns (\$350,000), Campaign Finance Institute (\$1,801,831), Center for Public Integrity (\$607,000) and the League of Women Voters Education Fund (\$1,210,000). Pew also funded an environmental group, the National Environmental Trust (\$256,000), and even a few right-leaning groups like the American Enterprise Institute (\$1,093,000), Citizens for a Sound Economy (\$225,000) and the Hudson Institute (\$270,000).

As a Pew vice president responsible for the foundation's campaign finance initiative, Treglia knew that his enormous advocacy effort could fall apart if its intended subject recognized Pew's hidden hand. He explained to the Annenberg class, "Having been on the Hill I knew that...if Congress thought this was a Pew effort, it'd be worthless. It'd be 20 million bucks thrown down the drain." Treglia devised a way to avoid that: "So, in order, in essence, to convey the impression that this was something coming naturally from outside the Beltway, I felt it was best that Pew stay in the background." Treglia added that in his opinion this "wasn't stealth."

In his interview with CRC, Treglia claims that members of the press knew Pew was a leading funder of research on campaign finance reform:

[I]t would be virtually impossible for them to miss. For example, along with all the disclosure...Pew periodically sent out fact sheets to various journalists that outlined all the grants and projects it was funding on the issue...The day after reform was passed I think Jim Drinkard of *USA Today* had a page one story with his assessment of winners and losers under the new law. He placed Pew in the winners column because of all the research that had been funded on the issue. I think he based his assessment in part on a fact sheet Pew had sent the media listing the various projects.

"The target audience for all this activity was 535 people in Washington," Treglia said. "The idea was to create an impression that a mass movement was afoot. That everywhere they looked, in academic institutions, in the business community, in religious groups, in ethnic groups, everywhere, people were talking about reform."

There is reason to doubt this. A Lexis/Nexis search does reveal a March 19, 2002 article on winners and losers by Jim Drinkard shortly after passage of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance law. But Pew is not on the list. Instead, Drinkard lists Pew as a winner in a much later December 2003 article about the Supreme Court decision that upheld McCain-Feingold as constitutional.

Perhaps Treglia was simply confused. But there are other reasons to question the extent of press awareness of the Pew role. Why else would Treglia tell his audience that this was a story he had "never told any reporter"? Furthermore, why was he so concerned about a March 2001 George Will column that nearly exposed Pew's role?

We had a scare. As the debate was progressing and getting pretty close, George Will stumbled across a report that we had done and attacked it in his column. And a lot of his partisans were becoming aware of Pew's role and were feeding him information. And he started to reference the fact that Pew had played a large role in this—that this was a liberal attempt to hoodwink Congress. But you know what the good news is from my perspective? Journalists didn't care... So no one followed up on the story. And so there was a panic there for a couple of weeks because we thought the story was going to begin to gather steam, and no one picked it up.

When asked about this by CRC, Treglia replied, "I was always uncomfortable with the idea that Pew might get dragged into the substance of the debate. Pew was a funder, not a grantee." Yet during the Q&A period of his talk at Annenberg, Treglia again suggested that the Pew strategy at the time was to keep the press in the dark:

The reality is we did everything by the letter of the law. All of our grantees disclosed that they were Pew grantees. We disclosed on our 990s and on our annual reports that we gave to all these people. We just never released press releases saying that we were funding these grants at the time. If any reporter wanted to know, they could have connected the dots. But they didn't.

A search of grantee websites reveals that several Pew-supported groups—Alliance for Better Campaigns, Campaign Finance Institute, Center for Public Integrity and the Center for Responsive Politics—did mention their Pew grants. But search the section of Pew's website that lists its press releases and you find that Treglia was telling the truth: There is no evidence that Pew issued any press releases announcing its sizeable and numerous grants promoting campaign finance reform before McCain-Feingold became law.



“Spinning in his grave”: conservative philanthropist J. Howard Pew, a founder the Pew Charitable Trusts

That may have determined the lack of press awareness of Pew’s role in what had been one of the most hotly debated public issues. Surely reporters would have been more cognizant of Pew’s grants for campaign finance reform had it issued the sorts of press releases it circulates for its other areas of interest. Did it really expect reporters to rummage through Pew tax forms and annual reports or search grantee websites to “connect the dots”? By leaving the press uninformed about its involvement in the issue, Pew let Congress think an array of pre-selected groups represented a true grassroots phenomenon. How convenient.

In his interview with Capital Research Center, Treglia downplayed the importance of Pew’s involvement:

The politics of the reform debate had its own life cycle separate and apart from what any foundation was funding. The noteworthy junctures include the public disgust with money in politics that blossomed in the early 1990s in the wake of the Clinton White House soft money scandals. Next, Senator John McCain’s presidential campaign provided the movement with a unifying national voice. Finally, the Enron debacle followed by a host of crippling

accounting scandals in the corporate sector whetted the public appetite for reform.

Yet the history of the McCain-Feingold law’s passage in March 2002 does not support Treglia’s current account.

Two national elections in 1998 and 2000 occurred after the 1996 Clinton campaign finance scandal and no candidate had lost election over the issue of campaign finance reform. Moreover, Senator John McCain failed to win his presidential bid. Didn’t that show that most of the voting public was not excited by advocates of campaign finance reform?

Indeed, a January 2002 public opinion poll—conducted by the Pew Research Center!—showed that only 23 percent of respondents said campaign finance was a priority issue for them. Out of the twenty-two public issues rated, campaign finance reform ranked dead last. (Online at <http://people-press.org/reports/priit.php3?ReportID=147>)

Contrary to his current claims, at his Annenberg talk Treglia suggested Pew’s involvement was *crucial* to the outcome. “We funded business communities, minority groups, religious groups. When you talk to people in Washington about this, they will tell you the turning point in the debate was when key elements in the business community stood up and said we want campaign finance reform.”

To get the business community on board, Treglia approached the Committee on Economic Development:

We said, here’s what your community thinks about money and the role of money [in politics]. Can you guys go out and pitch a campaign finance project? I negotiated with them for a year because they were afraid to do it initially. And they finally agreed. In the end they got guys like Warren Buffet, and Sony, major Fortune 500 companies to support this. And the day before the vote on McCain-Feingold in the Senate, McCain stood up there with Tom Daschle and a

whole bunch of business leaders you would recognize in support of reform and it was, you know, the crowning moment.

Treglia may now say that the Pew-led coalition of groups and foundations “had nothing to do with” pushing the political forces in the debate. But his March 2004 talk at Annenberg made Pew’s key role clear.

The Fallout Continues

Sean Treglia may reasonably claim that he did not hide Pew’s involvement in the fight to shut down individual spending on political party activities. But he certainly avoided doing anything to alert the press or to generate press inquiries about Pew grant support for groups promoting campaign finance legislation. In short, he avoided doing anything not required by law that would jeopardize the Grassroots Potemkin Strategy.

We now live with the fallout from McCain-Feingold, and the problems of campaign finance seem worse than ever.

(Continued on page 7)

You can probe the backgrounds of many of the organizations profiled in *Foundation Watch* by visiting our online database at

www.capitalresearch.org

You can also retrieve past issues of CRC newsletters, including

***Organization Trends*
Foundation Watch
Labor Watch
*Compassion and Culture***

Past issues may be ordered for \$2.50 each. Orders must be prepaid. For information or credit card orders, call (800) 459-3950.

Or mail your check to:

**Capital Research Center,
1513 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036**

Excerpts of CRC's Interview With Sean Treglia

(Note: The complete interview appears on the CRC website, www.capitalresearch.org)

Q: In your statement on the journalist training web site where your speech is posted, you seemed to back away from your remarks that have been featured in various blogs. Were any of the controversial parts of your remarks accurate?

A: I think that is the wrong question. I made some remarks that were purposefully taken out of context by a group of individuals opposed to campaign finance reform to advance their political agenda. I have maintained all along that they are at best confused in their interpretation of my remarks. By way of background, it is helpful to summarize the accusations made on the blogs, to wit: As an executive at The Pew Charitable Trusts, I led a hidden liberal conspiracy over the course of the better part of a decade that duped Congress, the President and the Supreme Court into passing and upholding the constitutionality of campaign finance reform. The conspiracy consisted of a group of eight of the nation's largest and most prestigious foundations, included all of the mainstream media who were silent co-conspirators, and was accomplished through hidden foundation grants to phony groups and organizations. As the story goes, I then delivered a secret speech (that just happened to be taped and which was later uncovered by a blogger) in which I describe the details of the conspiracy.

Q: Did you expect that Congress would see any of the research?

A: Yes, Congress and everyone else who cared about the issue including the Federal Election Commission, scholars, the media, think-tanks, the White House, etc. We hoped the grantees would talk about their work, get it into circulation in the policy community—that was the point. For example, it was common practice for grantees to write op-eds about their research findings, promote the research reports to the media, mail the reports to policy makers at the Federal Election Commission, make presentations at conferences, appear on the nightly news discussion their findings, etc.

Q: The op-eds, promotion in the media, etc. Isn't that part of the politics of reform?

A: It might be useful to define our terms because I understand that the word "politics" can mean different things to different people. The politics of the reform debate had its own life cycle separate and apart from what any foundation was funding. The noteworthy junctures include the public disgust with money in politics that blossomed in the early 1990's in the wake of the Clinton White House soft money scandals. Next, Senator John McCain's presidential campaign provided the movement with a unifying national voice. Finally, the Enron debacle followed by a host of crippling accounting scandals in the corporate sector whetted the public appetite for reform. Some may quibble with the details of my summary but generally I believe it represents a brief but accurate overview of the political forces driving campaign finance reform. Foundations had nothing to do with those forces.

Q: Why did George Will's column scare you?

A: Again, personally I was always uncomfortable with the idea that Pew might get dragged into the substance of the debate. Pew was a funder not a grantee. To be fair I should mention that others at Pew did not share my view on the topic.

Q: But if you wanted the press to cover your strategy, why would Will's column scare you? He could have simply used what was covered in the press against you.

A: Pew talking about which projects it funded is very different from Pew getting drawn in and expressing its opinion about the merits of this or that research report or campaign finance proposal. In my opinion it was the grantees' role as scholars and experts on the topic to weigh in on the merits of the research and various proposals (within certain limits proscribed by law), it was Pew's role to talk about the people and organizations it funded. That was how I viewed it at least. To be clear, different foundation officers will have different views on this topic (and probably all the issues I discuss with you today) and I don't think there is any correct opinion. I am simply expressing my personal views as I shared them with the journalists that day.

(continued from page 5)

Rather than remove big money from politics, campaign laws insure that candidates can't be held accountable for much of the money spent by others on their campaigns. Money is hard to track and there is more of it than ever before. One example: George Soros, originally a supporter of campaign finance reform, dumped over \$27 million into the 2004 election to various 527 political groups in his effort to defeat President Bush.

The new law also seems to directly threaten free speech. The Federal Elections Commission is now exploring whether or not to regulate the content of blogs, the popular websites that circulate extensive discussion of public issues.

There may be more to come. In his Annenberg talk Treglia said, "I'll tell you that about two years ago, when I

knew that reform was going to come, I wrote another strategy paper. I'm not going to bore you with all those details, but it's unfolding now. And the things that you're seeing in Washington, around campaign finance reform, aren't by mistake. So if you want to learn about that we can talk more later."

Unfortunately, the conference participants didn't take Sean Treglia up on his offer. *FW*

David Hogberg is the editor of "Educationwatch" and "Greenwatch," CRC's online research programs. He also co-hosts "Organization Watch," CRC's monthly radio program.

The work of the Capital Research Center continues solely through the generosity of our contributors.

Please remember Capital Research Center in your will and estate planning.

Thank you for your support.

Terrence Scanlon, President

New from CRC...

Capital Research Center's

GUIDE TO NONPROFIT ADVOCACY

by Christopher Morris

CRC's invaluable "who's who" among leading advocacy groups: their finances, their leaders, their agendas.

Concise profiles of 80 major organizations, plus thumbnail sketches of conservative state policy groups.

Single copy \$10, or three for \$25

To order, call
800-459-3950

The Politics of Peace What's Behind the Anti-War Movement?

By John J. Tierney

The leaders of the "anti-war" movement today are leftists who oppose capitalism and believe in socialism.

Many are communists.

At root, they are anti-American rather than anti-war.

Anti-war groups have their own outlets for propaganda, employ sophisticated tactics and exploit modern information technology to give their messages instant and global reach.

In this important new book from Capital Research Center, international affairs expert Dr. John J. Tierney traces the leftist ideological roots of this influential movement, and exposes its strategies and objectives.

Single copy \$20

Three or more only \$15 each.

To order, call

800-459-3950

or mail your check and order to:

Capital Research Center

1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

PhilanthropyNotes

Taxpayers, listen up. In late April **Cybercast News Service (CNS)** reported that the **Open Society Institute**, founded and funded by liberal billionaire financier **George Soros**, had received \$ 30,454,031 from 1998-2003 (excluding 1999) from the federal government. Then in mid-May CNSNews revealed that the “**U.S. Agency for International Development** has allegedly supported needle exchange programs in Central Asia...by giving taxpayer dollars to groups like George Soros’ Open Society Institute, which support needle exchange programs.” This news did not sit well with **Representative Mark Souder**, chair of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources. “Not only is USAID exercising bad judgment by supporting the facilitation of so-called ‘clean needle programs,’ he said, “but the agency may be violating U.S. Government policy, which prohibits the purchase of materials used in conjunction with a needle exchange program.”

In the *American Spectator* online, **Capital Research Center** Senior Research Associate **David Hogberg** examined the agenda of those groups involved in the recent Cover The Uninsured Week (CTUW). The prime mover behind CTUW is the **Robert Wood Johnson Foundation**, whose agenda could not be clearer: “[I]nsofar as achieving universal coverage,” wrote former Robert Wood Johnson Foundation president **Steven Schroeder**, “government functions as a legitimate public servant.” Since 1999, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation also funds many groups involved in CTUW that have government-run health care agenda, including the **AARP** (\$4.8 million), the **Service Employees International Union** (\$350,000), **Healthcare Leadership Council** (\$397,000) and **Families USA** (\$7.3 million).

The May 10 issue of the *New York Times* reports that the **Ford Foundation** is launching its largest initiative to support nonprofit media in more than a quarter century. Ford will send \$50 million over five years “to a baker’s dozen of public television, radio and other media organizations,” according to the report. A key focus will be “to spur the creation and distribution of public affairs programming, particularly programs dealing with international affairs.” Recipients of the biggest grants will be the **Public Broadcasting Service** (PBS) and **National Public Radio** (NPR), receiving \$10 million and \$7.5 million respectively. Other beneficiaries of Ford’s largess will be **Link TV**, “a television network devoted to explaining the rest of the world to the United States”; the **Sundance Documentary Fund**, which backs human rights documentaries; and **New California Media**, “a consortium of more than 600 print, television, radio and Internet outlets devoted to ethnic news.” “No doubt this will be seen by conservatives as an ideological initiative,” said **Tim Graham** of the conservative watchdog group **Media Research Center**. Citing the Ford Foundation’s long-standing support of leftist causes, and liberal groups such as **Fairness and Accuracy in Reporting**, Graham said that the new initiative “seems to be taking public broadcasting and tilting it away from the viewpoint of a lot of taxpayers.”

The **George Marshall Institute** recently released a report titled “Funding Flows for Climate Change Research and Related Activities.” The report details the recipients of government and foundation resources for research on global warming. Among the findings: The federal government spent over \$2 billion on climate-change research in FY 2004; foundations spend a minimum of \$35-50 million annually on climate-change research that is produced by non-profits and universities; from 2002-2002 the top five foundations funding this research were the **Energy Foundation**, the **Pew Charitable Trusts**, the **William and Flora Hewlett Foundation**, the **Turner Foundation** and the **Rockefeller Brothers Fund**; meanwhile, the five biggest recipients were **Strategies for the Global Environment**, the **Energy Foundation**, **Natural Resources Defense Council**, the **Union of Concerned Scientists** and **Environmental Defense**. (The report can be accessed online at <http://www.marshall.org/article.php?id=289>.)

FW

