

## Historically Untrustworthy

*How the Trust for Historic Preservation works against property rights*

**By Peyton Knight**

**Summary:** *The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a congressionally chartered nonprofit established to protect and administer properties important to our nation's history. But its mission has grown to include entire communities and landscapes that it wants to add to its list of protected sites. The Trust has become an anti-growth advocate that values preservation over property rights.*

**T**he National Park Service and others will use the National Register as a bludgeon against the property owner and trample his property rights, if they can. To them, your property, once listed, is just a 'resource'; to them, it is not a home." Last April homeowner Peter Blackman made this appeal to members of Congress at a hearing of the House Subcommittee on National Parks.

Blackman objects to the Park Service's decision to place his home on the National Register, a federal historic designation that carries significant regulatory baggage. He says he has become a virtual tenant on his own property and that his most minor renovation plans are now subject to the review of federal bureaucrats.

That is just the way the National Trust for Historic Preservation would have it. Testifying on the same panel, the Trust's vice president for public policy, Emily Wadhams, countered Blackman's plea with a bit of revisionist history: "[P]rivate property rights have never been allowed to take precedence over our shared national values and the preservation of our country's heritage." Wadhams' hostility to the traditional American understanding of property rights is symptomatic of the



Woodlawn Plantation in Alexandria, Virginia, was the first property the National Trust administered and acquired.

modern-day National Trust, but it wasn't always this way.

The U.S. Congress chartered the National Trust in 1949 as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit charity to "receive donations of sites, buildings, and objects significant in American history and culture, to preserve and administer them for public benefit, to accept, hold, and administer gifts of money, securities, or other property of whatsoever character for the purpose of carrying out the preservation program." It has received ample donations: in its 2003 tax filing (the most recent available), the National Trust boasts total revenue of \$65,715,572 with net assets of \$158,175,241.

True to its charter, the National Trust in 1951 took over administration of the Woodlawn Plantation, a gift from George Washington to his nephew, Major Lawrence

Lewis. Six years later, the Trust acquired the Alexandria, Virginia property outright. Since then it has obtained 25 other historic sites ranging from Frank Lloyd Wright's home and studio in Oak Park, Illinois to James Madison's home in Montpelier, Virginia.

### November 2005

#### CONTENTS

The Trust for  
Historic Preservation  
Page 1

Exposing "ExxposeExxon"  
Page 7

Philanthropy Notes  
Page 8

Yet along the way, the interests of the National Trust began to shift away from acquiring and administering historic properties so that today the Trust seeks to preserve “the neighborhoods and landscapes they anchor.” The Trust champions the “Smart Growth” movement, which seeks to check suburban sprawl by limiting land development to designated growth areas (preferably served not by highways but by rail and other forms of mass transit). The National Trust is now less concerned with true historic preservation than with stamping out development—and it tramples on property rights to get its way.

~~In a recent interview for~~ *Washingtonian* magazine, National Trust President Richard Moe acknowledges his foundation’s shift in focus. “For years the preservation movement was limited in its goal and its appeal, which was primarily to those who cared about the houses of—to use the old phrase—‘dead white males,’” Moe tellingly said. “Now we’re trying to preserve communities.”

But the way the National Trust seeks to “preserve communities” is also changing. Now it is less by preserving historic sites that it acquires and protects and more by lobbying federal, state, and local legisla-

tures for tightened restrictions on land use—restrictions that affect everyone from enterprising developers to small property owners.

## The Money Trail

Richard Moe has been president of the Trust since 1993, but before that he was a Democratic Party operative. A 1959 Williams College graduate with a J.D. from the University of Minnesota Law School, he became chairman of the Minnesota Democratic Farmer Labor Party at age 32. In 1972 he moved to Washington, D.C. to serve on the staff of Senator Walter Mondale. Five years later, he was chief of staff to Vice President Mondale and a member of President Carter’s senior staff. During the Reagan-Bush years he was a Washington, D.C. attorney with the New York firm of Davis, Polk & Wardwell and continued to perform Party chores, including advising House majority leader Dick Gephardt during his 1988 presidential bid and acting as trustee for a legal trust fund set up for two aides to Vermont Senator Pat Leahy who were suspected of leaking information about Supreme Court nominee Clarence Thomas in 1992. Moe’s liberal credentials no doubt have helped him secure funds for the Trust, whose donor list reads like a guest list for a Democratic fundraiser.

When Moe became its president, the Trust had a \$35 million budget and about \$7 million in total came from the federal government. But the handwriting was on the wall when Republicans took over control of the House of Representatives in 1995. House Republicans then were demanding that nonprofits lose taxpayer funding if they engaged in political advocacy—and advocacy was precisely the direction Moe intended for the Trust. Even though Tom Delay lost a 1995 vote (281 to 129) on his amendment to zero out the Trust’s annual appropriations, Moe concluded that it was best to cut a deal: if Congress would guarantee three more years of taxpayer support, the Trust would voluntarily surrender its \$3.5 million in appropriations for general operations in 1998.

Grants from federal agencies declined—a little—after 1998. Grants from the National Endowment for the Arts went from \$130,000 in 1997 and \$174,000 in 1998 to \$25,000 in 1999 and \$5,000 in 2000. However, the Trust has received grants since 1998 from the National

Endowment for the Humanities (\$246,000 in 1999 and \$229,000 in 2000), and from the Environmental Protection Agency (\$19,578 in 2004). Taxpayers and commuters who spend hours each day mired in traffic should take special note that from 2001 to 2004 the Trust expended almost \$600,000 in federal grant money from the Department of Transportation for “transit planning research.” Given the National Trust’s vehement opposition to most road construction and highway improvements, one wonders whether the DOT could have spent this public money more wisely.

In his *Washingtonian* interview, Moe admits the Trust’s efforts to “lobby” for the National Park Service, a federal agency with a history of antagonism toward landowners and private property rights. A cozy relationship with the Park Service pays off: in 2003 the

---

*“For years the preservation movement was limited in its goal and its appeal, which was primarily to those who cared about the houses of—to use the old phrase—‘dead white males,’” Moe tellingly said.*

---

Trust spent \$8,769,309 in federal grant money. The bulk of that money came from the Department of Interior—the federal agency within which the Park Service resides.

The Park Service certainly gets what it pays for. The Trust is a vocal supporter of the National Park Service, often helping it acquire new historic sites—this at a time when the Park Service is running a maintenance backlog estimated to be from \$6 to 10 billion. Park critics observe that the agency cannot care for the land and monuments it already possesses, which is taking its toll on many of our national treasures. The physical foundation

---

**Editor:** Joseph de Feo

**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:**  
jdefeo@capitalresearch.org

**Web Site:**  
<http://www.capitalresearch.org>

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

---

of the visitor center at the USS Arizona Memorial in Hawaii is crumbling. Ancient stone structures are collapsing at Chaco Culture National Historical Park in New Mexico. Historic structures at Pennsylvania's Gettysburg National Military Park need rehabilitation and repair. It's odd that the National Trust wants to entrust more land and monuments to the Park Service's crumbling fiefdom.

To compensate for its loss of taxpayer funds for general support, Moe has consulted his rolodex. The Trust, which was getting just two percent of its funding from foundations before Moe took charge, now receives about one-fifth of its revenue from foundations, according to the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. In 2003, the Rockefeller Foundation gave \$300,000 to the National Trust, as did the Ford Foundation. The Public Welfare Foundation gave \$50,000 in 2004. The Pew Charitable Trusts gave a whopping \$10,000,000 to the Trust in 1999, and chipped in another \$300,000 two years later. The Gates Family foundation gave \$500,000 in 2003. The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation gave \$2,500,000 in 2001. The Barr Foundation gave \$375,000 in 2001 and \$125,000 in 2002. The Trust also received \$50,000 from the Turner Foundation in 2001. Most of this grant money was earmarked for general operating funds, although the Turner grant was specifically directed toward the Trust's campaign against so-called "big-box" retail stores, mega-schools, and "sprawl." Richard Moe sits on the board of directors of the Ford Foundation, which channeled a total of \$550,000 to the National Trust between 2002 and 2003. These grantmakers also fund the many environmental groups that pay scant regard to property rights.

The National Trust has provided seed money to Smart Growth America, a consortium of organizations dedicated to restricting land use nationwide, and Trust president Richard Moe sits on the group's board of directors. Smart Growth America's list of member organizations is a Who's Who of anti-property rights ideologues, including Environmental Defense, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Biodiversity Project, and Friends of the Earth.

If you read Smart Growth America's literature, the National Trust's new course is clear. Among the group's claims: Road construc-

tion leads to traffic jams, and new subdivisions promote social inequity and divide people by income and race. Best of all—if stricter land-use regulations and zoning



Richard Moe, president of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, makes ample use of his left-wing rolodex to help fund the Trust.

aren't implemented soon "one in four of today's kids will suffer from diabetes as an adult if trends continue." How to save the children? According to Smart Growth America, abandon your cars and make the kids walk.

*New Democrat* spells out his intent: "Smart Growth's appeal is an outgrowth of several movements. The first is the kind of public choices made in Portland, Ore., where voters and elected leaders have protected open space at the urban edge while encouraging 'in-fill' development in the core."

What a difference a few years make. On November 2, 2004, Oregonians overwhelmingly rejected Moe's personal utopia of strict land-use control by passing a ballot initiative, Measure 37. Passed by a 61 to 39 percent margin, the initiative simply states that property owners must be fairly compensated when state or local land use regulations to devalue their property. If government chooses not to compensate the regulatory victim, it must either modify the rule so it has no adverse effect on the property owner or waive the regulation altogether.

This matter of simple fairness seemed like common sense to the citizens of Oregon. But it is anathema to the National Trust, which teamed up with The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club, 1000 Friends of Oregon, and Defenders of Wildlife in a campaign to deny Oregonians relief from land-use regulation. The Trust's director of state and local policy, Constance Beaumont, penned an opinion piece for the Portland *Oregonian* that railed against Measure 37 and even claimed that home values would plummet if property rights were respected and more development allowed. Judging by Measure 37's wild popularity, Oregon voters were not persuaded.

---

*The National Trust has provided seed money to Smart Growth America, a consortium of organizations dedicated to restricting land use nationwide....*

---

### Supporting Ballot Measures

Moe is modeling his plans to restrict development on a 1973 Oregon law requiring every local government to calculate the amount of land it needs to accommodate growth during the next 20 years. The planning agency then draws a circle, called an urban growth boundary, around that land. It concentrates development inside the circle while restricting development outside it. Writing with former Clinton speechwriter Carter Wilkie, Moe in a 1999 article in *The*

Oregon resident Gary Dye posed an excellent question to Beaumont's diatribe: "[W]here is her concern for the person who loses most if not all of the value of his land because the government has effectively transferred it to the public through environmental restrictions? I see her using the same arguments that I've seen before from the environmentalist crowd." The latter is a shrewd observation—the Trust frequently uses environmental regulations for its own anti-development purposes.

## FoundationWatch

In 1995 the National Trust helped bankroll the opposition to a similar property rights initiative in the state of Washington. Referendum 48 would have required governments to compensate property owners for regulations, particularly environmental ones, that reduced the value of their land. The initiative also would have required local governments in Washington to conduct economic impact studies before enacting land-use restrictions.



The National Trust opposed a highway project near the Chancellorsville battlefield in Virginia because the proposed artery “would pass within a mile of the park boundary.”

Referendum 48 had nothing to do with historic preservation, but that did not stop the National Trust from joining the “No On Referendum 48” campaign. According to the *Washington Post*, the Trust was one of the “top contributors” to the opposition, which raised a reported \$850,000 from such liberal stalwarts as the Sierra Club, the League of Women Voters, the Washington State Labor Council, and “wealthy environmentalists from Seattle, Colorado and Pennsylvania.” The bill was defeated by a 3-2 margin.

### In the Courts

Another tactic the Trust uses is to file *amicus curiae* (friend of the court) briefs in land-regulation lawsuits. These supporting statements are another way the Trust promotes its agenda, since as a 501(c)(3) public charity it is prohibited from spending a “substantial” portion of its revenue on lobbying.

In 2001, the National Trust filed an *amicus* brief with the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Tahoe Sierra Preservation Council, Inc.*

*v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*. The Trust opposed efforts by Lake Tahoe-area landowners who wanted compensation for losses they suffered when the California/Nevada bi-state Tahoe Regional Planning Agency slapped a thirty-two month development moratorium on their land in the early 1980s. The Trust applauded when the Court in 2002 ruled 6-3 against the property owners, holding that if a temporary moratorium were considered a taking it would impose an unrea-

sonable financial obligation upon governments. (The dissenters were Rehnquist, Scalia and Thomas.)

Also in 2001 the Trust joined a Preservation League of New York lawsuit opposing construction of a factory by St. Lawrence Cement in the Hudson River Valley. The Trust claimed the factory would be visible from 87 historic sites, would “have an adverse effect on the historic resources of the Hudson River Valley, and therefore, New York State *environmental* permits should be denied” (emphasis added). The Trust was not above using whatever laws could accomplish its end—and environmental protection laws are an easy tool for restricting property rights. This year, after a five-year battle, the New York State Department of State succumbed to pressure from the environmental and historic preservation lobby and killed the proposed plant.

*Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, a 1992 takings case decided by the U.S.

Supreme Court, remains one of the biggest barriers to the type of land-use planning favored by the National Trust. In that case, landowner David Lucas won compensation for his lost property rights after the state agency invoked a 1988 state law to bar him from building a home on two vacant ocean-front lots he purchased in 1986 for \$975,000. In a decision written by Justice Scalia, the court ruled 6-3 that the act had rendered Lucas’s property “valueless” and that the owner was entitled to compensation. (The dissenters were Blackmun, Stevens, and Souter.) Interestingly, after the state compensated Lucas, it sold the lots to a developer whom it encouraged to apply for a permit to build the maximum size house possible so that the state could be paid the highest possible price.

This case had nothing to do with historic preservation. Still, the National Trust joined the Sierra Club and the Humane Society in filing *amicus* briefs against Lucas and his right to compensation for what Justice Scalia concluded was a total taking of his land.

On June 23, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 5-4 that the city of New London, Connecticut could use the power of eminent domain to take Susette Kelo’s property. The case generated over forty *amicus* briefs from both supporters of land use planning and defenders of the homeowners. The National Trust’s non-response is noteworthy. The Trust’s online news report noted the historic character of many of the homeowner properties condemned by the city and it pronounced the ruling “bad news to many preservationists.” However, it did not actually condemn the decision and it did not submit an *amicus* brief in this case. Curious. To be fair to the Trust, it invited attorney Scott Bullock of the Institute for Justice (which represented Susette Kelo) to address its national meeting in September; its final position on eminent domain remains to be seen.

### Endangered Historic Places

For the past 17 years, the Trust has enjoyed widespread publicity by releasing an annual list of what it deems “America’s 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.” According to the Trust, the places are threatened by “inappropriate development or insensitive public policy.” Much ballyhooed, the list is

designed to grab media attention and generate activism to “save” whatever the Trust considers endangered. Many of the listings fail the laugh test.

For instance, in 1993, the year Richard Moe assumed its leadership, the Trust put the entire state of Vermont on the “most

---

*The Trust’s publicity-seeking is not about historic preservation. It is about dictating land-use practices right down to the width of the roads.*

---

endangered” list. “Vermont was the only state without a Wal-Mart,” it declared, noting that the state now faced “an invasion of behemoth stores.” Did Congress envision this sort of anti-corporate scaremongering when it first chartered the Trust?

In 1998 the National Trust listed every “historically black college” in America (712 in all) as endangered. In 1999, all of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania made the Trust’s list of eleven, along with the west side of downtown Baltimore and the east side of downtown San Diego.

The Chancellorsville Battlefield in Virginia also appeared on the 1998 list. Lamenting that most of the land in the designated battlefield “is still privately owned,” the Trust called for help so that the National Park Service could acquire the area before motels and fast food outlets made their move. “With land values skyrocketing, the National Park Service needs financial assistance to acquire and preserve key parts of the battlefield that are still subject to development,” says the Trust.

The Trust joined with the National Parks Conservation Association and the Civil War Preservation Trust to create a “Coalition to Save Chancellorsville Battlefield.” In 2003, it successfully lobbied the Spotsylvania County board of supervisors to stop a proposed housing development and thwarted

construction of a much-needed “outer connector” that would bring traffic relief to the heavily congested area. The Trust opposed the highway project because the planned artery “would pass within a mile of the park boundary.”

Private ownership is a major problem for the Trust. In 2000 the Red Mining District in Colorado made the list. The problem: “the fact that much of land is privately owned.” The Trust’s solution: “Transferring each privately held piece of the Red Mountain Mining District into public ownership.” On its website, the Trust makes a pitch for more federal funding. Never mind that landowners within the district might not want to sell.

The 2005 list includes a 175-mile corridor stretching from Gettysburg, Pennsylvania to Monticello, Virginia as a “place” most in need of saving. Dubbed “The Journey Through Hallowed Ground” Corridor, the Trust laments “new subdivisions” and roads that have been “straightened and widened to accommodate traffic,” that threaten the area’s heritage.

“Without comprehensive planning to manage sprawl and encourage appropriate growth, much of the region’s heritage could be paved over,” Moe reports. Of course, no one plans to raze Monticello or build an office park in the middle of the Gettysburg battlefield. These and other historic places are already protected. The Trust’s publicity-seeking isn’t about historic preservation. It’s about dictating land-use practices right down to the width of the roads.

The National Trust is lobbying for the 175-mile swath to be designated a National Heritage Area. To date the National Park Service has established 27 such areas, creating a boundary around a specific region and committing federal funds to its preservation. Far from innocuous designations, National Heritage Areas are a backdoor attempt at federal zoning.

Another “endangered historic place” on the 2005 list is the National Landscape Conservation System, a series of publicly owned and protected monuments, trails, rivers, and wilderness areas in 12 western states. The system comprises 26 million acres and is currently managed—poorly—by the Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

The Trust’s solution, of course, is to lobby for more money and staffing at BLM.

**Large Homes and Drugstores: A National Epidemic?**

In 2002, Richard Moe told the *Washington Post* that “a national epidemic” gripped the nation. Cancer? AIDS? The flu? Not quite. Moe was decrying the age-old “epidemic” of

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

**You can probe the backgrounds of many of the organizations profiled in *Foundation Watch* by visiting our online database at [www.capitalresearch.org](http://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**

property owners razing their homes to replace them with homes more to their liking.

“Sometimes houses should be replaced for various reasons,” conceded Moe. “But what really troubles us is the phenomenon of ‘McMansions,’ where a perfectly good house that was designed to fit in with a neighborhood is replaced by something that is vastly out of scale with the neighborhood.” At some point the National Trust took on the mantle of National Arbiter of Style.

Prosperity and the larger homes it breeds are not the Trust’s only concerns. The foundation considers chain drugstores to be grave threats to America’s small towns and down-

towns. Notwithstanding their indispensable services, they imperil a community’s “unique sense of place.”

“Even when stores use vacant land,” warns the Trust, “their prototypical boxes are inappropriate for pedestrian-oriented downtowns.” To drive home the point, in 1999 the Trust announced that every single “Main Street” in America was in danger of a “drug-store invasion.” It added every last Main Street in America to its list of most endangered places.

That year, the Trust published a book, *Challenging Sprawl*, intended to promote the “grassroots, smart-growth movement.”

It boasts essays and articles from a bevy of regulatory enthusiasts, including Christine Todd Whitman and Al Gore.

### Conclusion

Writer James Bovard hit the nail on the head in a 1997 article for the *American Spectator* when he suggested that historic preservation “has long since been replaced by ‘hysterical preservationism.’” Bovard singled out the National Trust for Historic Preservation as the leader of the trend, and observed, “Preservationists have ‘progressed’ from targeting specific buildings to targeting neighborhoods and even entire valleys and states for strict, government-enforced controls.”

Moe responded to the article, but he neglected to counter any of Bovard’s assertions. However, he did offer this astonishing passage:

“[H]istoric preservation is a dynamic, fundamentally nonpartisan, and non-ideological effort to create, sustain, and enhance livable communities. At its base, preservation is about empowering communities to protect what they hold dear. Preservationists are citizens who care about our rich heritage and who want to ensure that future generations will be able to experience, appreciate, learn from, and be inspired by this legacy that helps to define us as Americans.”

If historic preservation is non-ideological, why are all of Moe’s allies on the Left—and many on the fringe? If preservation is about creating and sustaining livable communities, why block traffic improvements, evict property owners in existing communities, and refuse to allow new owners to build new communities? If preservation is about empowering communities, why use the federal government to decide what’s best for them? How can future generations preserve the “legacy that helps to define us as Americans” by disdaining our rights to own our land? **FW**

*Peyton Knight is director of the John P. McGovern, M.D. Center for Environmental and Regulatory Affairs at the National Center for Public Policy Research.*

## 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

## Exposing “ExxposeExxon”

*Environmentalists drag out a corporate bogeyman*

by David Hogberg

*"How much money did you receive from ExxonMobil in 2005?"* When energy expert Indur Goklany gave a National Press Club briefing about his recent paper, "Living With Global Warming," he probably expected inquiries about his findings and research. But that's the accusation he was hit with during the Q&A from David Tuft, an official of the Natural Resources Defense Council. "We know you received \$315,000 [from Exxon] through 2004; we're wondering what it is in 2005."

The National Center for Policy Analysis, which published Goklany's research, did receive funding from ExxonMobil, but Goklany rightly responded that he received no Exxon money. Still, he was forced to publicly confront a left-wing smear tactic. Unable to win the public policy debate fair and square, environmental groups are falling back on an old stand-by—they attack the integrity of their opponents by dragging a corporate bogeyman out of the closet. Disgruntled green groups failed to win passage of global warming regulations in the recently passed energy bill, so they are resorting to claims that ExxonMobil buys off everyone who doesn't take their side. Some strategy.

The Exxpose Exxon campaign (Exxpose, get it?) was launched by some of the biggest guns in the environmental movement: Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, Environmental Action, Greenpeace, National Environmental Trust, Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, U.S. Public Interest Research Group (PIRG) and the Union of Concerned Scientists. True Majority, the creation of leftist ice-cream maker Ben Cohen (of Ben & Jerry's), and MoveOn.org, whose members played such a large part in Howard Dean's attempt to capture the Democratic presidential nomination, also are part of the anti-Exxon group. They charge (correctly) that Exxon favors opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling and opposes restrictive global warming legislation, and they argue (questionably) that Exxon refuses to invest "enough" money in alternative energy sources.

However, the thrust of their report "ExxonMobil Exxposed" is as hollow as a Halloween pumpkin: "In 2004, ExxonMobil gave \$1.9 million to 26 organizations specifically to challenge the scientific consensus on global warming," it says. Does the report then compare the Exxon amount to the amount that foundations give to groups that believe global warming is an imminent threat to the environment? No. Fortunately, the George C. Marshall Institute has done just that. It examined funding trends for 2000-2002 and discovered that among the twenty top grantmakers on the issue, ExxonMobil was the only one not hyping global warming and it only ranked 14th in the amount of money it gave away. The top two givers, the Energy Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trusts, gave over \$43 million and \$12 million, respectively, for programs on climate change. Both are strong supporters of the argument that the world is growing warmer because Americans use too much oil.

Indeed, looking at the funding patterns of the groups in Exxpose Exxon reveals that they have a vested interest in promoting global warming hype. In fact, some groups raked in more money in one year for their own global warming campaigns than ExxonMobil doled out in total. According to the Marshall Institute, the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Union of Concerned Scientists each took in over \$2.4 million just in 2002. From 2000-2002, they took in \$6.7 million and \$6.3 million, respectively, for activities promoting the global warming hypothesis. Other big grants went to the National Environmental Trust (\$2,150,000), U.S. PIRG (\$1,015,000), Sierra Club (\$405,000), Greenpeace (\$385,000), and Friends of the Earth (\$150,000).

One Greenpeace website called "Exxon Secrets" claims to have discovered more shady information about ExxonMobil's support for policy groups that question the global warming argument. But there are no "secrets" here. ExxonMobil's grantmaking is public information, and it is available from the company's 2002 Annual Report and its 2003 and 2004 Corporate

Giving Reports. They are all posted on ExxonMobil's website.

Like other activist groups, the anti-Exxon coalition arrogantly demands a boycott. Americans can help "by refusing to work for ExxonMobil, refusing to invest their hard-earned dollars in ExxonMobil, and *refusing to buy ExxonMobil products*" [italics added]. But guess what? Some of the foundations that support these groups invest their own money in ExxonMobil! The Ford Foundation gave \$150,000 each to the Natural Resources Defense Council and Friends of the Earth in 2003. According to its most recent tax return, the foundation owned about 2.2 million shares of ExxonMobil stock that was then valued at about \$82 million. The Surdna Foundation handed out \$125,000 to Defenders of Wildlife (in 2001) and \$75,000 to the National Environmental Trust (in 2003), and it owned about 15,000 shares of ExxonMobil stock. The Wallace Global Fund gave \$490,000 to the Sierra Club Foundation (2001-2003), \$200,000 to the Union of Concerned Scientists (2001-2003), and \$100,000 to Greenpeace (2001), and it owned 20,000 shares of ExxonMobil. Because those "hard-earned dollars" are invested in ExxonMobil, will the green groups return the tainted money?

Few debates have been as one-sided as the one over whether the scientific evidence backs up arguments for global warming and what American public officials should do about it. Environmental groups have gone overboard in attacking the integrity of anyone who questions their assertions. Leftist groups never hesitate to argue that having a "national debate" means all sides need to be heard. Funny, though, how that doesn't apply to ExxonMobil's support for the other side of the climate debate.

*David Hogberg is editor of the Capital Research Center's online research programs "Education Watch" and "Greenwatch." He also co-hosts CRC's monthly radio program, "Organization Watch." This article originally appeared in the American Spectator Online.*

# PhilanthropyNotes

**Google, Inc.** announced in October that it was devoting one percent of both its stock (about \$900 million) its profits to a philanthropic effort called **Google.org**, which will remain part of the corporation and not part of Google's charitable foundation (assets: \$90 million); Google.org will thus have greater flexibility to fund for-profit entrepreneurial initiatives, as well as programs that are related to Google's business (problematic expenditures for a foundation). Google's founders have expressed interest in philanthropy related to the environment and poverty. Google's much-vaunted corporate philosophy is "Don't be evil"; we hope shareholders will hold the company's corporate giving up to that ideal.

In late September the beltway newspaper **The Hill** reported that financier **George Soros** has entered the midterm election fray, holding a fundraiser in his Manhattan home that raised \$250,000 for the **Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee**. New York Senator (and DSCC chairman) **Charles Schumer** was on hand to pitch a spiel to about sixty of Soros's friends and associates. The Democrats seem not to have noticed that Soros and his friends, though they have oodles of money, also have the touch of death.

**New York University's Washington Square News** reported on October 11 that NYU's **Brennan Center for Justice** filed suit against **USAID** on behalf of George Soros's **Open Society Institute**; OSI opposes the stipulation that organization receiving federal money for AIDS relief condemn prostitution. Regardless of what one thinks of the stipulation, OSI (2003 assets: \$356 million) could easily afford to take itself off the federal dole and avoid the issue altogether—in fact, the government should reconsider giving funding to an organization that thinks such lawsuits are a sensible use of its resources.

The **New Yorker** reported on October 3 that **HBO** planned to show "**Last Best Chance**," the film produced by the **Nuclear Threat Initiative** (see the September 2005 **Foundation Watch**). Funded by the **Carnegie Corporation** and **MacArthur Foundation**, the 45-minute thriller stars former **US Senator Fred Thompson** as a president dealing with stray nuclear material in the hands of terrorists. After a screening at the New York headquarters of the **Council on Foreign Relations**, **Ted Turner** said, "As short a time ago as nine years or eight years... I still thought that nuclear weapons, biological and chemical weapons, was an area that the government took care of." The founder of **CNN**, of all people, should know that you can't believe everything you see on TV.

**ABC News's "Primetime Live"** recently aired a scare-mongering report about "gaping security holes" at nuclear reactors on college campuses. Some colleges exposed by ABC countered that the report exaggerated security lapses, did not mention important security measures, and avoided altogether the fact that campus reactors mostly use low-enriched fuel, at a power level one thousand times smaller than a nuclear power plant. The colleges also criticized the way the investigation was conducted—by graduate students posing as innocent visitors interested in nuclear power. Those graduate students had one thing in common: they were all part of an ABC internship program funded by the **Carnegie Corporation**, which seems to be getting what it has paid for.

The **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation** announced a grant of \$2,581,669 to the **Papua New Guinea Institute of Medical Research** for a project on treating children for **malaria**—almost a million children die of the disease each year. As detailed in the July 2005 **Organization Trends**, that money would probably have been better spent on **DDT**, long condemned on the basis of junk science. Of the very few mentions of DDT on the Institute's website, one researcher astonishingly notes without irony or evidence that discontinuing DDT usage "would have beneficial environmental implications." That's doubtful; regardless, what about the children?

In September **President Bush** signed a special measure allowing (among other things) donors to write off up to 100 percent of their income for cash donations made from August 28 until the end of the year—a significant tax break designed to spur increased charitable donations to aid in the **Hurricane Katrina** recovery and reconstruction. The **Chronicle of Philanthropy** reports that **Rick Cohen**, executive director of the **National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy**, criticized the measures because they could make some groups hesitant to criticize the government for its role in disaster relief. There's no pleasing some people.

