

## The Killer Elite

*Anti-pesticide activists perpetuate diseases that kill millions*

By Paul Driessen

**Summary:** Malaria is a disease that kills three times more African children than AIDS. Hundreds of millions are infected and up to two million die annually. But as the body count continues to mount, environmental activists and international aid agencies continue a deadly campaign against DDT.

**M**alaria sickens an estimated 500 million people every year. It kills up to 2 million annually, half of them children, most of the rest pregnant women. Malaria sends more African children to graves than any other disease—three times as many as HIV/AIDS, according to UNICEF. Worldwide, children die from malaria at the rate of two per minute, or 3,000 per day. That's the equivalent of 80 fully loaded school buses plunging over a cliff every day of the year.

In sub-Saharan Africa alone, this mosquito-borne executioner infects over 400 million people year after year. It leaves tens of thousands with permanent brain damage, makes tens of millions so sick with fevers and convulsions that they can't work or attend school for weeks on end. Tens of millions more are forced to leave work, school and fields to care for sick loved ones. Malaria costs the region \$12 billion a year in lost economic production.

The United States and Europe eliminated this horrible disease by using DDT and other pesticides, along with window screens, aerial spraying of mosquitoes, drugs and other measures.

But when it comes to preventing malaria in poor developing countries, Western government agencies and green activists apply vastly different standards of ethics, science and public health. Committed to



The mosquito and one of its many Third World victims. Hundreds of millions are infected each year with malaria, and up to two million die. Yet meanwhile, environmentalist groups pressure governments to continue the ban on DDT.

environmentalism, they deliberately withhold the same insecticides that helped make America, Canada and Europe malaria-free.

While millions die, the U. S. Agency for International Development (USAID), European Union (EU), World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), UNICEF—plus dozens of environmental groups like Greenpeace, Beyond Pesticides, the World Wildlife Fund, Natural Resources Defense Council and the perversely named Physicians for Social Responsibility—do everything in their power to perpetuate these lethal policies. They coerce nations to eliminate pesticides, especially DDT, from disease control programs, and to rely on anti-malaria programs that are Politically Correct, but proven failures.

All the while, this “Killer Elite” exaggerates the risks of man-made chemicals and the benefits of “natural” alternatives. Their environmentalist ideology has trumped science, medicine, ethics and painful experience, allowing the deadly resurgence of a readily preventable disease.

**July 2005**

**CONTENTS**

The Killer Elite  
*page 1*

Community Rights Counsel  
*page 5*

Briefly Noted: *page 8*

# Organization Trends

## Fatal Funding

In many cases government agencies such as USAID, and international donors like the World Bank's Global Environment Facility (GEF), tell impoverished countries that grants are conditioned on their *not* using DDT or other pesticides and that funding will be withdrawn if they do. Over the years they have replaced healthcare professionals who support pesticide use with environmental activists and NGOs that emphasize "holistic" alternatives.

These powerful entities write the rules, control the purse strings and host numerous international conferences like the World Health Assembly, which pass anti-pesticide resolutions and dictate the scope of policy discussions. Roll Back Malaria—a consortium of aid agencies, international institutions and environmentalist groups funded by the World Health Organization (WHO)—has issued a 40-page action plan to reduce countries' reliance on DDT. Its goal is eventually to eliminate DDT use for public-health purposes. But *The Lancet*, the esteemed British medical journal, concluded that Roll Back Malaria (RBM) was a failure. Anticipating RBM's "Africa Malaria Day" on April 25, 2005, the journal found that the group's program was so ineffective that malaria rates had increased after five years of effort.

---

**Editor:** Robert James Bidinotto

**Publisher:** Terrence Scanlon

### Organization Trends

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>

**Organization Trends** welcomes letters to the editor.

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

---

U. S. and international grantmakers bankroll dozens of activist groups that share an anti-pesticide ideology and promote myths about the dangers of DDT. For example, the GEF contributes to the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and Greenpeace, the two most prominent opponents of DDT use. The European Union, which bans the marketing **of any product containing DDT**, provides major grants to environmental activist non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that pressure poor countries to abandon DDT use.

Other support comes from leftist foundations, including the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Ted Turner's foundation. The Heinz family philanthropies have actively supported anti-pesticide group efforts to ban "DDT and other harmful pesticides." Teresa Heinz Kerry, who leads these foundations, worries that country club women will get a "devastating triple whammy" from "the chemical soup" they encounter daily from birth control pills, makeup, sun block and golf courses that are "perfectly manicured, thanks to estrogenic pesticides." Her concern about the malaria epidemic in her native Africa is muted.

Some U. S. government agencies deny an anti-DDT bias. For example, USAID says that DDT will "be considered" for malaria control programs—but only if a full environmental impact assessment demonstrates that DDT "is the only effective alternative" and "could be used safely" under strict WHO protocols. But in fact for many years USAID has not spent "one dime for any actual effort, either pesticides, bed nets or drugs," says University of Ottawa infectious disease expert Dr. Amir Attaran. Dr. Roger Bate of the group Africa Fighting Malaria notes that USAID spends some 85 percent of its annual \$80 million malaria budget on consultants who hold meetings, write educational materials, exhort people to use bed nets and assert "progress" in the war on malaria. The agency hopes to provide 40 million pediatric doses of remedial drugs annually by 2006. But it will be many years before there are nearly enough doses for 500 million malaria patients annually. Anti-malaria vaccines are likewise at least a decade away—after which it will take years to immunize the two billion people at risk of getting the disease.

How many more millions will die in the meantime?

## The Miracle Chemical

Before the 1930s, insect-borne diseases were responsible for taking millions of lives each year. In 1935, India alone endured an estimated 100 million cases of malaria and up to a million deaths. In World War I, typhus epidemics killed at least three million Russians and untold millions more across Europe.

But in the late 1930s, Paul Hermann Müller discovered that tiny amounts of the chemical that came to be known as DDT killed just about every insect he used it on. Even when some mosquitoes eventually developed resistance to it, DDT still acted as an effective repellent, driving them from homes.

The U.S. military began using DDT in 1942 to fight widespread malaria and typhus epidemics. They sprayed soldiers, dusted beaches, deloused concentration-camp survivors with DDT, without apparent ill effects. These measures saved millions of troops and camp survivors. As A.G. Smith of the British medical journal *Lancet* put it: "If the huge amounts of DDT used are taken into account, the safety record for human beings is extremely good."



A child suffers from cerebral malaria. Millions die each year from this disease, which has seen a huge resurgence with the international campaign against the use of DDT and other pesticides.

After the war, the United States launched a global malaria eradication project. "From colonial times until the 1940s, malaria was the American disease," says Dr. Robert Desowitz, professor of tropical medicine at the University of North Carolina. Up to seven million Americans were stricken every year until the mid-1920s; 3,900 died in 1936. By the 1960s, however, the disease had been almost eliminated, not just from America, but also from southern Europe, the Caribbean and much of eastern and southern Asia. In India alone malaria's horrific annual toll in lives plunged from a million deaths per year to fewer than 50,000 total cases of infection in 1961.

For his discovery, Müller received the 1948 Nobel Prize in medicine. “To only a few chemicals does man owe as great a debt as to DDT,” the National Academy of Sciences later reported. “In little more than two decades, DDT has prevented 500 million human deaths, due to malaria.”

But that changed in 1962, with publication of Rachel Carson’s anti-pesticide classic, *Silent Spring*—the book that launched the modern environmental movement. The fledgling Environmental Defense Fund, joined by the Sierra Club, initiated lawsuits against DDT use and pressured the Environmental Protection Agency to hold hearings. Though the presiding administrative judge concluded that DDT was not a hazard to man, EPA administrator William Ruckelshaus—himself an Environmental Defense Fund member—banned it in 1972.

The U. S. ban became the spearhead of a worldwide assault on DDT. Under pressure by green groups, other wealthy countries joined the ban and began to restrict funding for DDT projects. That campaign continues to this day—and its consequences are untold death and misery, especially in the Third World. Since the EPA ban in 1972, over 50 million people have died from a disease that was once nearly vanquished outside Africa, but now has returned with a vengeance.

## Mosquitoes Spared, People Sacrificed

The carnage caused by the environmentalists’ anti-DDT policies is not a matter of conjecture. The consequences of DDT use—and non-use—are well documented.

South Africa slashed its malaria rates by 80 percent in just 18 months by spraying the walls and eaves of traditional mud and thatch huts twice a year with small amounts of DDT. Ecuador cut its malaria incidence by 60 percent by using DDT; Madagascar by 90 percent after just two spraying cycles with DDT.

In stark contrast, Bolivia’s infection rate increased 80 percent since 1993, when it bowed to international pressure and banned the pesticide’s use in favor of bed nets and other alternatives, notes Dr. Silvia Pasquier of Bolivia’s St. Thomas Aquinas College. Zanzibar, Sri Lanka and other countries have had similar experiences.

The resurgence of malaria should come as no surprise. A few years ago, several organizations provided loans to Eritrea, where malaria is responsible for 50 percent of all deaths. But the UNICEF money could be spent only on insecticide-treated bed nets, while USAID funds went for “environmental assessments.” Meanwhile, as the carnage continued, the World Bank required Eritrea to develop a program and schedule to replace DDT house spraying with “chemicals or techniques that are safer for the environment and human health.”

The impoverished African nation of Ethiopia grieves over nearly 150,000 malaria deaths a year, including 95,000 children. Yet Canada gave Ethiopia \$1.5 million (U. S.) toward a “national implementation plan” to comply with the international Stockholm Convention to eliminate “persistent organic pollutants,” including DDT. In effect, then, this effort to eliminate DDT pays Ethiopia about \$10 for each dead Ethiopian.

In February 2005, an EU bureaucrat warned Uganda that the country’s export of

male hormones in animals and is “related” to premature births and slow reflexes in babies, their reports claim.

Wildlife and people are “contaminated” by a “cocktail of highly toxic chemicals,” including DDT, say World Wildlife Fund press releases.

“Measurable quantities” of DDT and its breakdown product DDE “are present” in human fatty tissue, blood and breast milk, argue Greenpeace activists. “Researchers *think* DDE *could* be inhibiting lactation because of its estrogen-like effects and *may* therefore be contributing to lactation failure throughout the world,” says a 2001 Greenpeace International report. [Emphasis added.]

Studies “*suggest* that DDE and *possibly* other organochlorines *can* weaken the immune systems of children, increasing their *risk* of developing asthma and certain infections,” Physicians for Social Responsibility argues. [Emphasis added.] PSR urges “holistic” alternatives to DDT, as part of a chemicals-free “integrated malaria control program.”

---

## *U.S. and international grantmakers bankroll dozens of activist groups that share an anti-pesticide ideology and promote myths about the dangers of DDT.*

---

fish, flowers and cereals to Europe could be disrupted if it used DDT to reduce a malaria epidemic that kills up to 100,000 Ugandans every year. Even barely detectable traces of DDT on these products could trigger an import ban. The threat puts Ugandan lives a distant second behind the ideological preoccupations of disease-free European environmentalists.

According to Attaran, Bate and others, since the “Roll Back Malaria” campaign was launched in 1998, global malaria disease and death rates have actually *increased* by nearly 10 percent. Yet a recent WHO-UNICEF report claims “progress” in the battle against malaria. Worse, until 2004 the two agencies were still prescribing and providing drugs they had known for years were no longer effective.

## But Is There A Danger?

Anti-insecticide ideologues maintain that DDT constitutes an intolerable risk to human health and the environment. DDT poisons food chains, harms fish, thins bird eggshells, might cause cancer or reduced

Mosquitoes in some areas have become resistant to DDT, reducing its effectiveness as an insect killer, says Environmental Defense. “Chronic low dose DDT exposure *is associated* with premature birth and low birth-weight in babies who were exposed before birth, and with decreased duration of milk supply in nursing mothers,” it asserts. [Emphasis added.]

“The main factor that needs to be addressed is poverty. The mosquito is only secondary,” insists Dr. Romeo Quijano, director of the Philippines Pesticide Action Network. “People liberate themselves from poverty, and reduction of mortality due to malaria ensues.” But what is the truth?

- Millions, perhaps billions have been exposed to DDT—millions of World War II allied troops and Holocaust survivors, hundreds of thousands of insecticide sprayers and tens of millions of Americans and Europeans. But

*no replicable, peer-reviewed scientific study has ever found significant harm to a single human being.* In fact, no study has ever found harm to humans, wildlife or the environment from spraying DDT *inside houses* for malaria control.

- Even when mosquitoes acquire resistance to the chemical, it still acts as an irritant that repels them from homes before they can bite.

with safeguarding the health and well-being of the world's most vulnerable people.

There is some evidence that mounting bad publicity over this environmentalist-inspired carnage is causing some of them to get defensive, even backpedal. For example, a recent World Bank loan provides money for DDT spraying in Eritrea, offering hope that its anti-DDT policies may finally be softening. Earlier this year, *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof wrote a harsh column chiding environmentalists on their DDT opposition.

---

***“People are the cause of all the problems. We need to get rid of some of them, and this is as good a way as any.”***

---

- DDT is cheaper and more effective than many alternatives, making it more affordable for the poor in developing countries.
- Malaria is less the result of poverty than its *cause*, especially in Africa. Its economic impacts are devastating in the Third World. Controlling malaria is critical to these nations' rise from poverty.

The WHO, USAID and NGOs also judge DDT and other pesticides as failures because they don't work everywhere and don't achieve 100 percent malaria eradication. And to be sure, DDT is no “magic bullet.” Neither are other pesticides or more Politically Correct strategies. The war against malaria must be fought against many mosquito species and constantly mutating parasites, in different terrains and cultures, under many housing and climate conditions.

But the battle requires every weapon at our disposal. Disease control specialists—not ideologues—should determine when, where, why and how to use DDT or other strategies. They need the freedom to do so.

Certainly, chemicals must be used carefully and may have side effects. But risks must be balanced against clear benefits. For insecticides, the benefit is in millions of lives saved.

Unfortunately, in the practice of ideological medicine, such facts seem to merit little attention—even from those charged

But when he contacted Greenpeace and WWF spokesmen for statements, they tried to sound more conciliatory: “If alternatives to DDT aren't working, you've got to use it. If there's nothing else and it's going to save lives, we're all for it.”

However, inflammatory anti-DDT polemics still dominate their websites, and neither the activist groups nor “healthcare” agencies have actually recognized, much less promoted, the use of DDT and other insecticides in the battle against parasitic diseases. Nor have they acknowledged the two most fundamental issues in the malaria debate:

1. Wealthy, malaria-free countries are dictating the malaria control policies of poor, malaria endemic countries, and forcing them to stop using pesticides.
2. Anti-pesticide NGOs and government agencies are systematically violating the human rights of the poorest, most powerless, most disease-ridden people on the planet by denying them access to proven protective chemicals.

A disturbing undercurrent meanders through some anti-pesticide rhetoric, suggesting that at least a few environmentalists clearly recognize that their policies cause numerous deaths. Club of Rome director Alexander King wrote in *The Discipline of Curiosity*, “My chief quarrel with DDT in hindsight is that it greatly added to the population problem.”

Sierra Club director Michael McCloskey opined, “By using DDT, we reduce mortality rates in underdeveloped countries, without the consideration of how to support the increase in populations.” Some hardly even seem ambivalent. Asked whether banning DDT would result in more deaths from disease, former Environmental Defense Fund scientist Charles Wurster once said, “People are the cause of all the problems. We need to get rid of some of them, and this is as good a way as any.”

It would be unfair to suggest that preventing access to insecticides, biotechnology and electricity, and letting Mother Nature run her course is all part of a deliberate attempt to reduce Third World “over-population.” However, at the very least, EU-WHO-USAID priorities, abetted by the fanaticism of prominent greens, have spawned policies whose effects are just as lethal as if they were calculated.

The victims of these policies insist on progress *now*—not ten, twenty or fifty years from now, when vaccines and Politically Correct “integrated vector management” programs finally achieve some measure of success, and after countless millions more have succumbed to the epidemic.

“I lost my son, two sisters and two nephews to malaria,” says Ugandan farmer and businesswoman Fiona Kobusingye, herself a repeated malaria survivor. “Don't talk to me about birds, and don't tell me a little DDT in our bodies is worse than the risk of dying or losing more babies to this disease. African mothers would be overjoyed if DDT in breast milk was our biggest worry.”

In impoverished, disease-ridden nations, an 80-90 percent reduction in malarial infection and death rates is clearly possible. They should not have to settle for less.

We certainly did not.

**OT**

*Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow, and author of Eco-Imperialism: Green Power - Black Death (see [www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)).*

*Robert James Bidinotto, the editor of Organization Trends, contributed to this report.*

## Community Rights Counsel

*For this public interest law firm, “community” means “government”*

By Scott Bullock



Suzanne and Matt Dery may lose their home of 20 years to benefit private developers, while Susette Kelo received notice of condemnation from the NLDC (New London Development Corporation) the day before Thanksgiving 2000. Defending these government “takings” is the Community Rights Counsel.

(Photos by Isaac Reese, 2004 © Institute for Justice)

Wilhelmina Dery was born in her home in the Fort Trumbull neighborhood of New London, Connecticut 87 years ago. She still lives there, as she has for her entire life. Her husband Charles lives there as well. He moved into the house when the couple married 60 years ago. Her son Matthew and his family live right next door.

But the Dery family and all their neighbors stand to lose their homes through a government “taking.” Under the authority of “eminent domain,” the city of New London proposes to use its power to take private property.

But this particular “taking” of an entire neighborhood is not for a public use—a bridge, reservoir or some public building. The city simply wants to make it easy for a private business to develop a large-scale project that the city thinks will generate economic activity and tax revenue—at the expense of the existing landowners.

It’s no surprise that tax-hungry governments and some land-hungry businesses support the abuse of eminent domain power. What is surprising, however, is that a non-profit “public interest” law firm claiming to champion “community rights” is defending the use of eminent domain to throw Mrs. Dery out of the only home she has ever known.

The group is the Community Rights Counsel—probably the most pro-government public interest organization in the country. And no wonder. The group was formed in 1997 as a project of the International City/County Management

Association (ICMA)—a national organization representing over 8,000 city and county managers. According to its mission statement, the group provides “strategic assistance to state and local government attorneys in defending land use laws, environmental protections, public health measures, and other *community* protections.” (Emphasis added.)

Even a cursory review of the Counsel’s written materials and litigation practices shows that it believes the word “community” means “government.” The Counsel argues that courts should not overturn decisions made by government agencies—

---

***What is surprising is that a non-profit “public interest” law firm claiming to champion “community rights” is defending the use of eminent domain to throw Mrs. Dery out of the only home she has ever known.***

---

at least not in cases where governments seek to overturn private property rights. It takes pains to provide legal assistance to government lawyers and bureaucrats in hearings, on panels and in courts. It also publishes guidebooks, how-to articles and newsletters, and it runs workshops showing state and local government managers and administrators how to overcome citizen claims that they have property rights.

One Counsel specialty is to defend government agencies against “regulatory takings” claims—that is, against lawsuits by property owners challenging burdensome governmental regulations that destroy or significantly reduce the value of their

land. But the Counsel is also a leading defender of eminent domain abuse—the unholy alliance between local governments and private businesses that combine to seize property for private profit rather than legitimate public use.

The power of eminent domain permitting government to take private property is implicit in the 5th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. However, the 5th Amendment places two vital limitations on that power. First, if the government takes your property, it must pay “just compensation.” Second, and more importantly, the government can only take your property if it is for a “public use.”

“Public use” used to mean what were clearly public projects such as roads, bridges and courthouses. But starting in the 1950s courts allowed governments to expand the definition to include slum clearance and the removal of so-called “blight.” Now eminent domain can mean condemning private property simply to expand a community’s tax base. Local governments have tried to use the power of eminent domain to condemn church property to make way for a new Costco. They have torn down homes to build shopping malls and taken smaller businesses for the sake of larger ones.

What’s happening in New London has spurred the formation of a diverse coalition opposed to the abuse of one of government’s most awesome powers. A landmark eminent domain case, *Kelo v. City of New London*, is now before the U.S. Supreme Court. Argued before the Court on February 22, 2005, a decision is imminent. Groups ranging from the NAACP and AARP to defenders of property rights like the Pacific Legal Foundation have filed briefs on the side of the homeowners. They urge the Court to make clear that New London cannot abuse the power of eminent domain.

Standing against them is the Community Rights Counsel. It represents a number of nonprofit organizations whose primary membership is units of government, such as the National League of Cities, the Conference of State Legislatures and the National Association of Counties—all entities that stand to gain from eminent domain abuse. Except for these government groups and the developers who benefit directly from New London’s abuse of eminent domain, the Counsel is one of the very few organizations to side with the city.

The Counsel’s brief strongly defends the government practice of taking property from poorer owners to give to wealthier claimants in the hope that government—or, in the Counsel’s terminology, the “community”—will benefit through increased tax revenue and job creation. Its brief is so extreme that it even questions whether there is a “public use” requirement in the Constitution at all! It claims the “language of the Takings Clause of the Constitution does not impose any limitation other than the payment of just compensation.”

## 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

The Counsel's defense of government power cannot be defined in conventional "liberal" vs. "conservative" terms. For instance, in the recently decided Supreme Court case, *Gonzales vs. Raich*, the Counsel filed a brief asserting the federal government's power to invalidate state laws allowing citizens to use marijuana for medical purposes. The issue was not whether the particular state laws were good or bad public policy, but whether the Constitution gives the federal government authority to prohibit the states from enforcing them. In its brief, the Counsel ignored the arguments for federalism—

that is all too common in our nation's capital, much of it intended to further the accuser's legislative agenda. It is the [Counsel] who is undermining public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary."

Public interest groups typically claim to represent "the little guy." But the Community Rights Counsel defends the institutions of government—organizations that are least in need of charitable support. Funded by taxpayers who are required by law to pay, governments are the ultimate deep-pocketed party.

---

*"[The Counsel's] allegations typify the character assassination all too common in our nation's capital," wrote Judge Loken. "It is undermining public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary."*

---

for limited, enumerated constitutional powers—and championed the supremacy of the national government. The *San Francisco Chronicle* noted that the Counsel "feared a ruling in favor of the patients would weaken federal regulation of health care and the environment."

The Counsel also has launched unrelenting attacks on the economics programs for federal judges conducted by the George Mason University Law and Economics Center, and the Foundation for Research on Economics and the Environment (FREE). It regularly feeds stories to the *Washington Post* and Senator John Kerry claiming that these academic programs are nothing but free market propaganda organized as corporate-paid junkets that judges must be forbidden to attend lest they get the wrong ideas.

In June 2005, however, James Loken, chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 8th Circuit, threw out a complaint filed by the Counsel against Circuit Judge Danny Boggs, who serves on the board of FREE. The chief judge ruled that the Counsel wrongly assumed "a lack of integrity and impartiality from a judge's association with legitimate judicial education." The judge went even further in criticizing the Counsel's claims: "These allegations typify the character assassination

Government is more than capable of defending itself. It's hard to think of a worse investment of charitable dollars than defending governments like the city of New London—especially when they are eager to take homes from people like Wilhelmina Dery in order to benefit the politically connected. **OT**

*Scott Bullock is a senior attorney at the Institute for Justice, which represented the property owners in Kelo v. City of New London. (On June 23 the Supreme Court, by a 5-4 vote, ruled against the private property owners.)*

---

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

---

## 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**

You can probe the backgrounds of many of the organizations profiled in **Organization Trends**

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

# BrieflyNoted

In the April 2001 issue of *Organization Trends*, **Patrick Reilly** first reported on a brewing scandal over misuse of funds by the **Rev. Jesse Jackson's Rainbow/PUSH Coalition**. In May 2005, the **Federal Election Commission** ruled that Rainbow/PUSH and the **Democratic National Committee** had indeed violated campaign finance laws when Jackson used Coalition funds to tour the country in 2000 to drum up voter registration and hold get-out-the-vote rallies. Under an agreement with the FEC, Jackson, two of his organizations, Rainbow/PUSH and the **Citizen Education Fund**, and the Democratic committee were levied a \$200,000 fine. In accepting the fine, they also acknowledged engaging in a campaign travel arrangement in which Jackson's not-for-profit corporations illegally paid for political trips the committee was supposed to fund. A Rainbow/PUSH spokesman said the organization accepted responsibility for the violation and had paid the fine in order to put the matter behind it.

Top leaders of **Amnesty International USA**, who have been highly critical of the Bush administration's handling of war detainees, also contributed the maximum \$2,000 to **Sen. John Kerry's** presidential campaign, reports the *Washington Times*. **Federal Election Commission** records show that **William F. Schulz**, executive director of Amnesty USA, contributed \$2,000 to Kerry's campaign last year. Schulz also has contributed \$1,000 to the 2006 campaign of **Sen. Edward M. Kennedy**, Massachusetts Democrat. Amnesty board chairman **Joe W. "Chip" Pitts III** also gave the maximum \$2,000 to **John Kerry for President**. In late May, **Irene Khan**, Amnesty's secretary-general, compared the U.S. terrorist detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Soviet dictator **Josef Stalin's** "gulag" prison system. At the same time, Schulz issued a statement calling **Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld** and other administration officials "architects of torture," and suggested that other nations might file war-crime charges and arrest them. However, the group insists it is nonpartisan. "We strive to do everything humanly possible to see that the personal political perspectives of our leadership have no bearing whatsoever upon the nature of our findings and the conduct of our work," a spokesman said.

Animal rights activists protesting **Emory University's Yerkes National Primate Research Center** this spring were confronted by a handful of counter-demonstrators, leading to a shouting match. According to the *Emory Wheel* newspaper, the activists abandoned plans for a mock funeral for the primates killed in research at Yerkes after an argument erupted with five Emory students who held posters proclaiming, "Animals help us find a cure." When the research supporters cited medical treatments like antibiotics gleaned from animal testing, one animal rights activist screamed, "What makes your grandfather more important than an animal?"

Environmentalists and their political supporters have captive audiences in California: school children. On May 14 the anti-pesticide activist group **California Safe Schools (CSS)** held an "environmental health conference focusing on the school environment" at **Van Nuys High School**. Among those present, according to the CSS press release, were actor **Joe Mantegna** and the wife of late rock musician **Frank Zappa**, plus "political and environmental leaders, regulatory agencies, school district administrators, teachers, community members, and children." Besides entertainment by various student musical groups, participants viewed CSS "visual displays and materials [that] provided information on steps to take to reduce exposure to pesticides and environmental toxins. Most requested photo opportunity was a cut-out display titled 'STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ARE NOT LAB RATS'...The display refers to AB 405, legislation carried by **Assemblywoman [Cindy] Montanez**, that will prevent experimental pesticides from being used on school campuses throughout California."

"In reading our commentator biographies, you may have noticed that some commentators are affiliated with non-profit groups and think tanks," notes the website of **National Public Radio**. "For more information about these organizations, their history, and how they're funded, here are a few websites to try." NPR then cites **Capital Research Center** as one of three sources that provide background on the organizational affiliations of its on-air commentators.

