

The Campaign for America's Future: A Left-Wing Network Flush With Money

By Joseph A. D'Agostino

Summary: The liberal Campaign for America's Future is convinced that Democrats are going to win big this November, but it's not taking any chances. The group has moved to the forefront of progressive activism and is pushing for a permanent political realignment that would usher in a new era of Big Government.

Robert Borosage is convinced that the stars are aligned for a major political realignment this November that would reverse the trend toward conservatism that began with Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980. Conservatism as a movement is dead, he opined at a press conference in March, CNSNews.com reported. Although it's not clear from recent economic data that the U.S. is actually in a recession as opposed to a slowdown in growth, Borosage insists there is a recession and blames President George W. Bush for it, warning ominously that voters do, too. "The recession is similar to the kind of economic chaos we had in '79," he said, adding that "the failures abroad are similar to the frustrations [President Jimmy] Carter had with Americans held hostage. The public gets this."

The liberal activist believes in sea-change elections, but not in leaving things to chance: he believes landscape-altering political trends have to be helped along by dedicated campaigners and proselytizers. Borosage believes that it's not enough for liberal candidates to win control of both houses of Congress and the White House this fall: the kind of network that he and other self-described progressives have built alongside America's two-party system will be needed



The Campaign for America's Future "Take Back America" conventions attract left-wing activists, politicians, and union leaders from across the nation. Barack Obama, now the Democratic Party's presumptive presidential nominee, is shown addressing the June 2007 conference in Washington, D.C.

to make permanent the massive change he's praying for. His nonprofit network is where the rubber meets the road, and he thinks this road will lead to the end of the political era that Reagan inaugurated.

In an article for the Nation magazine in March, Borosage wrote, "The election this year has the potential to be not simply a change election but a sea-change election, one that marks the end of the conservative era that has dominated our politics for nearly three decades. It could be the progressive equivalent of the conservative triumph of 1980."

But later in the article, Borosage argued,

"Progressives must learn what conservatives came to understand after 1980: that a sea-change election doesn't take place on Election Day. Conservatives were frustrated as Reagan ignored their social agenda, abandoned Social Security privatization and

July 2008 CONTENTS

The Campaign for
America's Future
Page 1

Briefly Noted
Page 8

Organization Trends

negotiated with Gorbachev. They found it necessary to sustain an independent movement capacity, to push ideas and to hold politicians, Democrats and Republicans, accountable.... Democrats will have a chance to capture the White House and greater majorities in both houses with a mandate for change. Then progressives will find, as conservatives found under Reagan, that the real struggle begins. For that, progressives will have to expand the agenda, build grassroots and netroots power independent of the administration and the party, and organize to hold politicians of both parties accountable for supporting the changes this country so desperately needs.”

Borosage is well-positioned to help lead that real struggle, and believes the ongoing intense election campaign is a necessary prelude to it. He is co-director of the Campaign for America's Future and president of CAF's sister organization, the Institute for America's Future. In an arrangement common in the nation's capital, CAF is a 501(c)4 organization that is allowed to engage in political activity but can't accept tax-deductible donations while IAF is a 501(c)3 that cannot engage in political activity but whose donors can deduct their contributions from their taxes. So IAF does as much of the CAF-IAF

Editor: Matthew Vadum

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:

mvadum@capitalresearch.org

Web Site:

<http://www.capitalresearch.org>

Organization Trends welcomes letters to the editor.

Reprints are available for \$2.50 pre-paid to Capital Research Center.

work that it can—research, education, and the like—while CAF handles the explicitly political end.

Liberals' Strategy Center

“They're a front group for the AFL-CIO,” says Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform (ATR), a pro-limited-government non-profit that hosts regular coalition meetings for conservative activists in Washington. “Read their rhetoric, they talk about not going back to the Gilded Age. They're campaigning as if it's 1905.”

CAF is not quite an AFL-CIO front group, but it does mobilize left-wing activists and union organizers dedicated to increasing the government's control over the American economy. Billing itself as “the strategy center for the progressive movement,” CAF writers and activists generate large numbers of articles, blog posts, and videos pushing the liberal agenda, arguing for progressive policy proposals and explaining how to sell them to ordinary Americans. With the help of money from George Soros and Big Labor, CAF holds conferences such as the influential “Take Back America” gathering held in Washington, D.C. earlier this year and regular strategy sessions with other top liberal groups. CAF and IAF are officially independent of the Democratic Party and all political campaigns.

CAF's website (www.ourfuture.org) explains how it seeks to replicate the conservative movement's efforts at coordinating groups to provide a single loud and clear message, which Borosage has compared to a “mighty Wurlitzer”:

“Along with Americans United for Change and USAction, we brought together nearly 40 organizations to create the Change America Now (CAN) coalition, which promotes legislation providing economic security to all families. We work with the Economic Policy Institute and Center for American Progress Action Fund to host the biweekly Tuesday Group, where congressional aides, union strategists, scholars, pollsters and advocates share insight on progressive messaging and public opinion so we can elevate the national debate.”

But CAF issues do not run the gamut of liberalism. CAF avoids social issues such

as abortion and marriage, though CAF writers often take swipes at pro-life and pro-family advocates. Similarly, the group mostly steers clear of foreign policy details, often framing the Iraq war as an economic and fiscal issue. Instead, it is taxes, government programs, and economic policies that make up CAF's portfolio and distinguish it from other liberal groups. CAF says, “we spearhead a compelling progressive agenda that addresses the kitchen-table issues working families face.”

Indeed, CAF's articles are full of class warfare arguments, and lately they have focused on Senator John McCain (R-Arizona) as a tool of the ultra-rich establishment. McCain, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, is the target of an increasing number of CAF attacks.

For example, on the same day in March that McCain met in Paris with new pro-American French President Nicholas Sarkozy, CAF cleverly exploited anti-French sentiment by releasing a video ad in French with English subtitles. The ad attacked the Pentagon for awarding an aviation contract to a consortium of companies that included Europe's Airbus while ignoring Boeing. “A message of thanks to John McCain from the French people,” says a sarcastic CAF caption, with a “John McCain, hero of France” banner on the Arc de Triomphe. “Thanks for helping the U.S. military choose a French company, Airbus. Tens of thousands of jobs for the French and thousands fewer for Americans...It's a great day for France. Long live John McCain and long live France.”

Although many of the jobs generated by the contract will go to American companies with American workers, members of Congress whose districts—and whose union member constituents—were passed over by the contract were infuriated.

Framing the Issues

Typical of CAF's well-crafted articles is one posted on the front page of its website on April 28. Written by CAF fellow Bernie Horn, it simultaneously picked apart a McCain healthcare proposal, implied that McCain's role in life is to protect the powerful interests CAF is fighting, and educated readers on how to pitch liberal health policy alternatives. Many CAF articles, videos, and

conferences target these three goals: Render a McCain or other Republican proposal unattractive, suggest or claim that conservatives' concern is to protect the powerful at the expense of ordinary Americans, and teach left-leaning grassroots activists how to spin liberal policies to Americans suspicious of Big Government liberals.

In "How to Talk About Health Care," Horn wrote, "John McCain will be spending the week promoting his health care scheme. The crux of the plan is to abolish employer-based health insurance and throw middle-class working Americans to the wolves. It is market fundamentalism at its worst... McCain is trying to convince voters that Democrats are all about covering the uninsured while he, on the other hand, is all about lowering health care costs. Understand that this is a good strategy because it fits voters' stereotypes of Democrats (and is fairly true). To our credit, we focus on 'universal' or 'single-payer' coverage, 'Medicare for all,' 'Canadian-style' health, and the like. But this is not good message framing for the 2008 election."

Horn urges activists to stop acting superior and drop phrases which are dear to liberals but off-putting to many Americans. He suggests using patriotism to enact socialism: "Americans are not persuaded by comparisons to other nations. If they were, we'd already have single-payer health care, strict gun control, and voting rights for ex-offenders, and we would have abolished the death penalty and signed the Kyoto treaty on global warming years ago," he wrote. "Americans want an American solution. (You're going to hurt your eyes if you roll them like that.) This is politics; just go with the flow. Evoking national pride helps us enact programs that benefit our fellow citizens—so just do it." [parentheses in original]

Identifying progressives with Democrats is a common theme in CAF literature. With little concession to liberal Republicans or Naderites, CAF focuses instead on boosting the Democratic Party, and particularly its most liberal wing.

Co-Directors' Backgrounds

Robert Borosage comes from that wing. A graduate of Yale Law, he founded the far-left National Center for Security Studies in 1974. To this day, he seems to believe that

opposing Communism was needless. In his Nation article on the importance of think tanks and grassroots groups in affecting public policy change, he wrote of the 1980s, "While voters hadn't turned right, the right was on the march—and driving the debate within the Republican Party. The Moral Majority mobilized evangelicals; the Committee on the Present Danger trumpeted the

CAF with Co-Director Roger Hickey. Hickey was a founder of the coalition group Americans United to Protect Social Security, and CAF helped torpedo Social Security reform during the Bush presidency. A veteran of the civil rights movement and the anti-war group Clergy and Laity Concerned About Vietnam, Hickey has led organizations such as the National Center for Economic



A screen grab from CAF's sarcastic ad that accused Senator John McCain of doing France's bidding in the Airbus procurement saga.

mythic 'window of vulnerability' in the face of the alleged Soviet threat." Many liberals have in recent years admitted the evils of the Soviet Union and the wisdom of Reagan's opposition to it, but to the Borosage of 2008, the Soviets weren't a real threat.

In 1979, he became director of the Institute for Policy Studies, another far-left group. His bio proudly boasts, "Borosage helped to found and guide Countdown 88, which succeeded in winning the congressional ban on covert action against Nicaragua." He teamed up with Rev. Jesse Jackson's radical 1988 presidential campaign, "writing speeches, framing policy responses, and providing debate preparation and assistance. He went on to advise a range of progressive political campaigns, including those of Senator[s] Carol Moseley-Braun, Barbara Boxer and Paul Wellstone."

Borosage shares management control over

Alternatives and Consumers Opposed to Inflation in the Necessities (COIN) that advocate more government regulation and wealth redistribution. He, too, has written attacks on McCain's health care plan, CAF's favorite target of late.

"He [McCain] wants voters to think he is going after health care cost inflation. In reality, he wants to dismantle the employer-provided system that now covers over 60% (or about 158 million) of non-elderly Americans, forcing millions of us who now get fairly decent health insurance on the job to instead buy whatever they can find on the individual market controlled by unregulated and predatory insurance companies," Hickey wrote April 29. "And he would drive health care costs upward, not downward. This is truly amazing: McCain and his handlers knew they had to say something about health care. So they turned to their friends (and financial supporters) in the health care industry and

Organization Trends

the conservative think tanks.”

The Left-Wing Network

Founded in 1996 by 100 activists and writers, CAF’s founders include Mary Frances Berry, former head of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights; feminist Betty Friedan; Denis Hayes, coordinator of the first Earth Day in 1970 (and who chose Lenin’s birthday for the annual greenfest); Jesse Jackson; and a large number of union officials including John Sweeney, head of the AFL-CIO, and Andy Stern, leader of the large Service Employees International Union (SEIU). A scan of CAF’s founders shows that 13 of them are primarily identified as union officials, and many more are labor activists or labor scholars.

A large chunk of CAF’s funding comes from the unions and left-leaning foundations. Its revenues likely ramped up in 2007 and 2008, but 2006 is the most recent year for which data is available. Foundation donors’ money flows more to IAF than CAF. Typical is the liberal Agnes Gund Foundation, which was founded by a former president of the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. It gave IAF \$75,000 in 2006. Another foundation donor, the Arca Foundation, whose money comes from Democratic fundraiser and R.J. Reynolds heir Smith Bagley, gave \$50,000.

In 2005, liberal philanthropist George Soros’s Open Society Institute gave IAF \$465,000. Soros, who has been funding CAF and IAF for years, once said that stopping President Bush’s reelection in 2004 was “the central organizing principle of my life.” Presumably, he has a new one now. The Schumann Center for Media and Democracy, whose president is Bill Moyers, gave \$300,000 in 2005. The San Francisco-based Tides Foundation, which serves as a conduit for left-wing start-up groups, handed \$218,791 to IAF. The Barbra Streisand Foundation gave \$20,000. In 2006, CAF and IAF took in \$700,000 and \$5.7 million respectively, for a total of \$6.4 million.

In 2004, CAF and IAF collected \$1 million and \$5 million—and CAF provided a list of its donors’ names and addresses on its publicly available tax returns, something not required by the IRS and carefully avoided by most attentive nonprofits. After 2004, CAF learned to delete specific donor data.

Thus it is that we know that in 2004, the Communications Workers of America, the Sheet Metal Workers International Union, and the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) each gave CAF \$25,000. Other major contributors that year included George Soros (\$50,000 of his personal funds), the American Federation of Government Employees (\$20,000), the United Steelworkers (\$45,000), and MoveOn.org’s political

Leadership Council (DLC). The list of presenters and speechmakers at CAF’s Take Back America conference March 17-19 was packed with progressive journalists, authors, and bloggers, plus folks like Representative John Conyers (D-Michigan), Jesse Jackson, and TV host Phil Donahue. Inheritance tax enthusiast Bill Gates Sr., the father of the Microsoft billionaire, participated in a panel called “Challenging the Second Gilded Age.” Tapping into one of the latest trends



Representative Jan Schakowsky (D-Illinois) received CAF’s 2008 Progressive Champion Award. She is shown here addressing the group in June 2006.

action committee, which contributed \$175,000. Other unions provided funding as well, and unions directly provided at least \$270,000 of CAF’s \$1 million in contributions for that year. Major individual and foundation donors included Bernard and Audre Rapaport of Waco, Texas (\$25,000), Rapaport’s company, the American Income Life Insurance Company (\$25,000), the Rockefeller Family Fund (\$60,000), Rockefeller Family Associates (\$22,000), Rhino Records founder Richard Foos and his wife Shari (\$50,000), and heiress Caroline Getty (\$35,000).

Taking Back America

CAF is considered to be a major player in the big electoral comeback liberals are planning for this year. Since its focus is on economic public policy issues, CAF is often cited by liberals within the Democratic Party as a counterweight to the more moderate, Clinton-aligned, pro-business Democratic

among liberals—courting religious voters instead of ridiculing them—Norman Lear gave a speech called “Reflections on God and Country from the Left.” Lear received the America’s Future Lifetime Leadership Award at the conference.

Representative Jan Schakowsky (D-Illinois) received the Progressive Champion Award and spoke from the self-confidence that liberals currently enjoy when she said, “It looks like all of our work is finally paying off. We were told all of these years that we had to run to the political center, and we have succeeded in moving the center.”

Neither Barack Obama nor Hillary Clinton spoke to the conference this year, but Borosage saw the bigger picture. “They are carrying the message that progressive groups have organized around and have demanded that their candidates embrace.”

he said. “So we don’t feel neglected by these two contenders.”

Representative John Conyers (D-Michigan), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, told TBA attendees that even though he’d like to impeach President Bush, doing so could harm Obama’s chances of becoming president. “Dear friends, this is a decision I am struggling with, and I want to share it here. Do I want to jeopardize the election by taking up this issue?” he said. “The problem is, this could become the issue of the 2008 election. This brilliant, talented senator [Obama], who has more delegates and more votes than anybody else, could get derailed.” He spoke during a panel called “The Republic Against the Rogue Presidency.”

The candid Conyers later told CNS that taking some sort of action against Bush might be possible after the election. “I am afraid they would raise it in the campaign, and that they will use it against us, and that we would end up getting McCain. I would regret that for the rest of my life,” he said. “That’s the only reason. That would be my fear... We can win this election and go get these guys afterwards. But we just don’t want to jeopardize November 4th.”

Georgetown Law professor David Cole, a Nation magazine correspondent, asserted that Bush doesn’t believe in the system of constitutional checks and balances set up by our Founding Fathers. “The only checks and balances this president believes in is check and balances within the White House,” Cole told the audience.

One of the more impressive tricks of America’s left has been bringing together unions and environmentalists even though environmentalism has cost American workers millions of jobs. Environmentalists were among CAF’s founders, and CAF has worked hard to reconcile these two wings of the liberal movement, often by proposing government programs to make up for the job losses caused by environmental regulation. Environmental activists Van Jones from Oakland, Calif., and Majora Carter from New York City received the Paul Wellstone Citizen Leadership Award for a project called Green Jobs for All. Endowed by Congress in the energy bill that passed last year, Green Jobs for All works to create alternative energy



CAF is “a front group for the AFL-CIO,” says CAF critic Grover Norquist, who is president of Americans for Tax Reform.

jobs in inner cities.

Jones offered a CAF-style piece of advice to conference attendees on avoiding mistakes that liberals have made in the past. “America is not looking for a movement that will critique it. It is looking for a movement that will inspire it,” he said.

In fact, IAF and the Center on Wisconsin Strategy have a project called Apollo Alliance, joining unions and environmentalists to promote “green energy independence,” which aims to make America primarily reliant on domestically-generated wind, solar, biofuel, and other forms of renewable energy. This utterly unfeasible proposal takes care to emphasize the jobs the project would create—after government regulation forces industry to abandon the most economically efficient sources of energy.

CAF folks don’t want any Clinton- and DLC-style moderation diluting their leftism. An overwhelming 72% of Take Back America attendees favored Obama while 16% wanted Hillary; 12% said either was fine. CAF articles and blog posts sometimes contain snide references to “Clintonites.” The Politico reported (March 19) that Borosage said that CAF and other liberal groups planned to spend \$400 million on this year’s elections separate from the partisan party

machinery, an astonishing increase over previous election years’ estimates. Such spending can only be estimated because the nature of independent groups’ spending and in-kind contributions—such as when union officials organize Democratic voters—is often murky. “There is more coordination among groups that can coordinate,” Borosage told the Politico. “There is more sharing of information. There’s an incredible increase in sophistication and capacity since 2004, when we had the largest mobilization we had previously.”

If conservatives matched the left here, that would mean \$800 million in outside political spending. Can conservatives match the left? It remains to be seen. “I think so, at the end of the day, yes,” said Norquist. “It’s too important.” He said that right-leaning wealthy Americans would have to match the giving by Soros, Peter Lewis, and other super-rich leftists. However, one big advantage the left has, Norquist said, is “forced union dues,” which are spent on political activities as union bosses see fit.

Not only is more money pouring into independent groups, but with a political stalemate currently preventing the Federal Election Commission (FEC) from acting (only two out of six commission slots are filled, not enough for a quorum), these groups may feel free to

Organization Trends

push the boundaries of political activity this year with unprecedented amounts of cash.

Health Care for America

One of the top domestic policy priorities for liberals is health care, which is likely to be an election year promise congressional liberals won't forget if they keep their majorities in 2009. What progressives have to say today about health care reform could easily determine what sort of health care you receive tomorrow.

Unlike many other liberal organizations, CAF has been careful not to endorse a "single-payer" health care system. Yale professor Jacob Hacker has developed CAF's health care proposal, called "Health Care for America," and explains it as a public-private hybrid.

"America's \$2.2-trillion-a-year medical complex is enormously wasteful, ill-targeted, inefficient, and unfair. The best medical care is extremely good, but the Rube Goldberg system through which that care is financed

is extremely bad—and falling apart...." he wrote in a January 11, 2007 report. "What Health Care for America would do is simple: every legal resident of the United States who lacks access to Medicare or good workplace coverage would be able to buy into the 'Health Care for America Plan,' a new public insurance pool modeled after Medicare. This new program would team up with Medicare to bargain for lower prices and upgrade the quality of care so that every enrollee would have access to either an affordable Medicare-like plan with free choice of providers or to a selection of comprehensive private plans."

Hacker ignores evidence from states like Massachusetts, where former Governor Mitt Romney's version of a public insurance pool has already run into deep financial trouble. Instead, he claims that CAF's proposal is less likely to frighten Americans who fear more government control of the health care system. Unlike single-payer proposals, CAF argues that private insurance companies will continue to offer consumers differing healthcare choices (although medical saving

accounts wouldn't be one of them) that he promises the law will keep affordable.

Hacker shrewdly seeks to reassure corporations, a key special interest that liberals, in their rhetoric at least, do not often seek to mollify. "Health Care for America would be good not just for American families, but also for American corporations," he insisted. "It would make it easier for firms to provide coverage on their own by reducing the burden of uncompensated care and the cost to employers of covering workers' employed dependents (because all employers would be required to contribute to the cost of covering their own workers). It would also offer substantial savings to employers that decided to buy into the Health Care for America Plan—an option that many small and low-wage employers would likely seize."

Every American would be required to purchase health insurance, with those unable to afford it given free coverage. The Yale prof also picked out a word that supporters should associate with CAF's plan. "If one word

Capital Research Center's

GUIDE TO NONPROFIT ADVOCACY



JAMES DELLINGER

Introduction by Terrence Scanlon
President, Capital Research Center

Understanding the Nonprofit World

Capital Research Center's new *Guide to Nonprofit Advocacy* surveys more than 100 key nonprofit public interest and advocacy organizations shaping U.S. politics and society today. Although the law prohibits 501(c)(3) nonprofits from lobbying and political spending, this year nonprofits are working aggressively through 501(c)(4) and 527 affiliates and umbrella groups to pass laws and elect candidates.

\$15.00

To order, call 202-483-6900
or visit http://www.amazon.com/shops/capital_research
or mail your check and book order to:
Capital Research Center
1513 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036



CAF co-directors Robert Borosage (left) and Roger Hickey (right)

captures the essence of Health Care for America, it is ‘guaranteed,’” he said. “Health Care for America would guarantee coverage; it would guarantee a generous package of benefits; it would guarantee greater choice; and it would guarantee real savings and improved quality. The lack of such guarantees is at the heart of health insecurity in the United States today. To fulfill these guarantees, Health Care for America would create a new public-private partnership with powerful built-in incentives to control costs while improving quality.”

CAF typically approaches public policy issues with similar kinds of arguments. It favors greater government intervention in the economy and opposes reductions in taxes; it favors more spending on education, and opposes the Iraq war as a waste of resources; it favors the current Social Security system and opposes personal accounts. Its project called “The Big Con” is dedicated to criticizing—and learning from—conservative policy arguments and the conservative movement.

Progressive Triumph?

CAF commissioned a survey that purports to show that most Americans back a progressive agenda. Although every pollster knows survey responses depend greatly on what information is provided and how questions are phrased, CAF confidently reported last June that 69% of Americans believe government “should care for those who can’t care for themselves” and 43% would like “government to provide many more services even if it means an increase in spending” while only 20% want government to reduce services

“in order to reduce spending.” Two-thirds think “upper-income people” pay too little in taxes, and three-quarters say they would pay more for electricity if it came from renewable, non-warming sources. The report claims 69% believe that the federal government should guarantee Americans’ access to health coverage, and 60% favor increasing their own taxes to provide universal coverage.

A poll released earlier this year by the conservative National Center for Public Policy Research ran counter to some key findings in the CAF survey, suggesting Americans haven’t signed on to the progressive agenda. It found that 48% of Americans were opposed to paying higher gasoline taxes in order to help curb U.S. greenhouse gas emissions. The survey also found just 18% of Americans were willing to pay 50 cents or more in additional taxes per gallon of gas to reduce greenhouse emissions, a proposal favored by stalwart liberal Representative John Dingell (D-Michigan), chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. That poll was released in March, when, according to the Energy Information Administration, gasoline was around \$3.25 per gallon: At the end of May, gasoline had topped \$4.00 per gallon in some states.

The Campaign for America’s Future strategizes about how to make its radical policy ideas sound attractive to Americans. But ATR’s Grover Norquist says Americans listen to many campaign promises “until you tell them the cost. Do you want to combat global warming? People answer yes. But they don’t when you tell them what it would cost.”

CAF promotes a comprehensive agenda for economic change but neglects to mention the trade-offs—in taxpayer dollars and individual freedom—it requires to achieve them. That’s bad public policy, but in 2008 it may be good politics.

Joseph A. D’Agostino is a Washington, D.C.-based freelance journalist currently writing a book tentatively titled Triumph of Patriarchy. He is a former Associate Editor of Human Events and former Vice President for Communications at Population Research Institute.

OT

Editor’s Note: Capital Research Center previously published a profile of the Campaign for America’s Future. “Campaign For America’s Future: Liberal Group Battles Social Security Reform,” by Joel Mowbray, appeared in *Organization Trends*, March 2002.



Capital Research Center’s next online radio shows air live on
July 1, 3:05 p.m.
July 29, 3:05 p.m.
August 26, 3:05 p.m.
(Eastern time)
at <http://www.righttalk.com>

Replays follow at 5 minutes past the hour for the following 23 hours, or listen at your convenience later at <http://www.capital-research.org/podcast/>

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

Thank you for your support.

Terrence Scanlon
President

Briefly Noted

In the year since **Al Gore** began trying to make his home more energy-efficient, the global warming crusader's home energy use spiked more than 10%, the **Tennessee Center for Policy Research** reports. Over the last year, the former U.S. vice president's home used up 213,210 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity, which is enough for 232 average American households for a month. "Al Gore is a hypocrite and a fraud when it comes to his commitment to the environment, judging by his home energy consumption," said **Drew Johnson**, president of the Nashville-based think tank.

Obama Corps is coming to your town. **Barack Obama's** campaign is planning to mobilize 3,600 volunteers for six weeks of political work in 17 states, and it's calling the campaign jobs "Obama Organizing Fellowships." In exchange for working on the presumptive Democratic presidential candidate's campaign, fellows are promised training in community organizing techniques, which is code for leftist political agitation. The campaign claimed more than 10,000 people applied for the temporary gigs.

George Soros's largesse helped make possible *Boumediene v. Bush*, last month's Supreme Court ruling that gave America's terrorist enemies unprecedented access to our civilian court system. Soros's **Open Society Institute** has given the anti-American law firm Center for Constitutional Rights, co-counsel in the case, as much as \$200,000 in grants. CCR is headed by **Michael Ratner**, who wrote a book praising mass murderer **Che Guevara**, and was profiled by Matthew Vadum in the September 2006 *Organization Trends*.

With barely a whimper a few weeks after its big launch, **David Brock's** much-hyped **Progressive Media USA** has collapsed, thrown under the bus by Team Obama. In May the ambitious 501(c)(4) group, which vowed to spend \$400 million trashing GOP presidential candidate **John McCain**, quietly announced it would "dramatically scale back its efforts in deference to the wishes of the [Democratic] party's presumptive nominee," the Washington Post's **Chris Cillizza** reports. So much for Brock's claim that the Soros-sponsored group would be independent and nonpartisan.

Conservatives are more honest than liberals, **Peter Schweizer** writes in a Washington Examiner op-ed. He notes that a **Pew Research** study found 86% of conservatives believed it was "morally wrong" to cheat on taxes, compared to only 68% of liberals. More conservatives understood that individuals must take personal responsibility to prevent government from taking their earnings. In another survey 49% of progressives said if they were unemployed and were offered a job that paid cash under-the-table allowing them to continue collecting unemployment benefits, they would take it, compared to just 21% of conservatives in the same situation. Schweizer is author of the new book, *Makers and Takers: Why Conservatives Work Harder, Feel Happier, Have Closer Families, Take Fewer Drugs, Give More Generously, Value Honesty More, Are Less Materialistic and Envious, Whine Less...And Even Hug Their Children More Than Liberals* (Doubleday).

Washington Legal Foundation, a national non-profit public interest law and policy center, argues in a new report that the federal government has effectively criminalized the conduct of free enterprise in America. The report, *Federal Erosion of Business Civil Liberties*, details the increasingly unwarranted use by the Department of Justice and agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency of criminal prosecution of regulatory offenses when administrative or civil remedies would be more appropriate. With a foreword by former U.S. Attorney General **Dick Thornburgh**, the report is available at www.wlf.org.