

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

The New Leviathan: How the Left-Wing Money-Machine Shapes American Politics and Threatens America'sFuture

David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin

Last accessed on Thursday, July 25, 2024

44 Highlights | 0 Notes

Yellow highlight | Location: 77

> The political melodrama in which Democrats and progressives posture as paladins of enlightenment has a long and unpretty history. It was forged during the moderately populist and immoderately corrupt presidency of Andrew Jackson, spokesman for the "common man," who entered the White House as a self-proposed champion of the people battling the "moneyed elite." Both the image and the aura were transparent manipulations to seduce a willing public. Despite humble beginnings, Jackson was a man of means who basked in the privileges of an aristocratic life. The same comfortable circumstances did not discourage him from plundering the property of his political rivals, or justifying his avarice as a "sharing" of the wealth, or from exploiting the morality play he had created to expand his personal power. Nor did Jackson's "everyman" enthusiasms keep him from owning and selling slaves throughout his life or from presiding over the forced removal of American Indian tribes from their native lands on the "Trail of Tears." Politics being a market in which fictions are currency, the Jacksonian myth established the enduring template of the two-party system. As a Republican newspaper in Tennessee complained, "The rank and file of the democratic party honestly believes … the democratic party is the poor man's party, that the republican party is the party of boodle and corruption and that they obtain and maintain their supremacy in all the states by the undue use of money."2 Franklin Roosevelt entered the White House a hundred years after Jackson, and despite being a born aristocrat, a "son of privilege who never depended on a pay check," he was also able to frame his presidential tenure as "the Era of the Common Man."3 In the 1970s, Jimmy Carter took up the folksy mantle, touting himself as a simple peanut farmer from Georgia and promising to be the "people's president." Yet Carter was the son of a wealthy plantation owner, inherited his own business, and spurned a lucrative job in the private sector in order to sow the seeds of a political career with a tale of humble beginnings.4 Carter's claim to be a progressive was particularly dubious since he won his 1970 gubernatorial campaign by courting the support of southern segregationists and projecting what one biographer has called a "not-so-subtle racism" away from public view.5 In the election of 2000, Al Gore, another scion of an elite segregationist family, took up the populist theme with the campaign slogan, "The People vs. the Powerful." As part of a White House that set records fund-raising from "special interests," Gore's claim was hardly credible, although a politically sympathetic media

helped to make it seem so. After losing the presidency, Gore launched a new career posing himself as the people's champion against global polluters, even winning an Academy Award and a Nobel Prize from fellow progressives for these efforts while trampling on the environment and making himself a wealthy man in the process.…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 123

Wall Street—the very symbol of capitalist excess and wealth—was a key player in Barack Obama's successful presidential election run in 2008. Counterintuitive at first, this fact becomes immediately intelligible once one realizes that big government works for Wall Street bankers who float all the bonds that underwrite government spending programs and take their percentage on every dollar of big government debt. Award-winning business reporter Charles Gasparino observes: "… the assumption made by most Americans,

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 131

In light of these facts it is hardly surprising that the top financial backers of Barack Obama's presidential campaign included Wall Street leaders Jamie Dimon (CEO, JPMorgan Chase), Lloyd Blankfein (CEO, Goldman Sachs), Dick Fuld (CEO, Lehman Brothers), Warren Spector (CEO, Bear Stearns), Larry Fink (CEO, Black-Rock—the world's largest money management firm), Greg Fleming (number two at Merrill Lynch), and Mark Gallogly (number two at the private equity firm Blackstone). Collectively, these Wall Street titans raised more than $100 million for the Obama campaign.12 It is a reflection on human vanity that the Left

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 157

Long before Stein's presentation, the claim that the Right was massively funded compared to the Left was a standard piece of progressive folklore, supported by a bookshelf of left-wing tracts and pseudoscientific studies. In Moving a Public Policy Agenda: The Strategic Philanthropy of Conservative Foundations (1997), author Sally Covington charged that the conservative movement had relied on "a substantial and interconnected institutional apparatus" unrivaled by the Left in order to win the war of ideas and push the country rightward. Like Stein, Covington singled out a core of conservative foundations—Scaife, Bradley, Koch, and Olin—as the financial engine driving this ostensibly dramatic shift in the national ideology to the right. Yet, the Olin Foundation was so dedicated to this concerted effort that in 2005 it deliberately went out of business in accord with the wishes of its founder.17 A

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 172

> The twin premises of all these narratives, including Stein's PowerPoint, was that conservatives could draw on far superior and unrivaled tax-exempt resources to change the nation's political discourse and move it to the right. Both premises were demonstrably false. As of 2009, the financial assets of the 115 major tax-exempt foundations of the Left identified by our researchers added up to $104.56 billion. Not only is this total not less than the financial assets of the 75 foundations of the Right, it was more than ten times greater.19 Of the "Big Three" conservative foundations that every one of the left-wing analyses cited (Bradley, Olin, Scaife), not one has (or had) assets exceeding a billion dollars. By way of contrast, fourteen progressive foundations do, including Gates, Ford, Robert Wood Johnson, Hewlett, Kellogg, Packard, MacArthur, Mellon, Rockefeller, Casey, Carnegie, Simons, Heinz, and the Open Society Institute.20 As already noted, the John M. Olin Foundation, which figures in each of the left-wing foundation narratives and has so alarmed the Left over the years as one of the conservative "Big Three," actually terminated itself in 2005 and has been defunct ever since. No comparable progressive foundation has so far voluntarily put itself out of business. The conservative Scaife Foundation has assets totaling only $244 million, according to 2009 tax records,21 or less than one-twentieth the assets of MacArthur to take one progressive example (and not the largest). The Bradley Foundation had assets of $623 million in 2009,22 or about one-sixteenth the assets of the progressive Ford Foundation (also not the largest) and only slightly more than half of George Soros's Open Society Institute. Conservative resources may sound imposing, but only when looked at in isolation. When put in context, they are dwarfed by the financial behemoths of the Left. In 2009, the leading progressive philanthropy, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, had an endowment of more than $33 billion—over three times the total of all seventy-five conservative foundations combined.23 Progressive funders have created several organizations to coordinate their efforts, including a very large foundation that was set up specifically for this purpose. The $175 million Tides Foundation was created in 1976 by activist Drummond Pike and sees itself as an engine of progressive advocacy: "We strengthen community-based organizations and the progressive movement by providing an innovative and cost-effective framework for your philanthropy."24 Pike set up the foundation as a public charity that receives money from donors and then funnels it to the recipients of their choice. Because many of these recipient groups are quite radical, the donors often prefer not to have their names publicly linked with the donees. By letting the Tides Foundation, in effect, launder the money for them and pass it along to the intended beneficiaries, donors can avoid leaving a paper trail.25 Such…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 212

> a fiscal sponsor to some 677 separate projects with combined revenues of $552 million. According to the Tides website: "To date, Tides has managed project and

grantmaking activities totaling more than $2 billion. We have fiscally sponsored more than 800 nonprofit projects." Between 1993 and 2003, at least ninety-one foundations made grants to the Tides Foundation.28 As an indication of the way in which the philanthropic world itself has moved dramatically to the left, foundations that funneled money to the left-wing Tides operations included the richest and most venerable philanthropies, onetime symbols of American capitalism. These included the Rockefeller Foundation; the Rockefeller Family Fund; the Ford Foundation; the Carnegie Corporation; the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; the David and Lucile Packard Foundation; the W. K. Kellogg Foundation; the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation; the Heinz Family Foundation; the Howard Heinz Endowment; the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation; the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation; the Fannie Mae Foundation; the ChevronTexaco Foundation; the Annie E. Casey Foundation; the AT&T Foundation; the Barbra Streisand Foundation; the Bauman Family Foundation; Ben and Jerry's Foundation; Changemakers; the Columbia Foundation; the Energy Foundation; the Foundation for Deep Ecology; the Hoffman Foundation; the Homeland Foundation; the J. M. Kaplan Fund; the James Irvine Foundation; the JEHT Foundation; the Jenifer Altman Foundation; the Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation; the Joyce Foundation; the Lear Family Foundation; the Liberty Hill Foundation; the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; the Roberts Foundation; the Schumann Center for Media and Democracy; the Stern Family Fund; the Stewart R. Mott Charitable Trust; Vira I. Heinz Endowment; and the Woods Fund of Chicago.29 With over $100 billion in tax-exempt assets at their disposal, left-wing foundations have been able to invest massively greater amounts of cash in their beneficiary groups than have their conservative counterparts. The Washington Post observed that the Ford Foundation alone had given away more money in one year than conservative donor Richard Mellon Scaife—whom liberal journalists refer to as the "Daddy Warbucks" of the right—gave in forty years.30

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 262

The newly enacted campaign finance reform laws deprived both parties of soft money contributions, draining the Democratic Party of financial resources. It was Soros who had put together and financed the coalition that successfully lobbied to enact campaign finance reform.35 This was a calculated effort to create the opening for the 527 network Soros then put together as the Shadow Party to collect the contributions the Democratic Party no longer was legally eligible to receive, and thus to shape the message of the presidential campaign. It also provided the Shadow Party with a hammer over Democratic legislators who could no longer depend on the same level of financing from the official party for their individual campaigns. Soros, more than any other individual, is thus responsible for the Democratic Party's recent shift to the left. The network that Soros put together consisted of progressive billionaires, government unions (SEIU, AFCSME), grassroots radical organizations like ACORN, and political

operatives like former presidential adviser Harold Ickes and former White House chief of staff John Podesta, head of the then newly created Center for American Progress, a policy think tank. The political juggernaut that was formed concentrated a power the likes of which had never before been seen in national election campaigns. Providing venture capital to fund the Shadow Party's campaign were five left-wing billionaires—Soros, Progressive insurance head Peter Lewis, Hollywood mogul Stephen Bing, and California savings-and-loan CEOs Herbert and Marion Sandler. According to the election records, the collective investment of all 527s active in the 2004 campaign, Democrat and Republican, was $440 million. But of the $440 million total, a staggering 70 percent went to Democratic-leaning groups. One Shadow Party 527, the Media Fund, spent $57 million on broadcast and television advertising in battleground states attacking President Bush and supporting his Democratic opponent John Kerry. Another Soros-linked 527 group, America Coming Together, spent $78 million on get-out-the-vote efforts. By the time the campaign was over, between them the Media Fund and America Coming Together outspent their nearest two Republican counterparts by a factor of three to one. Between 2004 and 2008, 527s generally spent almost $1.5 billion, most of it in support of Democratic candidates. Despite the record infusion of money by the Shadow Party, the Democrats lost the 2004 election. Out of the disappointment of defeat, the Democracy Alliance was born. The idea behind the group was straightforward: by investing even more money in entities such as MoveOn.org, Americans Coming Together, and Media Matters, progressives could create an alternate structure within the Democratic Party to move it even farther to the left, and recapture Congress and the White House. To that end, the Democracy Alliance set about to continue the Left's massive spending, its members donating some $100…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 347

As a graduate student at Columbia University and at the time a self-identified Marxist, Barack Obama attended the Socialist Scholars Conferences held in New York between 1983 and 1985. Obama would later cast these conferences, which featured some of the most ideologically extreme voices on the left, as one of many intellectual distractions that he took in during his time in New York. He would also distance himself from the revolutionary politics celebrated at the conferences, insisting that he was always suspicious of the "dogma and excesses of the left and right." Despite those denials, the evidence assembled by Stanley Kurtz through assiduous research in left-wing archives, makes inescapable the conclusion that these conferences had a much more formative impact on Obama's later attitudes than he is today willing to acknowledge.2 More important, the conferences served as Obama's first introduction to the concept of community organizing, and to the Left's leading personalities and political parties. It also introduced him to the Left's newly devised strategies for implementing radical change in a democratic society by introducing "non-reformist reforms"—in other words, without appearing to be radical. The Socialist Scholars Conferences were Barack

> Obama's entrée into a world of organizers and organizations that would become the training ground and then the foundation for his political career.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 365

> Thus he was comfortable discussing everything from the tactics of Saul Alinsky,5 the theoretical guru of the new strategies, to the organizing strategies that had been tried and failed by socialist groups like Students for a Democratic Society during the 1960s.6 As Hershenov would recall, in her discussions with Obama they "were thinking about how you engage the world: what works coming out of the Sixties, what structures and models worked and what didn't."7

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 379

> American Marxists Richard Cloward and Frances Fox Piven had become famous among the Socialist Scholars Conference leftists, for example, by advancing a strategy of "breaking the bank" by overloading its welfare rolls.9 In a seminal 1966 article in the Nation titled "The Weight of the Poor: A Strategy to End Poverty," Cloward and Piven advocated a series of massive "welfare drives" in large cities that would swell the welfare rolls, cause widespread disruption in welfare agencies, and sow financial chaos in local and state governments. This deliberately engineered "political crisis" would create a political environment more favorable toward socialist policies.10 This strategy formed the mission of Cloward and Piven's National Welfare Rights Organization, whose leaders later created ACORN, an organization in which Obama would play a major role, and which in its turn would play a major role in his rise to the presidency. Both organizations could trace their ideological origins to another proponent of the strategy of undermining capitalism internally, American leftist Saul Alinsky. A self-identified "professional radical," Alinsky had written an indispensable guide for community organizers based on how to conduct a war against the free-market system by working inside it.11 His 1971 book, Rules for Radicals, would become a bible for left-wing activists (and is a manual to this day recommended on the official website of the National Education Association as a guide for the nation's unionized teachers). Obama was formally trained in the Alinsky principles at Alinsky-created institutions and went on to join a network of organizations dedicated to Alinsky-style radicalism, which became his political base in Chicago.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 404

> The DCP was actually an affiliate of another CCHD-sponsored initiative, a network of community organizing groups and organizer training centers called the Gamaliel Foundation. Gamaliel was founded in 1980 by Gregory Galuzzo, a former Jesuit priest

and Alinsky disciple. Modeled on Alinsky's methods, Gamaliel supports a variety of left-wing causes—from opposing restrictions on immigration to opposing national security legislation like the USA PATRIOT Act—all under the guise of fostering a "more democratic society."14 Gamaliel has also received grants from the most powerful philanthropies on the left, including the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and George Soros's Open Society Institute.15 Yet another left-wing foundation involved with the DCP during Obama's time there was the Woods Fund, which provided the money that activist and organizer Gerald Kellman, another Alinsky follower, used to hire Obama for the job.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 421

Obama's political star continued to rise as a result of his involvement with another institution, the Midwest Academy, which was a major training center for radical activists with a political pedigree to match.17 The Midwest Academy was run by veterans of 1960s radicalism and the Socialist Scholars Conferences, and it trained organizers in the Alinsky strategies. It was funded by a roster of big-budget left-wing foundations, such as the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the Open Society Institute, and in 2008, it had net assets of just over $654,000, the latest year for which figures are publicly available. The

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 471

Andrew Stern, the former head of the SEIU, also sits on ACORN's Independent Advisory Council. With its many contacts inside ACORN, the union often relies on the organization to do its dirty work. According to ACORN whistleblower Anita MonCrief, the SEIU paid an ACORN chapter in Washington, D.C., to harass an international equity firm called the Carlyle Group because the firm did not hire union workers.27

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 482

Obama's position as director of Project Vote was only one of the roles he would occupy in the network of organizations created by Alinsky radicals. In 1992, the year he joined Project Vote, he was also appointed to the advisory board of Public Allies. Taxpayer funded through AmeriCorps and the Corporation for National and Community Service, Public Allies was designed to connect young activists with left-wing organizations, nonprofits, and government agencies. The Chicago branch of Public Allies was effectively an adjunct of the Midwest Academy, and Obama's colleague on the advisory board was Heather Booth.29 The connection to the academy was also a family affair. In 1993, thanks to Obama's recommendation and his growing reputation as a community

radical, his wife, Michelle, would become the executive director of the Chicago branch of Public Allies.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 492

Foremost among these figures, early on, was Democratic state senator Alice Palmer, a veteran of Chicago politics, who also had ties to the Midwest Academy.30 Palmer represented Illinois's Thirteenth District, including large parts of Chicago's South Side, and was a prominent fixture in the world of leftist Chicago politics. In 1986, she attended the Twenty-Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and later touted the Soviet dictatorship as a model for the United States to emulate.31 When she announced in 1995 that she would be leaving her post as state senator to run for a congressional seat, she chose Barack Obama to be her replacement. For the still unknown politician, Palmer's endorsement was priceless, conferring instant credibility on a candidate with whom many in her district were not yet familiar. Without Palmer's passing of the torch, it is all but inconceivable that Obama could have achieved his first elected office as Illinois state senator in 1996.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 515

During the 2008 presidential campaign, attention was drawn to the fact that Ayers was unrepentant about his past participation in the Weather Underground, a cult that claimed responsibility for more than a dozen bombings between 1970 and 1974. In a notorious interview in the New York Times, which appeared on September 11, 2001, Ayers said, "I don't regret setting bombs … I feel we didn't do enough."36 When the predictable backlash occurred, both Obama and Ayers made concerted efforts to obscure the closeness of their friendship. Obama insisted that Ayers was just a "guy who lives in my neighborhood," while Ayers claimed that he hardly knew the presidential aspirant.37 This was disingenuous, to put it mildly. The public record is quite clear on their political friendship and working alliances, and whatever differences they had (if any) did not prevent Ayers from helping Obama rise up the rungs of Chicago politics, nor Obama from actively furthering Ayers's political projects. The reception and fund-raiser that Ayers and Dohrn held for Obama in their living room in 1995 was just a small aspect of their collaboration. Far more important was the instrumental role Ayers played in bringing Obama onto the board of the multimillion-dollar Chicago Annenberg Challenge, a left-wing foundation that distributed educational grants and was pursuing Alinsky politics in the Chicago K–12 schools. The Annenberg Challenge was in no small

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 549

With their often explicit subtext that African tribalism was superior to Western democratic cultures, and that American society was racist and oppressive, these curricula were the educational equivalent of the sermons delivered by Obama's pastor, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, whose rancid orations routinely demonized America as a country that God should damn. It is no mere coincidence that some of the leading Afrocentrist ideologues in Chicago were invited to address both Annenberg Challenge–funded teacher training sessions and Wright's congregation at Trinity United Church.41

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 624

Personal associations with Chicago leftists in the orbit around the Midwest Academy were an important part of Obama's career trajectory. Just as vital were the roles played by influential left-wing charities like the Joyce Foundation. Established in 1948 by the late Beatrice Joyce Kean, whose family made a fortune in lumber, the Joyce Foundation initially focused its philanthropy on apolitical causes like hospitals and health organizations.57 Following Kean's death in 1972, however, the foundation increasingly invested its assets—nearly $800 million as of 2009—in left-wing agendas such as campaigns against global warming, environmentalism, gun control, and Alinsky-style community organizing.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 699

The evidence is irrefutable and overwhelming that Obama's path to the presidency was paved every step of the way by a network of radical organizations and political figures, and the network of multimillion-dollar foundations behind them whose plan was to work within the system and present a moderate face, in order to advance an agenda of radical change. This was the strategy outlined at the Socialist Scholars Conferences that the youthful Obama had attended in New York, where he had received his formal introduction into the company of radical organizers and absorbed the socialist vision that underlay the rhetoric about grassroots activism, participatory democracy, and "community organizing."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 716

The Woods Fund, which was instrumental in making the career of Barack Obama possible, had been run by the Woods family until the member most active in the foundation, Frank H. Woods Jr., died in 1980.1 With the family's influence diminished, control of the previously traditional charity fell into the hands of leftist staffers, including veterans of the Midwest Academy, who hijacked its agenda and pushed the foundation aggressively to the left. Soon the Woods Fund was ideologically indistinguishable from the radical groups it was now funding, including Tides, ACORN,

and an assemblage of Alinsky-inspired community organizations.2 The Woods Fund trajectory—an apolitical, even conservative, foundation swerving dramatically to the left—was to repeat itself throughout the philanthropic culture. The Pew Charitable Trusts were created by the philanthropy of oil tycoon and Christian conservative J. Howard Pew in 1957 to educate Americans on the "values of the free market" and the "paralyzing effects of government controls on the lives and activities of the people." But in the 1980s, the Trusts fell under the sway of progressives like neurosurgeon Dr. Thomas Langfitt, who used his position as president to channel the foundation's wealth toward left-wing political causes. Pew's political transformation continued under Langfitt's selected successor, Rebecca Rimel, who had never been shy in expressing her hopes of shifting Pew's grants to the left. In 1991, for instance, she had told the Foundation News that she wanted to "infuse the spirit of the Sixties" into Pew's work. Rimel got her chance to do just that in 1994, when she took over as Pew's president and CEO. In her first annual report, Rimel announced that the foundation would now be pursuing a "new template" in making grants.3 What that meant soon became clear as Rimel purged most of the foundation's conservative staff members, ended the support for conservative causes, and turned Pew Trusts into a reliable ally of the progressive left.4 Pew Trusts is now the largest funder of the left-wing Tides Center, which acts as a middleman directing funds from multiple sources to hundreds of radical groups while concealing the sources of the funds.5 Between 1990 and 2002, Pew Trusts donated nearly $109 million to Tides.6 Pew Trusts also funds anticapitalist groups like the Institute for Policy Studies, a pro-Castro think tank that opposed America's efforts to roll back communism during the Cold War and since 9/11 has been a staunch opponent of America's war on terror.7 Its in-house "scholars" have included anti-American radicals Noam Chomsky, Gore Vidal, and Richard Falk. Pew Trusts also funds such radical groups as Earth Justice and the anarchist and violent Ruckus Society.8 In addition to funding radical organizations opposed to free market societies, Pew Trusts uses its resources to advance its own left-wing agendas. In recent years, the foundation has been spending its funds to support campaigns promoting…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 828

Heinz Kerry has also used foundation funds to celebrate environmental radicals, creating the Heinz Awards, and a $250,000 cash prize, to honor figures like Paul Ehrlich, an environmentalist doomsayer whose prophecies of ecological disaster in books like the 1968 Population Bomb, which predicted mass starvation in the next decades, turned him into an environmental icon despite the failure of the prediction to materialize.27 Heinz funds have also been used to sponsor activism in public schools. The foundation gave $140,000 to an organization that trains Pittsburgh schoolchildren to engage in "policy advocacy" on environmental issues.28

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 857

No shift to the left, however, was as significant as that which had taken place inside the Ford Foundation even prior to these other developments. The foundation was formed in 1936 by Edsel Ford, the only son of industrialist and auto magnate Henry Ford. The primary purpose of the foundation was to dodge the IRS's steep estate tax. In 1935, the federal government raised the tax on estates over $50 million to 70 percent, but the law retained a provision for a tax exemption for bequests to charitable, religious, and educational organizations. The Fords responded by creating a foundation in January of 1936. The arrangement placed 95 percent of company stock under the charge of the foundation. Although Edsel Ford initially envisioned small-scale philanthropic goals, the massive endowment of company equity made the Ford Foundation the largest and most influential charitable organization in the world, until it was surpassed by the endowment of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in 2006. Its sheer size makes Ford as financially powerful as an arm of a reasonably sized government—with one important difference: as a private foundation, it lacks the constraints of government, and in particular its accountability. Foundations like Ford and the recipients of their largesse are the only political players in America who don't have to answer to a constituency. They shape our society, culture, and politics but are self-perpetuating and answer to no one but themselves. By contrast, state and federal governments are constrained by a multitude of laws and oversight committees when they dispense money, and ultimately are responsible to the electorate. If government programs fail or go awry, the electorate can demand changes and get them. There is no electorate for foundation executives and there are no shareholders to exercise control over the foundations themselves. In

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 880

Edsel Ford died from cancer in 1943 at the age of forty-nine; Henry died in 1947. In the years following the founder's death, the foundation also became unmoored from the conservative views of the Ford donors. In 1951, the foundation began receiving millions of dollars in dividends from the massive endowment of stock left it by Henry and Edsel. Almost overnight the foundation was transformed into the country's largest and most influential philanthropy. At the time, young Henry Ford II was preoccupied with reviving the company that had foundered under years of mismanagement, and he could not devote attention to running the foundation. To oversee its newly lavish budget, Ford turned to Paul Hoffman, former president of the Studebaker Corporation and a liberal Republican.36 Hoffman was made the foundation's president in 1951 and immediately launched its political realignment with a symbolic change of location, moving the foundation from the Ford Company's base in Dearborn, Michigan, to a location near his home in Pasadena, California, as well as to New York City. These geographic changes heralded a shift in the nature and direction of the foundation's charitable giving that would take a dramatic turn in 1966, when McGeorge Bundy became the Ford

Foundation's president and engineered its political transformation into a radical force in American life.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 898

Intentions notwithstanding, Ford's sponsorship of radical causes frequently proved destructive to those it was intended to help. In 1967, on the advice of academic radicals in New York, Bundy aligned Ford with members of the black power movement to establish a community-run set of schools in the predominantly black Ocean Hill–Brownsville section of Brooklyn.39 Between 1967 and 1968, Ford gave over $900,000 to fund New York City schools as part of its "community control experiments."40 In theory, the Ford-funded project was supposed to empower minority communities and improve inner-city education by giving minority parents full control over their school districts. In practice, it proved divisive and counterproductive. When

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 923

Ford's "march to the Left" would ultimately provoke a bitter falling-out between the foundation's staff and trustees and most particularly Edsel Ford's son Henry Ford II, the last member of the Ford family to serve on the foundation's board. In 1976, a disillusioned Ford terminated his thirty-four-year-tenure with a protest against the leftward course his family's foundation had pursued. In a stinging letter of resignation, Ford excoriated the trustees for using Ford funds to support left-wing causes while abandoning the commitment to free enterprise that had made possible the profits from which the foundation was created and the funds that it dispensed in its grants: "The foundation exists and thrives on the fruits of our economic system. The dividends of competitive enterprise make it all possible. A significant portion of the abundance created by U.S. business enables the foundation and like institutions to carry on their work. In effect, the foundation is a creature of capitalism—a statement that, I'm sure, would be shocking to many people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities, that are the recipients of the foundation's grant programs."46 Ford wryly observed, "that the system that makes the foundation possible very probably is worth preserving."47 Ford's warning fell on deaf ears.48 Under McGeorge Bundy's leadership, the foundation made what it considered "civil rights" causes a priority. In fact, what it supported were left-wing agendas within the civil rights movement. Because the foundation's staff members were more and more politically partisan, even within the narrow definition laid down by the IRS guidelines governing its tax exemption, they resorted to a combination of audacity and finesse in pursuing their agendas. In particular, they had to convince moderate board members that the foundation should be using its funds to

bankroll groups and agendas the IRS might regard as inappropriate beneficiaries for a charitable organization.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 940

That task fell to Sanford Jaffe, the director of Ford's Government and Law Program from 1968 to 1983. Prior to his appointment, Jaffe had served as the executive director of the "Select Commission on Civil Disorder," established in 1968 by New Jersey's governor, Democrat Richard Hughes. The commission published a study examining the underlying causes of the violent and destructive riots that had erupted in the predominantly black inner-city of Newark in the summer of 1967. Like the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders initiated by President Lyndon Johnson, the New Jersey commission concluded that white racism and systemic inequities were the primary causes of the criminal events in Newark. As Jaffe later put it, the riots were sparked by "the inattention to the needs and aspirations of the black community, and the absence of opportunities available across the board."49

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 960

Nearly thirty years later, skyrocketing out-of-wedlock birth rates, endemic dependency and escalating crime rates led a Democratic president, Bill Clinton, to sign a massive welfare reform bill recognizing that many of the problems of the inner-city "underclass" had been fostered if not created by the government programs designed to remedy them.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,052

The network of progressive foundations built with right-wing and left-wing fortunes now exceeds over a hundred institutions, with assets of over $100 billion, the largest concentration of money available for political purposes ever amassed, and more than ten times the size of its conservative counterpart.64 It has spawned a secondary network of 501(c)3 policy think tanks and advocacy groups that number in the thousands, and that, in areas of critical social and political import, can deploy resources that exceed those of their conservative rivals by as much as a hundred to one.65 The consequences of this new institutional leviathan for the ideas, policies, and eventually laws that shape the American polity and determine its future are—and already have been—momentous. They are explored in the chapters that follow.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,125

With Ford's financial backing, MALDEF and La Raza quickly outgrew their humble beginnings. During the first three decades of MALDEF's existence, Ford provided almost all of its funding, a king's ransom for what had begun as a modest organization totaling $25 million.6 Ford funding also provided the radical MALDEF with a mainstream imprimatur, helping the organization draw additional millions from foundations like Carnegie and Rockefeller and from corporations like Anheuser-Busch, Coca-Cola, AT&T, and Verizon, among others. As a result, having started as a fringe civil rights group in San Antonio, Texas, with no national impact, MALDEF became a nationally influential advocacy group with regional offices in Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Antonio, Chicago, and Washington, D.C.; a satellite office in Sacramento; and program offices in Phoenix, Albuquerque, and Houston. MALDEF today has net assets of $7.9 million, an annual budget of $6.2 million, and a staff of seventy-five, among whom are twenty-two attorneys, and is without question one of the two most important rights advocates speaking for Mexican Americans. The other is La Raza, equally a Ford Foundation creation. When it first began in 1968 as the radical Southwest Council of La Raza in Phoenix, the organization had modest ambitions. It was supposed to apply the funds Ford provided to support community organizing efforts and develop local Hispanic leadership.7 Thanks to $30 million in Ford grants through 2002, and the ancillary grants of foundations and companies that followed Ford's lead, La Raza has become a major political organization on a national scale. Today La Raza boasts that it is the "largest national Hispanic civil rights and advocacy organization in the United States." With net assets of $46.6 million, La Raza claims more than three hundred affiliate organizations in forty-one states and a connected network of "30,000 groups and individuals nationwide."8 Mindful of that influence, Democratic presidential aspirants, including Barack Obama, now seek La Raza's backing and make a show of supporting its political agendas. Even more impressive than their size is what

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,442

Ploughshares's appetite for radical agendas helped to sustain causes that might otherwise have been little more than political sideshows. In 2006, for instance, Ploughshares made a grant of $100,000 to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for a campaign involving its so-called Doomsday Clock, a symbolic clock-face ticking toward a nuclear doomsday. The clock's "five minutes to midnight" message, which stayed in place for nearly fifty years, had long since made it a running joke.22 ("I have to hurry up and finish shopping, it's five minutes to midnight on the Doomsday Clock!") In 1999, Ploughshares became the model for the Peace and Security Funders Group, a vast network of individual philanthropists, private and public foundations, charitable trusts, and other grant-making programs.23 Like its parent organization, the Peace and Security Funders Group brings together sixty-four philanthropic organizations and individuals, including such major funders as the Ford Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, George Soros's Open Society Institute, the

Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Tides Foundation. Together they provide the Peace and Security Funders Group with a war chest of over $31 billion in total assets.24 That is a sum larger than the defense budgets of Greece, Colombia, and Poland combined. Since the Pentagon is barred by law from defending its programs in public relations campaigns to the electorate, this task is left to the handful of conservative 501(c)3s that have some focus on national security matters and whose assets are a tiny fraction of those available to the left-wing side of the debate.25 Thus ten conservative think tanks that have a focus on national security policy have assets of just $365.8 million. In short, the Left's resources available to devote to national security issues are more than eighty-four times that of conservatives.26

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,874

The runaway costs of government health-care programs failed to faze progressives in their crusade for a government health-care system. It merely cautioned them to use a piecemeal approach. In 1997, President Clinton passed the Children's Health Insurance Program, which provided health insurance to the children of the poor or near poor. Praised by supporters as providing a "critical safety net," the program marked another step toward creating a socialized medical system because its funding formula left open the option of expanding eligibility for government coverage far beyond the program's intended recipients. In February 2009, President Obama extended funding and eligibility for this program to cover an additional four million children, many of whom did not meet the original income qualifications.18 These efforts to institute a health-care reform that would irreversibly change the American health-care system had long been supported by the network of foundations committed to the progressive cause. In 1989, the Ford Foundation published a report called The Common Good: Social Welfare and the American Future. In it, the Ford executives concluded that "The national goal should be universal health coverage for all Americans." The Rockefeller Foundation had also made no secret of the fact that it was working to "support the transformation of health systems toward universal health coverage."19 The Tides Foundation described universal health care as one of the organization's "fundamental principles."20 George Soros's Open Society Institute funded several groups advocating a socialist, single-payer health-care system controlled by the federal government.21 The foundation-sponsored campaign gained significant traction in the 1990s, when state governments and then the federal government came under its influence. Prominent among the campaign's funders was the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Established in 1972, the Princeton, New Jersey–based philanthropy is a Tides Foundation donor, and a funder of the Children's Defense Fund, on whose board Hillary Clinton once sat, and the New Jersey Institute for Social Justice.22 It is America's largest philanthropy focused exclusively on health care, and, as a stockholder in the pharmaceutical industry giant Johnson & Johnson, one of the most financially powerful with $8.8 billion in assets.23 Politically, the RWJ Foundation has long been a supporter of universal health-

care coverage and in the 1990s, under the direction of President Steve Schroeder, it spent millions backing state and national efforts to pass legislation expanding government-provided health care. At the state level, the foundation funded a health-care task force in 1992 that pushed through a universal coverage plan in Minnesota. The foundation then tried to expand the program on a national scale by leading a campaign in support of the Clinton administration's health-care bill. Although the effort ultimately failed, the RWJ Foundation played a…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,923

Socialized health-care coverage was also an agenda of the $5.7 billion David and Lucile Packard Foundation.28 Created in 1964 by David Packard, a cofounder of Hewlett-Packard, the Packard Foundation had—like many other large foundations—come under the influence of the political left. The Packard Foundation was a donor to the Tides Center, the ACLU, MALDEF, Changemakers, the Children's Defense Fund, the National Council of La Raza, the EarthJustice Legal Defense Fund, the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL), the Feminist Majority, and the Alliance for Justice.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,047

Besides the SEIU, the HCCU included business groups like the Business Roundtable, which represents the CEOs of Fortune 500 companies with a combined $4.5 trillion in annual revenues.59 Partnering with the paragons of corporate America was perfectly consistent with the counsel given by Stern's and Obama's socialist mentor, Saul Alinsky, to work within the system and push it to the edge—in this instance, by using the leading beneficiaries of capitalism to advance a government takeover of health care, tying all citizens to the state. As Alinsky had said, "whatever works to get power to the people, use it." Of course "the people" who would get the power would be the government unions, government bureaucrats, and left-wing politicians who promoted the new order. Divided We Fail proved adept at doing just that. Before long, the coalition could boast that 360 members of Congress, including Republicans and Democrats, had signed its pledge or endorsed its campaign for universal health care.60 Just as Alinsky's pragmatic radicalism guided Divided We Fail, his shrewd grasp of market competition inspired another SEIU-headed coalition to support the universal health-care effort. In Rules for Radicals, Alinsky had instructed radicals to use what he called "corporate jujitsu" to achieve their political goals.61 By bearing in mind "the self-interest of corporations," Alinsky wrote, radicals could appeal to the corporate bottom line to achieve their own ambitions. The fruits of Alinsky's wisdom could be seen in groups like Better Health Care Together. Founded in February 2007, this organization allied left-wing activist groups like the Center for American Progress, a left-wing think

tank headed by former Clinton chief of staff John Podesta, with the Ford-funded League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). Also included were unions like SEIU and the Communication Workers of America and corporations like AT&T and retail giant Walmart. The alliance between the famously nonunionized Walmart and the SEIU may seem unlikely, but as Alinsky himself might have predicted, it was not. Walmart was just one of many corporations that lobbied for universal health-care legislation out of self-interest: it would impose new regulations to provide health-care coverage and thereby eliminate competition from smaller retailers, like Target, who would find such coverage too costly to provide.62 Alinsky's corporate "jujitsu" in action—Better Health Care Together—was now joined by still another. The new coalition called itself Health Care for America Now. It was created shortly after Obama secured the Democratic nomination in July 2008 and immediately pledged to spend $40 million to make health-care reform a reality. Billed to the public as a "grassroots" campaign, Health Care for America Now was a consortium of powerful left-wing interest groups and labor unions, and key elements of the billionaire-backed Shadow Party. Health Care for America Now's twenty-one-member steering…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,099

As the phalanx of left-wing funders supporting its goals indicates, Health Care for America Now was not the "grassroots" group that it claimed to be. Headquartered on Washington's K Street, home to the capital's high-powered lobbyists, Health Care for America Now was fueled by millions of dollars from its member groups and their financiers. Not only did each member of the Health Care for America Now steering committee have to put up an initial contribution of $500,000, but the group also drew from the coffers of leading left-wing funders. Atlantic Philanthropies, for example, a foundation with $3.3 billion in assets in 2007, provided a $10 million grant to HCAN. Atlantic was headed by Gara LaMarche, a Soros protégé. Soros himself pledged $5 million for the campaign.71 Health Care for America Now also received support from the Tides Center.72 All

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,128

Seizing on Scott's $5 million donation, the Left launched a successful smear campaign to marginalize his organization's modest attempt to provide a counterview. Appearing on CNN, Scott was ambushed by left-wing anchor Rick Sanchez, who proceeded to berate him as "the poster child for everything that's wrong with the greed that has hurt out current healthcare system."77 Sanchez then dismissed Scott as a "multimillionaire investor" out for himself, even though no one questioned the motivations of the billionaires and trillion-dollar corporations who were bankrolling the Left. In a typical attack, New York Times columnist Paul Krugman denounced Scott as a "cynical political

operator" and sneered that Conservatives for Patients' Rights was a "well-heeled interest group" that was distorting the health-care debate. Krugman failed to notice or acknowledge the fact that leftist groups like Families USA and Health Care for America Now invested more than ten times Scott's contribution to Conservatives for Patients' Rights.78 White House press secretary Robert Gibbs also got in on the act, suggesting that Scott's history as the CEO of a privately run healthcare company was evidence of his suspect motives, even though health-care company CEOs were a prominent part of the left-wing coalition supporting the Obama plan.79 Lacking the resources to repel this political siege, Scott's organization soon found itself on life support. Before long, Conservatives for Patients' Rights ceased to exist altogether. By contrast, Health Care for America Now not only thrived but was able to claim that the coalition and its agenda "are supported by President Obama, Vice President Biden, and more than 190 Members of Congress,"80 as the Obama administration, backed by congressional Democrats, moved full speed ahead with the socialized healthcare plan, which became known as "Obamacare." Notwithstanding the efforts of one of most powerful lobbies ever mounted in support of a piece of legislation, the radical nature of Obamacare created a fierce national backlash among the voting public. Poll after poll showed that an overwhelming majority of Americans—still committed to American individualism—opposed the health-care plan.81 That opposition soon fueled a populist revolt that saw Democrats in liberal blue states lose their seats to Republicans who ran on their opposition. Most notably, in Massachusetts, little-known Republican state senator Scott Brown scored an upset victory after campaigning to be the senator whose vote could block its passage.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,227

The first of these groups was the Environmental Defense Fund.10 Begun in 1967 with a Ford grant, the fund was a loose group of concerned scientists and birdwatchers opposed to the spraying of DDT because of its alleged toxic effect on humans and birds —a cause directly inspired by Silent Spring, Carson's anti-DDT polemic. Led by attorney Victor Yannacone, whose rallying cry "Sue the bastards!"11 captured the aggressive style of the new environmentalists, the Environmental Defense Fund allied with more traditional groups like the Sierra Club and the National Audubon Society to petition the US government to ban DDT.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,347

Philosophically, the radical environmental movement was an offshoot of Marxism. Just as Marxists claimed that capitalism oppressed man, the radical environmentalists insisted it destroyed nature. One of the early intellectual architects of this school of environmentalism was Marxist academic Herbert Marcuse, a student of the Nazi

philosopher Martin Heidegger. Marcuse's anticapitalist theories inspired the New Left's later view that the "degradation" of the environment was a systemic product of industrial capitalism.38 Those ideas in turn would shape the modern environmentalist movement. In 1969, radical students at Berkeley "liberated" a vacant lot, renamed it "People's Park," and proclaimed themselves a "conspiracy of the soil" to rescue the land from its rapacious property owner—the university, which had reserved the space for future student housing.39 The radicals then declared a strike for the "non-negotiable demands of the earth" and insisted that trees were no different than other exploited minorities, including American blacks.40 In 1970, Yale professor Charles Reich lent additional fervor to the anticapitalist strain in the environmental movement when he published The Greening of America, a bestseller charging that capitalism had bankrupted American culture and subjected the country to "uncontrolled technology and the destruction of the environment." In a more strident version of Reich's thesis, the New Left anarchist Murray Bookchin argued that "the immediate source of ecological crisis is capitalism" and that "capitalism is a cancer in the biosphere."41 Bookchin, who became an icon of the new environmental movement, also revealed its political character when he observed that "the color of radicalism today is not red (communism), but green (environmentalism)."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,405

The massive new government-subsidized green industry would open the door to more government unionization. Consequently, in 2009 the Blue Green Alliance spent $1.5 million lobbying for agendas like green jobs, a figure that surged to almost $2.5 million in 2010.53 The Blue Green Alliance is only one member of a national network fueling the campaign for green jobs. Another is the Alliance for Climate Protection, the environmental nonprofit founded by former vice president Al Gore, which in 2008 partnered with the Blue Green Alliance in a campaign promoting green jobs.54 The organization drew on connections in the world of progressive politics. Maggie Fox, the CEO of the Alliance for Climate Protection, is a past president of America Votes, a progressive coalition of over forty organizations that is a functional member of the left-wing Shadow Party created by Soros.55 The advocacy campaign for green jobs resonated with the Obama administration thanks to another group that linked the green jobs agenda of the environmental movement with the Obama White House. In 2007, environmental activist and self-described communist Anthony "Van" Jones founded the Oakland, California–based Green for All.56 Supported by funders like the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Family Fund, and by environmental groups like the Natural Resources Defense Council, the group lobbied to "build an inclusive green economy strong enough to lift people out of poverty" by "creating millions of quality jobs and careers" and Van Jones became a fellow at the Center for American Progress. According to Jones, the "green economy" would require a wholesale transformation of the American capitalist system: "We want to move from suicidal gray capitalism.… So

the green economy will start off as a small subset, and we're going to push it, and push it, and push it, until it becomes the engine for transforming the whole society."57 Saul Alinsky could not have formulated this gradualist approach to radical agendas any better. That this new government economic engine would arrest the essential dynamism of American capitalism—indeed that it was designed to do so—was openly admitted by Van Jones. In his 2009 book, The Green Collar Economy, Jones wrote that mankind must reconsider "the very notion of economic growth."58 Instead, Jones envisioned a brave new environmentalist world, where the economy would be "designed to maximize well-being—not necessarily wealth." Production for so-called need instead of profit is of course a cherished idea of the Marxist left and a hoary misconception of the role that profit and "production for wealth" play in the economic order of things. If there is no need for a product, there obviously will be no profit. Profit is both a measure of cost efficiency and an incentive to invest. Marxist schemes to "maximize well-being" by eliminating profit through government planning have been responsible for bankrupting whole continents, while capitalist systems built on…

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,471

This summit quickly became a showcase for the anticapitalist agenda of the modern environmental movement. In dissenting remarks, President Bush warned the radicals that "the American way of life is not up for negotiation." Yet that was precisely the kind of change the summit's organizers had in mind, most notably its chair, the self-described socialist Maurice Strong. A Canadian businessman and environmental activist, Strong was a fierce opponent of capitalism who had denounced private property as a "social injustice." He opened the summit by denigrating the idea of international sovereignty and advocating "global environmental cooperation" to provide "environmental security" against the alleged depredations of capitalism.66 Strong then proceeded to lecture the audience that the American way of life had to be changed to satisfy environmentalist demands, warning: "Current lifestyles and consumption of the affluent middle class—involving high meat intake, use of fossil fuels, appliances, air conditioning, and suburban housing—are not sustainable." Carrying his message at the Earth Summit a step further, Strong later that year joined with former Soviet premier Mikhail Gorbachev in launching the Earth Charter initiative, whose anticapitalist manifesto was enthusiastically endorsed by environmental groups like the Natural Resources Defense Council.67 The Earth Summit marked a political triumph for the environmental radicals and the global-warming agenda, which was given a further boost by the ascent of one the world's leading warming alarmists to the second-highest office in the United States. Al Gore had shown an interest in the subject even as a senator. In 1988, he had asked NASA scientist Dr. James Hansen to testify about the warming threat. His appearance at the summit was carefully choreographed by Democrat Timothy Worth, chairman of the Senate's 1988 hearing on climate change. Worth had called the US Weather Bureau to make sure that Hansen would testify on

the hottest day of the summer. A sweating Dr. Hansen sensationally asserted before a roomful of television cameras that the “earth is warmer in 1988 than at any time in the history of measurements” and that he had “a high degree of confidence” that humans were responsible.68 Like much of what would later pass for a scientific consensus on global warming, Hansen’s testimony was problematic. It downplayed the difficulty of predicting climate patterns, ignored natural causes as possible explanations for climate changes, and abandoned scientific nuance in order to dramatize the potentially catastrophic consequences if all his assumptions were correct and man-made greenhouse gas emissions were not reduced. Hansen’s testimony captured national headlines, inflamed fears about climate change, and ultimately inspired Gore to create a second career of spreading extreme claims about the coming environmental apocalypse.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,548

Climategate provoked an international backlash. In the scandal's wake, polls showed a sharp decline in the American public's belief that global warming represented an urgent concern and that human activities were primarily responsible for it.81 But far from conceding defeat for their alarmist agendas, the global-warming advocates remained as aggressive as ever. Left-wing foundations were a major reason why. In 2007, for example, the Doris Duke Foundation created a $100 million program to find ways to reduce the threat of global warming.82 In 2010, the Ford Foundation, which had been a staunch backer of environmental groups promoting the theory of man-made global warming, committed $85 million over five years to "combating climate change."83 The global-warming campaign has also been sponsored by smaller foundations like the Redwood, California–based Compton Foundation, which calls the United States "the largest national contributor to global climate change." The $64 million Compton Foundation has devoted a large share of its grants to funding environmental groups like EarthJustice, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club Foundation, the Tides Center, and other groups that have made the reduction of carbon emissions and global warming a central part of their platforms.84 Carbon is as central to the radicals' crusade for governmental control as is the prospect of a warming catastrophe. Massive state intervention can only be justified if global warming is seen as an apocalyptic threat, and only if something as ubiquitous as carbon, the most common element in life-forms, can be identified as its cause. As the late political scientist Aaron Wildavsky observed: "Warming (and warming alone), through its primary antidote of withdrawing carbon from production and consumption, is capable of realizing the environmentalist's dream of an egalitarian society based on rejection of economic growth in favor of a smaller population's eating lower on the food chain, consuming a lot less, and sharing a much lower level of resources much more equally."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,583

The Doris Duke Foundation's $100 million global-warming program included a mission that was designed specifically to research such policies. In 2000 and 2001, the Joyce Foundation, on whose board Barack Obama then sat, made a $1.1 million grant to establish the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), which describes itself as "North America's only cap and trade system for all six greenhouse gases, with global affiliates and projects worldwide." Maurice Strong, the radical host of the 1992 Earth Summit, is one of CCX's nine directors. Cap and trade has also been popular because many leaders of the environmental movement hope to profit from the program. Al Gore is an exemplary case. His Generation Investment Management, a carbon offset company, also exerts considerable influence over CCX and other carbon credit trading firms. (Maurice Strong is a longtime friend of Gore and remains a silent partner in Gore's company.) Gore has tried to atone for his energy-extravagant lifestyle by buying "carbon offsets" from the London-based Generation Investment Management, even

though he is the company's chairman and stands to profit from such investments, which are in essence stocks in his own company.88 Through this and other self-interested deals in the global-warming industry, Gore stands to become the world's leading "carbon billionaire."

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,620

Just how large are those budgets? The net assets of the 553 left-wing, anticapitalist environmental groups total $9.5 billion. That is substantially more than the EPA's 2011 federal budget of $8.7 billion.94 Indeed, if counted as a separate nation, the combined net assets of these 553 environmental groups would make it the eighty-first-largest in the world, just behind Bangladesh. Flush with nation-sized resources, these environmental groups have been able to overwhelm their free-market and nonradical environmental counterparts. There are 32 free-market and moderate environmental groups, and their net assets total $38.2 million—which is 249 times less than the financial resources of those on the environmental left. Smaller budgets have significantly constrained the influence of these groups. For instance, the 32 free-market and moderate environmental groups awarded total grants of $1.2 million, while the 553 left-wing environmental groups were able to make grants totaling nearly $555.4 million, a ratio of nearly 462 to 1.95 Moreover, as mentioned in the introduction to this book, the federal government annually provides $568.9 million in grant money to 247 progressive environmental groups, while providing only $728,190 to 7 groups supporting free-market solutions to environmental problems. Amid these staggering disparities, it is no surprise that environmental policy debates are increasingly conducted on the terms of the radicals, whose partisan lobbies—unlike those of energy producers and other corporate interests—speak in the name of the "public interest" and advocate in behalf of the public good. Conservative think tanks can speak with the same authority, but their voices are radically diminished by the scarcity of resources at their command. When it comes to the clash of ideologies in the area of green politics, the old-fashioned variety of "green" goes a long way.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,795

In the aftermath of the financial crash of 2008, the crippling costs of this socialist sector within the larger economy could no longer be ignored. Facing mounting pension liabilities for retired workers, many states teetered on the brink of bankruptcy. According to the Pew Center on the States, eighteen states face long-term pension liabilities in excess of $10 billion. In states like California and Illinois, the unfunded pension liabilities exceed $50 billion. If one adds retiree health-care costs to pension obligations, the unfunded liabilities of the states total $1 trillion.36 Given the sheer magnitude of labor costs in state budgets, it is not surprising that, of the forty states

that had a budget deficit in 2010, twenty-eight would have been able to balance their budgets if not for their exorbitant obligations to government workers.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 2,808

During the Wisconsin budget battle, left-wing critics sought to make much of the fact that Wisconsin governor Scott Walker was supported by the millionaire Koch brothers, whose funding of libertarian causes made them a progressive target. But campaign finance filings show that Walker received just $43,000 from the Koch Industries political action committee during the 2010 election. By contrast, the Wisconsin Education Association Council—the state teachers' union—donated nearly $1.6 million to four Senate races opposing Walker and other Republicans in the 2010 election. The teachers' unions' anti-Walker war chest was further bolstered by support from two national government unions, AFSCME and the SEIU, which since 2008 gave more than $1.3 million to the Greater Wisconsin Committee, a group that supports Democratic Party candidates. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, since 1989 unions have contributed over $509 million directly to political campaigns, a figure that does not include the amounts given through Section 527 organizations, political action committees, or other union adjuncts. Unions' actual total political spending may be anywhere from ten to fifty times greater than these direct campaign contributions.

Note: