

## The Green Counter-Establishment:

*How It Holds Power*

By Bonner Cohen

*Summary: What follows is an excerpt from Capital Research Center's forthcoming book, The Green Wave: Environmentalism and Its Consequences, by Bonner Cohen.*

The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, and the National Wildlife Federation are examples of traditional conservation organizations that underwent a radical transformation during the rise of modern environmentalism. On the other hand, Greenpeace, NRDC, the Environmental Working Group, the Center for Biological Diversity, and the Rainforest Action Network are examples of groups that came of age after the first Earth Day. What both groups have in common is that they recognize the importance of money—and lots of it—to achieve their ends. Whether through land deals, foundation grants, government funding, individual contributions or membership dues, the big environmental groups have found a way to stay big and rich.

The movement has put in place the “alternative power structure” that is the necessary prerequisite for the Left’s ability to do battle with the capitalist system it seeks to transform. This parallel universe of interlocking relationships and mutually reinforcing political agendas is not just about money, however. Money can grease the skids, buy advertising, hire staff, print books, fund demonstrations, and finance studies. But to transform society, you have to change the way people think. Or, to speak in the language of latter-day students of Hegel, Marx and Gramsci, you have to alter consciousness. The neo-Marxist Antonio Gramsci understood this better than anyone. Whether the



Saving gas and souls: Reverend Jim Ball, organizer of the “What Would Jesus Drive?” tour.

leaders and the foot soldiers of the environmental movement know it or not, they are executing Gramsci’s battle plan superbly.

Gramsci argued that because people in modern capitalist societies are captive to a false consciousness, the only way to overcome it is to create what he called a “counter-hegemony” of new values. These new values, which today include environmentalism, would undermine and delegitimize the prevailing ideas and institutions of the capitalist hegemony.

### “What Would Jesus Drive?”

The counter-hegemony prevails now in many of the nation’s houses of worship, where it gives new meaning to the phrase “Nothing is sacred.” In late 2002, the Evan-

gelical Environmental Network (EEN) launched a high-profile anti-SUV advertising campaign asking: “What Would Jesus Drive?” “As our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ teaches us,” one ad read, “Love your neigh-

**June 2006**

**CONTENTS**

The Green Counter-Establishment

page 1

Kyoto Kiddies

page 6

Briefly Noted

page 8

---

### *Whether through land deals, foundation grants, government funding, individual contributions or membership dues, the big environmental groups have found a way to stay big and rich.*

---

bor as yourself.' Of all the choices we make, as consumers, the cars we drive have the single biggest impact on all of God's creation."

This bit of tastelessness coincided with Arianna Huffington's anti-SUV campaign. The syndicated columnist and Hollywood maven made the outrageous claim that owning a SUV helps the cause of terrorism because it makes America dependent on Middle East oil. Both the Huffington and the EEN campaigns used the formidable fear-mongering skills of Fenton Communications. This is the left-leaning Washington PR firm that has stirred the pot with scare campaigns targeting children's toys, plastic medical devices, Alar, and endocrine disruptors—just to name a few. Indeed, in the "What Would Jesus Drive?" campaign, a Fenton news release boasted: "Here's how we did it." Fenton estimated that it turned EEN's \$70,000 invest-

ment into \$3 to \$4 million in free publicity, including 1,900 articles and extensive coverage on network television news shows.

On June 15, 2001, the nation's Catholic bishops unanimously approved a statement urging as a "moral imperative" taking action to end global warming. "At its core, global climate change is not about economic theory nor political platforms, nor about partisan advantage or interest group pressures," said the bishops' statement. "It is about the future of God's creation, and the one human family." Several days before, the Greater Boston Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life released a letter signed by 19 local leaders, which said that the Bush administration's energy plan "does not yet meet biblical standards for stewardship and justice." It called on Jewish communities to "raise awareness of how fossil fuel use contributes to global warming." Earlier in the month, a coalition of Protestant and Orthodox Christian leaders released a letter in New York City warning that "by depleting energy sources, causing global warming, fouling the air with pollution, and poisoning the land with radioactive waste, a policy of increased reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear power jeopardizes health and well-being for life on Earth."

These three statements, released shortly after President Bush's rejection of the Kyoto Protocol, show how churches and synagogues have positioned themselves in environmental debate. Their outlook is an outgrowth of the National Religious Partnership for the Environment (NRPE), founded in 1993, an alliance of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the National Council of Churches, along with EEN (an affiliate of Evangelicals for Social Action) and the Coalition on the Environment and Jewish Life. NRPE activities have been coordinated from the group's inception by its longtime executive director, Paul Gorman, a former vice president for public affairs and advocacy at the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine in

New York. Described by the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty as a "mecca for new age, ecological thought since the 1970s," the Cathedral provided a wealth of experience and contacts for Gorman to take to NRPE.

NRPE's first major undertaking was a three-year, \$4.5 million campaign to distribute "education and action kits" to over 100,000 U.S. congregations. Funded by grants from the Washington-based National Environmental Trust (NET), the project also distributed prayers to worshipers. These were drawn not from the Old or New Testaments but from materials based on the Gaia Hypothesis. Gaia is a maternal earth goddess in Greek mythology, and the Gaia Hypothesis regards earth as a superorganism, both living and divine. One NRPE prayer that was distributed to congregations resolved that "We must say, do and be everything possible to realize the goal of the environmental Sabbath: an ecological society...We cannot let our mother die. We must love and replenish her." Another prayer, taken from the Iroquois, delivers a similar same message: "We return thanks to our mother, the earth which sustains us. We return thanks to all the herbs, which furnish medicines for the cure of our diseases. We return thanks to our corn and her sisters, the beans and the squashes."

Whatever its impact may be on worshipers, NRPE is very successful as an organization. With generous grants from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Blue Moon Fund, NRPE is financially prepared to make its influence felt, particularly in circles identified with the religious left. But one member of the NRPE alliance, the Evangelical Environmental Network would have a trickier task in getting its flock to embrace a green agenda. How would the group that introduced the "What Would Jesus Drive" campaign deal with an evangelical audience not likely to look fondly on Gaia-inspired environmentalist rhetoric? EEN would have to do more than substitute Jesus for the Earth Mother if it hoped to get evangelicals on board.

The infatuation for all things green has provoked a backlash within the evangelical community. At a March 2005 Capitol Hill meeting of the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), attendees debated

---

**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](mailto:mvadum@capitalresearch.org)

**Web Site:**

<http://www.capitalresearch.org>

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

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

---

whether the evangelicals' political platform should go beyond such issues as opposition to abortion and support for traditional marriages. Fissures surfaced. Arguing against a "one or two-item political approach" was the Rev. Ronald J. Sider, president of Evangelicals for Social Responsibility, the EEN parent organization. Opposition to greening the NAE

---

## *The annual incomes of the nation's biggest environmental groups, according to the latest available IRS tax forms, are staggering.*

---

was led by the late Diane Knippers, president of the Institute on Religion and Democracy, who said: "The religious left is political smoke and mirrors." Added Tom Minnery, vice president of Focus on the Family, "Do not make this about global warming."

But they did. Over the next year, EEN and its allies lobbied NAE's president, the Rev. Ted Haggard, to extend the idea of "creation care" to include support for measures to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. However, in February 2006 NAE announced that because it could not reach a consensus on climate change, the group would take no stand on global warming. In a letter to Haggard, more than 20 evangelical leaders had urged NAE not to adopt "any official position" on global climate change because "Bible-believing evangelicals...disagree about the cause, severity and solutions to the global warming issue."

EEN's attempt to attract socially conservative evangelicals to the banner of environmentalism was a feat of daring. Still, the effort has fallen short.

### **Green Power Structure**

There will be inevitable setbacks in the never-ending trial-and-error game of seeking to spread environmentalist influence into hitherto unoccupied territory. But ever resourceful, both financially and politically, green advocacy groups remain determined to open up new avenues of influence. In late

March 2006, for example, Environmental Defense (ED) teamed up with the Advertising Council and the high-powered New York PR firm of Ogilvy & Mather to launch a national public service advertising campaign to "motivate Americans to participate in activities that will help combat global warming." The ads are created pro bono by Ogilvy & Mather and distributed nationwide. (See page 6 for more on the ED ad campaign.) "According to Environmental Defense," the Ad Council press release states, "our nation's most distinguished science community agrees that global warming is an urgent problem, we are causing it, and we have time to avoid the most dangerous consequences, which could happen in our children's lifetime." "We've launched this campaign as a wake-up call," adds Fred Krupp, president of Environmental Defense. "This is the most serious environmental challenge of our time. It is more urgent and its dangers more fundamental than most Americans realize."

Environmental Defense, once known as the Environmental Defense Fund, made a name for itself in the late 1960s and early 1970s in calling for a ban on DDT. Four decades later, it continues to generate environmental scares, even if its tone is more muffled than Greenpeace or NRDC. What *has* changed, however, is ED's finances. From its upscale Park Avenue address in Manhattan, to its annual 2003 income of \$50,289,354 (according to its latest available federal tax forms) to the \$358,172 in salary and benefits pocketed by ED president Fred Krupp, ED is riding high in the saddle. It also helps to have had Teresa Heinz Kerry serve on its board of trustees for over 20 years and to enjoy grants from such foundations as Heinz, Mott, Blue Moon, MacArthur, Turner, Cummings, and the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. ED epitomizes the green elite, whose comfortable surroundings bear little resemblance to the natural world over which it regularly issues the most dire pronouncements.

The big environmental groups have become a part of the establishment they seek to transform. ED's Manhattan neighbor, the Natural Resources Defense Council, rakes in even more money: \$57,303,067 in 2003. And these two high-fliers are not even the wealthiest. The annual incomes of the nation's big-

gest environmental groups, according to the latest available IRS tax forms, are staggering:

- \* The Nature Conservancy, \$732,402,173 (2003)
- \* World Wildlife Fund, \$112,001,561 (2004)
- \* National Wildlife Federation, \$100,534,318 (2004)
- \* Sierra Club, \$91,843,757 (2004)
- \* National Audubon Society, \$76,595,365 (2003)
- \* Conservation Fund, \$67,546,599 (2004)
- \* Natural Resources Defense Council, \$57,303,087 (2004)
- \* Environmental Defense, \$43,661,043 (2003)
- \* Conservation International Foundation, \$43,659,355 (2003)
- \* The Wilderness Society, \$27,234,601 (2003)
- \* Defenders of Wildlife, \$25,729,780 (2003)
- \* Earthjustice, \$21,090,378 (2004)
- \* World Resources Institute, \$16,179,169 (2003)
- \* Greenpeace, \$15,913,343 (2004)
- \* National Environmental Trust, \$13,352,810 (2004)
- \* Union of Concerned Scientists, \$12,130,811 (2003)
- \* Resources for the Future, \$9,189,422 (2003)
- \* League of Conservation Voters, \$8,369,006 (2004)

Some of this impressive wealth has made its way into the pockets of the leaders of key environmental groups. How well do they do? Here's a sampling of what the best-paid environmental leaders earn in salary plus benefits, according to IRS Form 990. The list confirms what many environmental advocates have been saying for years: It pays to be green.

- \* Steven McCormick, president & CEO, The Nature Conservancy, \$380,067 (2003)
- \* Fred Krupp, president, Environmental Defense, \$358,172 (2003)
- \* John Flicker, president, National Audubon Society, \$362,237 (2003)
- \* Kathryn Fuller, president and director, World Wildlife Fund, \$310,781 (2003)
- \* Jonathan Lash, president, World Resources Institute, \$302,186 (2003)
- \* Peter Seligmann, chairman & CEO, Conservation International Federation, \$336,353 (2003)
- \* John Adams, president, Natural Resources Defense Council, \$353,220 (2004)

# OrganizationTrends

- \* Rodger Schlickeisen, president & CEO, Defenders of Wildlife, \$281,473 (2003)
- \* John Selzer, president & CEO, The Conservation Fund, \$268,977 (2004)
- \* Carl Pope, executive director, Sierra Club, \$241,224 (2004)
- \* William Meadows, president, The Wilderness Society, \$236,675 (2003)
- \* Vawter Parker, executive director, Earthjustice, \$234,869 (2004)
- \* Phillip Clapp, president, National Environmental Trust, \$190,462 (2004)
- \* Kenneth Cook, president, Environmental Working Group, \$160,122 (2004)
- \* Leslie Carothers, president, Environmental Law Institute, \$156,350 (2004)
- \* Stephanie Pollack, vice president, Conservation Law Foundation, \$153,995 (2003)
- \* Paul Hansen, executive director, Izaak Walton League of America, \$151,958 (2003)
- \* Larry Schweiger, president, National Wildlife Federation, \$151,610 (2003)
- \* Kevin Knobloch, president, Union of Concerned Scientists, \$149,671 (2003)
- \* Brent Blackwelder, president, Friends of the Earth, \$139,250 (2004)
- \* John Passacantando, executive director, Greenpeace, \$16,749 (2004)

## The Corporate Connection

While their compensation packages pale in comparison with those of *Fortune* 500 CEOs, those at the top of the green NGO bureaucratic ladder enjoy the perks of power, and they use it to give their seal of approval to corporations that toe the green line. Politically-correct companies are expected to follow a code of conduct based on environmentalist-inspired notions of sustainable development and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Companies that embrace CSR or otherwise flaunt their green *bona fides* are not, however, necessarily selfless environmental stewards or sterling corporate citizens. Sometimes they earn their credentials in less than honorable ways. Here are three recent examples:

**Enron:** Once-mighty Enron Corp. has come to symbolize corporate greed and irresponsibility. Its spectacular collapse in 2002 is commonly lumped with such odious contemporaries as GlobalCrossing, WorldCom, Adelphi, and Tyco. But Enron's self-serving

commitment to combating global warming should stand alongside its notorious accounting schemes as an example of its fraudulent claims.

Toward the end of the Clinton administration Enron began to claim that it would help counter changes to the planet's climate—and increase its bottom line—by emissions trading, a scheme that involves selling the right to emit greenhouse gases. On December 12, 1997, one day after the Kyoto Protocol was completed, an internal Enron memo predicted that the company would profit handsomely from a global warming treaty. Enron, the memo noted, had “excellent credentials” with many environmental groups and they were referring to the company in “glowing terms.” The Kyoto Protocol, the memo asserted, would “do more to promote Enron's business” than any other initiative, and the treaty's emissions trading provisions would be “good for Enron stock.”

Confident that emissions trading would open up a bright future for his company, Enron president Ken Lay met with President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore to express his support for the administration's climate policy. “Enron hoped to cash in on Kyoto by masterminding a worldwide trading network in which major industries could buy and sell credits to emit carbon dioxide,” observes Bill O'Keefe, president of the George C. Marshall Institute. But Enron's descent into bankruptcy and ignominy put an end to its dreams of global warming profits even as it ruined the finances of its employees and shareholders.

**BP:** When Ken Lay went to that White House meeting with Clinton and Gore, he was joined by Sir John Browne, CEO of energy giant BP. “Sir John,” an internal Enron memo points out, “thinks there will soon be government regulation of greenhouse gases. And companies that have anticipated regulation will not only know how to use it to their advantage; they will also, as Browne puts it, ‘gain a seat at the table, a chance to influence future rules.’” One could hardly find a better description of what economists call “rent-seeking”—pursuing profit by using political influence and taking advantage of regulations that skew the market. BP, which has

enormous natural gas reserves, saw an opportunity to rig Kyoto-like regulatory schemes in its favor. Because natural gas emits less carbon dioxide than coal or oil when it burns, BP stands to benefit handsomely from any Kyoto-driven switch to natural gas.

Enron's collapse has removed it from the global warming game, but BP is still eager to play. Even though the Kyoto Protocol proves itself increasingly unworkable, BP is pouring millions into high-visibility advertising campaigns on television and in newspapers touting the virtues of the company's commitment to reducing the effects of carbon dioxide. “It's time to turn up the heat on global warming,” reads the headline on a full-page ad in the *Wall Street Journal*. “We were the first major energy company to take steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions,” proclaims another full-page *WSJ* ad. “BP supports energy education throughout the country,” it continues, “from a traveling classroom that teaches alternative energy, to the Solar Decathlon in Washington, D.C.” “Reducing our footprint: Here's where we stand,” begins another ad. It closes with the company's logo and the words “BP beyond petroleum.”

And yet BP's footprint is still very much with us. In late 2005, the Environmental Protection Agency launched a criminal investigation of BP's management of pipelines in Alaska's North Slope. EPA later expanded its inquiry to include the spill of an estimated 134,000 to 267,000 gallons of crude oil from a BP-operated pipeline in Prudhoe Bay. According to Alaska state conservation officials, the pipeline ruptured from internal corrosion, causing what is considered the largest spill ever in the energy-rich North Slope. Officials at Alaska's Department of Environmental Conservation announced they would seek fines of up to \$2 million from BP for damage caused by the spill.

The Alaska spill isn't the only recent blemish on BP's environmental record. In 2005, 15 workers were killed and over 170 injured in an explosion at the company's Texas City plant, which earned BP a \$21.3 million fine from federal workplace safety regulators. The *Wall Street Journal* reported that the case had been passed on to the Justice Department for

possible criminal investigation. Current and former BP employees accused the company of skimping on maintenance and ignoring repeated warnings of trouble at the Texas and Alaska facilities. BP has denied the charges. However, in April 2006 BP's environmental credentials were further called into question by the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, which fined the company \$2.4 million for safety violations at its Oregon, Ohio refinery. OSHA said the violations were similar to those uncovered in the Texas City explosion.

BP's culpability in the cases cited here will have to be determined by further investigations and possibly by the courts. The oil and gas business is inherently risky, and no one should accuse BP or any other energy company of intentionally disregarding environmental or safety concerns. One cannot help but wonder, however, if the tens of millions BP poured into self-congratulatory testimonials to its global warming achievements might not have been better spent on workplace safety and maintenance at facilities it managed in Alaska, Texas and Ohio.

**Goldman Sachs:** In November 2005, the global investment banking and securities giant Goldman Sachs Group, Inc. joined Citigroup, J.P. Morgan, Bank of America, and the World Bank in capitulating to a radical activist environmental group. These financial behemoths caved in to the demands of the Rainforest Action Network (2005 income: \$2.8 million). Goldman Sachs adopted sweeping environmental policies to guide its lending practices in developing countries. Following the demands of RAN, it agreed that human-induced greenhouse gases cause catastrophic climate changes that must immediately be reduced; that the self-appointed representatives of indigenous peoples must approve all its development projects; and that logging must be conducted according to procedures developed by eco-activists.

Within months after it adopted the new lending guidelines, Goldman Sachs revealed that it would donate 680,000 acres of land it owns in Tierra del Fuego, Chile to the New York-based Wildlife Conservation Society. The Chilean land deal, which caused an uproar in the media and among many sharehold-

ers, provides a revealing glimpse of the cozy relationships between corporate heavyweights and well-connected green advocacy groups. Goldman Sachs CEO Hank Paulson happens to be chairman of the board of the Nature Conservancy, and Paulson's wife is a former Conservancy board member. The Nature Conservancy, the world's wealthiest environmental group, has long-standing ties to the Wildlife Conservation Society, having



Hank Paulson represents the increasingly cozy relations between big business and environmental groups. He is both CEO of Goldman Sachs and chairman of the board of the Nature Conservancy.

worked with it on projects outside the United States. One of the trustees of the Wildlife Conservation Society (2004 total revenue: \$195,598,851) is H. Merritt Paulson, the son of Hank Paulson. Goldman Sachs officials have rushed to the defense of Paulson and brushed aside questions about conflict of interest. But they are at a loss to explain why the Nature Conservancy, no stranger to land deals, was paid a \$144,000 "consulting fee" for its role in the transaction.

Two New York City-based powerhouses—one a global investment banking firm, the other a blue-stocking environmental group with over \$700 million in assets—with family ties in common are disposing of 680,000 acres of land in far-away rural Chile and it's considered rude to ask questions? The deal was completed without the advice and consent of the inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego who, in Paul Driessen's words, are "about to have a no-development conservation easement

forced on them." "Nor," he adds, "did anyone assess the vast area's potential value for timber, oil or metals, so that locals and [Goldman Sachs] shareholders would at least know the true cost of the giveaway."

Enron and BP are examples of rent-seeking companies eager to assist global environmental officials and green NGOs in creating a regulatory structure they can exploit. The Goldman Sachs land giveaway—a variation on the theme of insider trading—shows how those who bask in the glow of "corporate social responsibility" take care of their own at the expense of the less well-connected. All three examples attest to the extraordinary ability of well-situated elites to use the green power structure to their advantage.

### Limiting Growth

Recently the media has widely reported on the alleged "muzzling" of scientists by the Bush administration. James Hansen, the director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies, has charged that the Bush administration is gagging government scientists who disagree with its policies on climate policies. While Hansen's scientific credentials are beyond question, his dedication to the cause with which he has come to be identified has led him to rhetorical excesses. The man who once admitted to devising "extreme scenarios" about global warming to get the attention of "decision-makers," has also gotten the attention of the media. Describing working conditions for government scientists in disagreement with the Bush administration's climate policies, Hansen told a New York audience in February 2006: "It seems more like Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union than the United States." He told CBS's "60 Minutes" the following month that, "in my more than three decades in the government, I've never witnessed such restrictions on the ability of scientists to communicate with the public." Hansen's allegations have also been featured in the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and in a fawning portrait in the May 2006 "Special Green Issue" of *Vanity Fair*.

Despite environmentalist claims of a "consensus" on global warming, climate science is contentious. Like other fields of scientific inquiry, there are clashes between scientists

in and out of government, and there are conflicts between career government scientists and political appointees. At stake are not just scientific reputations and political agendas but also much-sought-after grant money to fund further research. These disputes are beneficial to the extent that they shed light on the subject and are conducted with civility. And in this regard, it is worth noting that *Washington Post* reporter Juliet Eilperin has written that while there were tensions between government scientists and Bush administration officials, “none of the scientists said political appointees had influenced their research on climate change or disciplined them for questioning the administration. Indeed, several researchers have received bigger budgets in recent years because President Bush has focused on studying global warming rather than curbing greenhouse gases.”

Hansen’s determination to turn the science of climate change into a political cause celebre has moved him into the center of the green establishment. He received a \$250,000 Heinz Award from the Heinz Foundation in 2001, then endorsed Teresa Heinz Kerry’s husband, John, for president in 2004, and served as a consultant to former Vice Presi-

dent Al Gore in putting together Gore’s 2006 traveling slide show/power-point presentation on climate change. Hansen’s ties to Gore and Kerry are a matter of public record. But when CBS’s “60 Minutes” reporter Scott Pelley interviewed Hansen for the network’s March 19, 2006 segment on climate scientists and the Bush administration, Pelley failed to mention Hansen’s political links and referred to him as an “independent.”

Environmental advocacy groups have been eager to echo Hansen’s accusations. For instance, NRDC senior attorney Robert F. Kennedy Jr. ludicrously says Bush and his appointees “are engaged in a campaign to suppress science that is arguably unmatched in the Western world since the Inquisition.”

In their magisterial study, *How the West Grew Rich: The Economic Transformation of the Industrial World*, Nathan Rosenberg and L.E. Birdzell, Jr. point out that:

*“Western innovation owes much to interaction between economic and scientific spheres. Underlying the geometric growth in the output of Western economies has been a geometric growth in scientific knowledge, linked to a variety of institutions that*

*transmute the growth in scientific knowledge into growth in material welfare. This growth in scientific knowledge has shaped, nurtured, and fueled Western economic growth. It offers a key to understanding the growth process.*

The operative word here is “growth”—both in scientific knowledge and material welfare. But what if growth is seen as the root of all that threatens the well-being of the “planet”? “Limits to Growth” was not just a fashionable slogan of the now-forgotten Club of Rome: the idea has guided leading environmentalist advocacy groups to this day. The precautionary principle, it will be recalled, was conjured up to ensure that the growth in scientific knowledge didn’t interfere with green elites imposing their will on the rest of the world. Limiting growth is the ideological glue that holds together environmentalism’s alternative universe, its counter-hegemony. The green power structure—the interlocking networks of power and influence that promote environmentalist goals—now has a prominent and well-padded seat at the table of public policy. It will not be dislodged easily.

*Bonner R. Cohen is a senior fellow at the National Center for Public Policy Research and senior policy analyst for the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow.*

For frequent updates on environmental groups, nonprofits, foundations, and labor unions, check out the CRC-Greenwatch Blog at

[www.capitalresearch.org/blog](http://www.capitalresearch.org/blog)



## Kyoto Kiddies

By David Hogberg

If children didn’t exist, the left would have to invent them. Case in point is Environmental Defense’s new television ads, in conjunction with the Ad Council, sounding the global warming alarm. Filled with little skulls full of mush who probably don’t know the difference between a polar ice cap and Pokemon, they implore us grownups to preserve the planet for them by combating climate change.

The ads have received a fair amount of media attention and uncritical coverage (but I repeat myself), leading to a lot of self-satisfied backslapping by Environmental Defense. An email I received from the group the other day was titled, “Global Warming Ads Get Rave Reviews.” “Nothing short of

---

### *The truth is, no country is going to cut its growth or consumption substantially in the light of a long-term environmental problem.*

---

remarkable,” the email reads. “That describes the media’s reaction to the launch of our powerful new TV spots to wake up America on global warming.” It also boasts, “*Time* magazine devoted its April 3 issue cover to global warming and gave generous coverage to our Fight Global Warming work”—as if you needed any further proof that the line between mainstream journalism and liberal advocacy is now so blurred as to be non-existent.

The email continues, “The overwhelmingly favorable response means that global warming has finally arrived as a mainstream American issue. Global warming is no longer a matter of political or scientific debate.” This is in keeping with the *Time* magazine issue that declares in the table of contents that “The debate is over.” If you had a dime for every time environmental alarmists and the media (but I repeat myself again) declared the debate over global warming is over, you could afford Laurie David’s Tudor mansion along with its high electricity bills.

Of course, the debate is far from over. Just recently, over sixty scientists urged the Canadian government to review the science of climate change as it relates to Canada’s position on the Kyoto protocol. The letter stated:

*Observational evidence does not support today’s computer climate models, so there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future. Yet this is precisely what the United Nations did in creating and promoting Kyoto and still does in the alarmist forecasts on which Canada’s climate policies are based. Even if the climate models were realistic, the environmental impact of Canada delaying implementation of Kyoto or other greenhouse-gas reduction schemes, pending completion of consultations, would be in-*

*significant. Directing your government to convene balanced, open hearings as soon as possible would be a most prudent and responsible course of action.*

While Environmental Defense may succeed in stifling debate on the science of global warming, it is going to have a much harder time doing so on global warming policy. One policy Environmental Defense promotes is a “cap-and-trade” system in which the total amount of greenhouse gases that companies can emit is restricted by the federal government. Companies that do a better job of limiting their greenhouse gas emissions under the cap can earn credits that they can trade with companies that do not do as well as limiting greenhouse gas emissions. Environmental Defense points to the successful cap-and-trade system employed to limit sulfur dioxide, the main cause of acid rain. However, technologies like smokestack scrubbers and low-sulfur coal were already in development when the sulfur dioxide system was established. As of yet, there are no such technologies available for a greenhouse gas like carbon dioxide.

We can also look to how well the cap-and-trade system of the Kyoto Protocol is working by looking at Europe, which ratified the agreement in late 2004. Most of the major nations in the European Union will fall far short of the 8 percent cut (based on 1990 levels) in greenhouse gas emissions by 2012. A recent study by the International Council for Capital Formation found compliance with Kyoto would result in substantial job losses and reductions in GDP for the United Kingdom, Spain, Germany and Italy. Last year British PM Tony Blair admitted that Kyoto wouldn’t work: “The truth is, no country is going to cut its growth or consumption substantially in the light of a long-term environmental problem. Some people have signed Kyoto, some people haven’t signed Kyoto, right? That is a disagreement. It’s there. It’s not going to be resolved.” If this is the effect cap-and-trade is having on Europe, one can only imagine how dismal its economic impact would be on the U.S., the largest emitter of greenhouse gases.

The environmental movement may have duped much of the American public that global warming is a major crisis. But they will

have a much harder time convincing us that we must sacrifice economic growth to combat it. Environmental Defense will have to find even cuter looking kids for their commercials.

*This article originally appeared in The American Spectator and is reprinted here with permission. David Hogberg is a senior research associate at Capital Research Center.*

**OT**

---

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

Please remember Capital Research Center in your will and estate planning. Thank you for your support.

Terrence Scanlon, President

---

**To find out more about organization profiled in *Organization Trends*, visit our online database at [www.capitalresearch.org](http://www.capitalresearch.org)**

**You can also retrieve past issues of CRC newsletters, including**

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

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

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

# BrieflyNoted

Former vice president **Al Gore** has started a new environmental group, the **Alliance for Climate Protection** that aims to persuade Christian conservatives, hunters, union members and others that global warming is a crisis for the world. Film distributor Paramount Classics has contributed \$500,000 and hopes further funding will come from proceeds of "An Inconvenient Truth," a Gore-produced film on the issue that opens nationwide this month.

After **Ken Blackwell** won the Ohio GOP gubernatorial primary, **People for the American Way** issued a press release with the headline "Ohio Republicans Nominate Radical Right-Wing Candidate for Governor." No surprise there. But there was also this eye-popping criticism: "Blackwell has...[a] record of race-baiting to win campaigns." Come again? How could Blackwell, an African American, become governor if his campaign antagonized Ohio's white majority?

The **People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)** no-cruelty-to-chickens campaign is accelerating. On May 11 **PETA** introduced a shareholder resolution at the annual meeting of **Applebee's International Inc.** to have the company issue reports on how its chicken suppliers slaughter their birds. Only six percent of the shareholders voted for it. Meanwhile 19-year-old **PETA** volunteer Ashley Fruno donned a yellow bikini to protest outside a **Kentucky Fried Chicken** restaurant in British Columbia. One passerby got the wrong idea. "I wouldn't have come in at all but after I saw her, the way she was dressed, I slowed down and came in to check out her breasts and thighs," said Martin Van der Horst, who left the KFC restaurant with a snack pack of chicken, fries and a salad.

**CAIR**, the **Council on American-Islamic Relations**, suffered a resounding defeat when it withdrew its lawsuit against a website called **www.Anti-CAIR-net.org**, (**ACAIR**), which regularly attacks it as an apologist for Islamist extremism. CAIR's unwillingness to disclose financial information necessary for its suit to proceed seems to have prompted a settlement, whose terms remain confidential. However, ACAIR was not required to issue an apology or retract or correct its criticisms. All the critical statements that triggered the CAIR suit remain on the ACAIR website.

Give the teachers' unions points for consistency: They oppose anything that smacks of competition, not merely vouchers. The *Washington Post* reported last month how many students are seeking tutoring services from foreign countries like India. The teachers' unions have responded by lobbying for legislation denying **No Child Left Behind** funds to any after-school tutors that haven't passed the same certification as public school teachers. "Quality control doesn't end at 3 o'clock when the school bell rings," said Rob Weil, deputy director of educational issues at the **American Federation of Teachers (AFT)**. "If you need a highly qualified teacher in school at 2:59, you should have a qualified teacher as a tutor after school at 3:01." You would think that the market would take care of quality control. That is, if the student isn't benefiting from the tutoring, the parents will take their money elsewhere. But not according to the AFT. "We don't believe that education should become a business of outsourcing," said Weil. "When you start talking about overseas people teaching children, it just doesn't seem right to me."

More companies on the global warming bandwagon. **AIG**, the world's largest insurer, has become the first U.S.-based insurance company to adopt a policy on developing "products and services to help AIG and its clients respond to the worldwide drive to cut greenhouse gas emissions." The **Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies (CERES)**, which lobbies corporate America on global warming, praised AIG for sending "signals to the market and policy makers that climate change is a critical insurance issue." So critical that government no doubt will someday require employers to purchase climate insurance--from AIG?



