
Internal Radical Service

Abuse of Taxpayer Dollars to Advance Leftwing
Causes Illegally and Unconstitutionally

Zuckerberg Paper Ballots

Black Lives Matter

Broken Borders

Racist Health Care

War on Fossil Fuels

by David Horowitz and John Perazzo

Copyright 2022
David Horowitz Freedom Center
PO BOX 55089
Sherman Oaks, CA 91499-1964
Elizabeth@horowitzfreedomcenter.org
ISBN: 978-1-941262-07-8

www.frontpagemag.com
Printed in the United States

INTERNAL RADICAL SERVICE

By David Horowitz & John Perazzo

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: The Problem and the Plan	2
2. Zuckerberg's Tax-Exempt Election Machine	11
3. Black Lives Matter Subsidies	30
4. Broken Border Charities	44
5. Racist Health Care	58
6. Tax-Exempt War on Fossil Fuels	72

1. Introduction: The Problem and the Plan

by David Horowitz

(Reform the IRS, De-Fund the Culture War Juggernaut
and Save the Republic)

1. The Problem

Our country is facing a crisis unprecedented in its history. The immediate manifestations of the crisis are out-of-control inflation, record crime waves, broken borders, and governmental efforts to suppress free speech, to categorize and divide the population by race, to demonize and delegitimize its opposition, to pack the Supreme Court and end the independence of the judiciary, to destroy the fossil fuel industry, and to complete the transformation of the educational system into an indoctrination and recruitment center for the anti-American left.

The deeper import of this assault is that it is directed against the very foundations of America's political system and social order, which it slanders as "white supremacist and systemically racist." Equally disturbing is that the source of these attacks are the White House and a Democrat Party that currently controls all three branches of government.

How did we arrive at this point in our history, and what are the possible levers of change to reverse it?

In the first place, we must recognize that this did not happen overnight but is the result of a calculated 50-year effort by Cultural Marxists to infiltrate and then dominate the academic, philanthropic and media institutions that create a

society's culture and shape its principles and policies.

The academic institutions are of course the most important of these because they feed the political parties, the judiciary, and the media with graduates whose outlooks they have molded and whose ideas they have shaped. Critical Race Theory, for example, which is a Marxist attack on America as “white supremacist” since its inception, and white people as racist by birth, is now promoted by the Democrat Party, and is a curriculum in our K-12 public schools.

Critical Race Theory is a poisonous doctrine antithetic to the principles of the American founding. It is entirely a product of the tax-exempt university world, and therefore financially supported by all American taxpayers, including white Americans and conservatives whom it attacks. No serious educational institution can abandon the American principle of pluralism or aspire to be a one-party state. Yet the vast majority of American universities do exactly that, and through their Teacher Colleges have duplicated this monolithic, highly politicized attitude in the K-12 schools as well.

The one-party character of the university has led to a situation in which the liberal arts and related disciplines are operating at the lowest intellectual level in their history. This is the only way a doctrine as primitively racist, and historically illiterate, as Critical Race Theory could be developed and spread. The fact that universities are now feeder systems for the Democrat Party and the cultural institutions that shape American values, in itself explains why the nation is moving in the direction of a one-party state, or why so many so-called

“liberals” think that it should.

A 2020 [study](#) of more than 12,000 college professors from 31 states conducted by the Heterodox Academy showed that the college professors’ donations to Democrats outnumber those to Republicans by a ratio of 95-1. A [similar study](#) of academic departments at 66 top-ranked liberal arts colleges and more than 8000 professors shows that there are *no* Republicans on the faculties, for example, of communications departments in those schools. Communications departments are the training and credentialing institutions for future members of the media. No wonder the Fourth Estate has become so dishonest and partisan to the left.

In accord with these troubling statistics, a recent [survey](#) of 1200 seniors by the *Harvard Crimson* revealed that only 7.1% of Harvard’s students identified as conservatives before coming to Harvard. This fact in itself indicates rampant discrimination against conservatives by the Harvard admissions office, since in a population of 330 million, roughly half of whom vote Republican, it is not possible that only 7.1% of admissions to the nation’s premier school should be conservatives. Harvard’s well-documented discrimination policy against Asians is probably influenced by Harvard’s apparent attitude that it should be a training and recruitment center for Democrat operatives and their social causes. But why then should Harvard be tax-exempt? Why is there not an endowment tax levied on Harvard and all the collegiate institutions that emulate Harvard to retrieve those tax benefits that were bestowed under false pretenses?

The political bias in university curricula has profound effects on the directions in which America is headed. The study of collegiate departments revealed, for example, that the [ratio](#) of Democrat-supporting professors compared to Republican-supporting professors in the field of Environmental Studies was 25 to 1. To understand the scope and political reach of the war on fossil fuels – a war that has inflicted incalculable damage on the oil and gas industry and the American economy – one need look no further than the way universities have been converted into training and recruitment centers for the political left.

Partisan universities are only the beginning of the problem, however. There is another post-graduate dimension to this juggernaut, and that is the field of advocacy 501(c) (3)s. A study documented in the book *The New Leviathan* showed that as of 2012, philanthropic funding foundations like Rockefeller and Ford had 13 *times* the assets of conservative foundations, and more discretionary spending power than the federal government.¹ This ratio becomes much greater when the funds from these giant foundations are distributed to 501(c) (3) advocacy environmental groups, whose paid activists, as documented in *The New Leviathan*, have had a major impact on government policies, including the war on fossil fuels. Poll after poll shows that “climate change” ranks way down on the list of issues that concern American voters, yet it is the dominant driver of Democrat policies that are fueling inflation and destroying the American economy. These taxpayer supported “charities” are wholly responsible for that anomaly.

In 2012, according to statistics compiled in *The New*

¹ David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin, *The New Leviathan* (New York: Crown Publishing Group, 2012), pp. 156, 209-246.

Leviathan, there were 553 environmental advocacy 501(c)(3)s on the left compared to only 32 groups on the right promoting market-friendly approaches to environmental problems. The net assets of the 32 conservative environmental groups amounted to \$38.2 million, while the net assets of the 553 left-wing environmental groups amounted to \$9.53 *billion*, or 249 *times* as much.²

This imbalance in tax-exempt funds to environmental activists on the left led directly to the economy-destroying plan for a “Green New Deal,” announced by Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez in February 2019. Of course, AOC had nothing to do with the research, analysis and planning of the Green New Deal. That was the work of the environmental juggernaut funded by tax-exempt donations. When AOC first announced the Green New Deal, it was already supported by 600 leftist organizations as well as 67 House Members and 11 U.S. Senators – all Democrats.

During the presentation, AOC’s chief of staff blurted out the real agenda of its creators, [telling](#) the press: “The interesting thing about the Green New Deal,” he said with great candor, “is it wasn’t originally a climate thing at all. Do you guys [reporters] think of it as a climate thing? Because we really think of it as a ‘how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy’ thing.” Climate change is the faux crisis that leftists intend to use to transform America’s market economy into a socialist state.

Another subterfuge funding this extremist agenda with contributions from all tax-paying Americans is I.R.S. Code 527

² Ibid.

which allows multi-billionaire George Soros to have access to tax-exempt funds and create the “Democracy Alliance,” an organization that as of 2012 was composed of 80 millionaires and billionaires who each contribute at least a million dollars a year to support the Democrat Party. The rationale for the 527 Code is that tax-exempt funds can be used to influence elections, provided they do not favor a particular political candidate. Obviously this makes no sense except as a blatant way to circumvent the I.R.S. bans on 501(c)(3) foundations that engage in politics. There is no organization comparable to the Democracy Alliance on the Republican side.

The existence of this multi-billion-dollar network of culture-shaping institutions and activists, beginning with the corruption of America’s universities and schools and their conversion into indoctrination and recruitment centers for anti-capitalist and anti-American causes, explains how the American spectrum has shifted away from the founding principles of the nation, transformed the Democrat Party, and led to the crises we face.

This transformation did not happen by accident. Fifty years ago, the most popular intellectual figure among leftwing academics was a dead Italian Communist named Antonio Gramsci, who turned out to be the founder of this movement. Gramsci wrestled with a problem that had burdened leftists since the First World War: Why had the Marxist proletariat failed to make a revolution? Gramsci not only came up with an answer, he proposed a solution.

According to Gramsci, the capitalist ruling class exerts

a cultural hegemony over society, which allows it to dominate its culturally diverse population. Through its hegemony, it is able to manipulate the culture of society as a whole – its ideas, beliefs, perceptions, and values, so that the worldview of the ruling class becomes the accepted cultural norm. The industrial proletariat is unable to overcome this disadvantage. Therefore, the revolutionary vanguard must be drawn from the intellectuals who deal in ideas, beliefs, perceptions, and values.³

Instead of taking over the means of industrial production as the fulcrum for transforming society, as Marx had advised, under Gramsci's plan the revolution would instead be advanced by taking over the means of *cultural* production – the universities, churches, philanthropic institutions and media. Having achieved that goal, the radical vanguard would be able to manipulate the ideas, beliefs, perceptions and values of the population as a whole to support its revolutionary goals.

Over the next 50 years, this set of ideas shaped a movement that succeeded in manipulating the cultural and political institutions that shape the nation's worldview in behalf of its goal of achieving what Obama called the “fundamental” transformation of the United States of America.

2. The Remedy

How to stall this transformation, and if possible reverse it? By leveling the cultural playing field. If there is an equal competition for the hearts and minds of the American people, and the government doesn't put its thumb on one side of

³ Bullock, Alan; Trombley, Stephen, Editors (1999), *The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought* Third Edition, pp. 387–88.

the scale, the weight of America's remarkable history, its unparalleled prosperity and freedoms, will cause the conservers of its principles and wisdoms to prevail.

The campaign to achieve this goal should consist of:

1. A Political and Educational Campaign to Expose the Corruption of the I.R.S. to the General Public, and to Call for Its Reform – Specifically to Create and Enforce I.R.S. Rules that are Politically Neutral and Equally Applied.
 2. A Legal Campaign to Sue the I.R.S. and its Tax-Exempt Beneficiaries in order to: (1) Expose the Problem and (2) Where Possible, Remedy It.
 3. A Lobby to Impress Members of Congress on the Oversight Committee and Potential Occupants of the White House with the Pressing Need to Reform the I.R.S. and Its Rules.
 4. I.R.S. Rule Changes That Would Profoundly Alter the Balance of Cultural Power.
- A. Deny Tax-Exemption and Federal Funding Generally to Educational Institutions That Have Become Indoctrination and Recruitment Centers for the Democrat Party and the Left. Require These Institutions to Commit to a Plan to Make Their Faculties Reasonably Reflect the Intellectual and Political Diversity of America within a Period of 10 Years, or Forfeit Their Federal Support and also Incur Endowment Taxes to Provide Restitution for the Monies Gained under False Pretenses.

- B. Voucherize All Education for All Americans from Kindergarten through Graduate School.
- C. Deprive Advocacy 501(c)(3)s of Their Tax-exempt Status.
- D. Repeal the 527 Tax Code.

Sunset After 5 or 10 Years Philanthropic Foundations That Devote Any Portion of Their Donations to Partisan Causes Rather Than Charitable Efforts. (A Charitable Effort Should Be Accessible to All Regardless of Political Views.)

2. Zuckerberg's Tax-Exempt Election Machine

Everybody to the right of [Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez](#) knows that the root cause of the crisis facing America — the most serious since the Civil War — is lawlessness. And everybody not under the spell of the Democrat spin machine understands that the lawlessness begins at the top, with government and the many agencies of the executive branch that are tasked by our Constitution with enforcing the law. Whether by failing to enforce our immigration statutes, or failing to prosecute criminals in our streets, or violating our election procedures to favor one particular party, Democrat administrations in our nation's capital and our major cities have brazenly supported criminal behavior carried out by [Black Lives Matter](#) rioters, common street thugs, and anti-Supreme Court agitators seeking to extort decisions by fear. The effect has been to systematically undermine the rule of law, stoke the fires of anarchy, and sow chaos in our institutions.

This trend has been evident since the revival of the radical left on the eve of the 9/11 attacks and its creation of Sanctuary Cities designed to flout the law and prevent the enforcement of the PATRIOT Act. It escalated with Obama's illegal, unconstitutional — and self-acknowledged — violation of America's immigration laws. And it spread to the revenue authority of the I.R.S., which systematically rejected the applications for tax-exempt status of conservative organizations, until the scandal grew so large that it forced the resignation of the tax commissioner, Lois Lerner. But while one commissioner is gone, the illegal partisan practices of the I.R.S. have continued to grow under her latest successor, Charles Rettig, playing a key

role in skewing the results of the last presidential election.

Tax-exempt foundations are barred from contributing their resources to election campaigns. There is no ambiguity in the law concerning this prohibition:

Under the Internal Revenue Code, all section 501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office. Contributions to political campaign funds or public statements of position (verbal or written) made on behalf of the organization in favor of or in opposition to any candidate for public office clearly violate the prohibition against political campaign activity.

The existence of such a regulation is meaningless, however, if it is not enforced. Consequently, this ban on campaign activities by “charitable” organizations didn’t daunt Facebook billionaire and Democrat Party patron Mark Zuckerberg and his wife when they plotted a massive campaign to swing the 2020 presidential election in favor of the Democrat, Joe Biden. The Facebook couple donated \$419.5 million to two leftwing tax-exempt foundations with the intention of tipping the result to Biden by launching “get-out-the-vote” campaigns focused on Democrat precincts in battleground states.

A rarely mentioned fact about the 2020 election is that Biden eked out a victory by perhaps the narrowest margin in history — .027% of the 159 million votes cast.⁴ This was a margin easily created by a strategic influx of campaign cash coupled with orders to spend the money on massive numbers of paper ballots, which could be harvested from “drop boxes,” which, as Dinesh D’Souza’s documentary *2000 Mules* shows, were repeatedly stuffed by Democrat operatives in the middle of the night.

All these millions of Zuckerberg dollars, underwritten by American taxpayers, drew no attention from I.R.S. Commissioner Charles Rettig or the I.R.S. investigating teams whose responsibility it was to see that taxpayer-supported operations like the Zuckerberg “charities” were not intervening in American election campaigns with the idea of shaping their outcomes.

⁴ The final tally in the Electoral College (EC) was 306 EC votes for Biden, to 232 EC votes for Trump, with 270 being the number required to win the presidency. The popular vote margins by which Biden allegedly won the three most hotly contested battleground states were as follows: (a) Arizona: 10,457 (EC votes: 11); (b) Georgia: 11,779 (EC votes: 16); (c) Wisconsin: 20,682 (EC votes: 10). Collectively, Trump lost these 3 states by a grand total of just 42,918 votes. If he would have won these 3 states, he would have gained their 37 combined EC votes, bringing his total up to 269. Biden, conversely, would have lost 37 EC votes, bringing his total down to 269 as well. In the event of a 269-269 tie, the election would have been decided by the House of Representatives. Even though the Democrats held a majority in terms of total House members, the Republicans held a majority of seats in 26 separate states while the Democrats held a majority of seats in 23 separate states, and 1 state had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Each state delegation would have been permitted to cast 1 vote for president, meaning that Trump would have won the election in this scenario. In short, the presidential election of 2020 was decided by a mere 42,918 out of the 159 million votes that were cast overall, or 0.027 percent of all the votes that were cast.

In 2020, the Zuckerbergs donated \$69.5 million to the tax-exempt Center for Election Innovation and Research (CEIR), whose founder was formerly a director of the leftwing People For the American Way, and \$350 million to the “Safe Elections” Project of the tax-exempt Center for Technology and Civic Life (CTCL). The title “Safe Elections” refers to the cover for Zuckerberg’s fraudulent operation, which he presented as an effort to protect voters from COVID-19. The three founders of CTCL were former co-workers at the Democrat-aligning New Organizing Institute. The conduit Zuckerberg used to funnel his \$419.5 million to CEIR and CTCL was yet another tax-exempt nonprofit, the California-based Silicon Valley Community Foundation which supports get-out-the-vote campaigns for the Democrat Party

On receiving Zuckerberg’s funds, CEIR and CTCL distributed the money, in the form of “COVID-19 response” grants of varying amounts, to election administrators in some 2,500 municipalities in 49 U.S. states and Washington, D.C. The alleged purpose of these grants, according to CTCL, was to help create conditions where Americans could vote as safely as possible in the midst of the deadly coronavirus pandemic. This could have been accomplished by renting football stadiums and other sports arenas capable of providing enough space for “social distancing” and would have been a worthy tax-exempt objective, if it had been the actual purpose of the project. But it wasn’t.

Neither CEIT nor CTCL had ever before experienced anything even remotely resembling the size of the cash influx they received from Zuckerberg for the 2020 election cycle. For example, over the course of the entire prior history of CTCL

- a small, unremarkable organization founded in 2012 – its yearly revenues from contributions and grants had never once exceeded \$2.84 million. That high-water mark represented a mere eight-tenths-of-one-percent of the astronomical sum donated by Zuckerberg in 2020.

Despite their self-professed “non-partisanship,” CEIR and CTCL allocated their Zuckerberg-provided funds in a highly partisan manner, which conformed to the election strategies followed by Democrat operatives across the country to make election fraud easier. The goal of Zuckerberg and the two organizations was to pump massive sums of money into voter-mobilization initiatives in specific cities and counties that had traditionally voted for Democrats, so as to maximize the likelihood that large numbers of Democrat voters in those places would cast ballots in the 2020 elections. Meanwhile, places that traditionally had voted Republican received far less money -- or in some cases no money at all. The CEIR and CTCL campaigns were highly targeted efforts to boost voter turnout in Democrat districts to a degree that would be substantial enough to overcome whatever level of voter turnout Republican districts in the same states might experience.

The CEIR/CTCL grants were not awarded as gifts that the recipient cities and counties could use in whatever way they saw fit. Rather, the Zuckerberg organizations extended formal invitations to the targeted communities encouraging them to apply for the Zuckerberg funds, which in turn would be doled out with many strings attached. Strict conditions were laid down as to how the recipient jurisdictions could use the money and administer their respective elections. “It was a pay-to-play scheme, where in exchange for taking this money, the CTCL

gets to tell them how to run the election,” observed Thomas More Society attorney Erick Kaardal.

Using COVID-19 fears as an excuse, CTCL required that its grant money be used to: (a) suspend existing election laws in order to promote universal mail-in voting, a practice singled out by the bi-partisan Carter-Baker Commission as particularly vulnerable to fraud and corruption; (b) eliminate or weaken signature-matching requirements and ballot-receipt deadlines for mail-in votes; (c) expand opportunities for “ballot curing” (i.e., “fixing” wrongly cast ballots to remove their disqualification); (d) cover the very considerable expenses associated with massive bulk mailings and “community outreach” programs administered by private activists; (e) enable the proliferation of unmonitored ballot drop boxes which would make it impossible to ensure a transparent and secure chain-of-custody trail for all ballots; (f) create unprecedented opportunities for illegal ballot harvesting; and (h) greatly increase funding for the hiring of temporary poll workers, which, as The Federalist points out, “supported the infiltration of election offices by paid Democratic Party activists, coordinated through a complex web of left-leaning non-profit organizations, social media platforms, and social media election influencers.” In other words, the Zuckerberg/CTCL funds were used to conduct and support multiple practices that are widely recognized as practices that make election fraud possible.

Zuckerberg’s donations to CEIR were used to promote objectives similar to the CTCL priorities cited above. But because CTCL received so much more money from the Facebook founder than did CEIR, the 2020 elections were impacted much more powerfully by CTCL. Zuckerberg’s “coordinated assault

on in-person voting generally favored Democrat Party voters who preferred to vote in advance, while placing Republicans, who preferred to vote in person, at a disadvantage,” according to former Kansas Attorney General Phill Kline in his December 2020 [report](#) titled *The Legitimacy and Effect of Private Funding in Federal and State Electoral Processes*, published by the Thomas More Society’s Amistad Project. That assault helped to create “a two-tier election system favoring one demographic while disadvantaging another demographic.” Kline’s report was also critical of CTCL for generally viewing state election-integrity laws as nothing more than “obstacles and nuisances to be ignored or circumvented.”

Additional ways in which CTCL grants were used in various states and cities across America:

- CTCL encouraged elections departments in multiple states to use its grant money for the [purchase](#) of vehicles to transport “voter navigators” to the places where their services were needed — services like: (a) registering voters; (b) helping people apply for absentee ballots; (c) helping voters, potentially at their front doors, to fill out their ballots; (d) witnessing absentee ballot signatures; and (e) “[curing](#)” absentee ballots that had been filled out incorrectly.
- CTCL grants in Georgia were [used](#) to: (a) expand curbside voting and conduct “voter outreach” campaigns designed to “promote absentee voting and encourage higher percentages of our electors to vote absentee”; (b) dispatch CTCL agents to [train](#) poll workers; and (c) [fund](#) “Happy Faces,” a temporary staffing agency affiliated with the Georgia Democrat [Stacey Abrams](#), to

count the votes on election night in Fulton County.

- CTCL grants to [Philadelphia](#) were used to pay election judges and various other election officials, and to increase the number of polling locations, mobile ballot-pickup units, and ballot drop boxes in the city.
- CTCL [grants](#) helped Delaware County, Pennsylvania — a heavily Democratic area — put one drop box in place for every 4,000 voters and every four square miles of land. By contrast, in the 59 Pennsylvania counties that Trump had won in the 2016 election, there would now be just one drop box for every 72,000 voters and every 1,100 square miles of land. “Government encouraging a targeted demographic to turn out the vote is the opposite side of the same coin as government targeting a demographic to suppress the vote,” Phill Kline wrote in the Amistad Project report. “This two-tiered election system allowed voters in Democrat strongholds to stroll down the street to vote while voters in Republican strongholds had to go on the equivalent of a ‘Where’s Waldo’ hunt. These irregularities existed wherever Zuckerberg’s money was granted to local election officials.”
- CTCL gave [\\$443,000](#) to Lansing, Michigan, whose elections department used that money to purchase additional absentee-ballot drop boxes and to mail absentee-ballot applications to [every registered voter](#).
- Election officials in Lorain County, Ohio [used](#) CTCL funds to pay an \$8,100 Verizon phone bill and to purchase a \$24,000 van that was used to transport equipment between a warehouse and the elections department.
- The Boone County, Missouri elections department used \$3,000 of CTCL’s COVID grant to [produce](#) a rap video

and purchase radio spots that, according to County Clerk Brianna Lennon, would “appeal to younger, first-time voters” — a demographic strongly inclined to support Democrat candidates.

- When CTCL gave \$100,000 to Racine, Wisconsin in May 2020, the organization directed Racine’s mayor to recruit the leaders of four additional cities — Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, and Milwaukee — to collaboratively draft a grant request for CTCL funds as well. On June 15, those four cities together submitted a “Wisconsin Safe Election Plan” to CTCL and were quickly approved to receive \$6.3 million to put their plan into action. As Amistad Project director Phill Kline points out, CTCL “retained the right, in the grant document, to, in its sole discretion, order all funds returned if the grantee cities did not conduct the election consistent with CTCL dictates. Effectively, CTCL managed the election in these five cities.”

All told, CTCL in 2020 made 26 separate grants of \$1 million or more to cities and counties in Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia. Twenty-five of those grants, totaling a combined \$85.5 million, went to places that Joe Biden ultimately won in the 2020 presidential election. The vast majority of CTCL’s money also went to places that had voted overwhelmingly for Hillary Clinton in 2016. By contrast, the lone Trump-supporting CTCL grant recipient of \$1 million or more in 2020 — Brown County, Wisconsin — was given just \$1.1 million.

Below are some additional examples of the enormous imbalance in CTCL’s grants to Democrat areas vs. Republican

areas:

- In Texas, counties that Biden won in 2020 received CTCL grants that amounted to \$3.22 per capita, whereas counties that Trump won received just 55 cents per capita.
- CTCL gave \$2.8 million to the heavily Democratic Webb County, Texas, thereby helping total registrations in that jurisdiction increase by approximately 10,000 over the corresponding figure from 2016 — and helping Biden beat Trump by a two-to-one margin.
- In Virginia, grants to pro-Biden counties accounted for over 90% of all CTCL grants in that state — far more than the corresponding 9.6% that was given to Trump-supporting counties.
- CTCL gave \$1.4 million to the Democrat stronghold of Fairfax County, Virginia, helping to increase Democrat voter turnout there by 65,458 above the 2016 figure. By contrast, Republican turnout in Fairfax County increased by only 10,564 above the 2016 figure.
- In Arizona, a state with 15 counties, fully 83.6% of all known CTCL grants were poured into just 3 counties that Biden won in 2020.
- The total dollar amount of CTCL grants to pro-Biden counties in Arizona was 5.8 times greater than the dollar amount given to pro-Trump counties in that state.
- In Pennsylvania, grants to counties that Biden won in 2020 received \$3.11 per capita, vs. just 57 cents per capita to counties that Trump won. More specifically, CTCL grants to rural, Republican-leaning Pennsylvania counties like Mercer and Luzerne amounted to an average of about 75 cents per registered voter, while

Democrat-majority areas like Delaware and Chester Counties received \$5.17 and \$6.73 per registered voter, respectively.

- CTCL gave \$20.8 million in grants to 10 (of the 13) Pennsylvania counties that Biden won in 2020. Those 10 CTCL-funded counties provided Biden with nearly 73% of all the votes that he received statewide. By contrast, CTCL awarded grants to 12 (of the 54) Pennsylvania counties won by Trump, and those dozen grants totaled a combined \$1.73 million. In other words, the combined value of CTCL's grants to pro-Biden counties in Pennsylvania was 12 times greater than the value of its grants to pro-Trump counties.
- CTCL gave \$42.4 million in grants to 17 (of the 31) Georgia counties won by Biden — a figure amounting to more than 94% of all CTCL funding in that state. Those 17 CTCL-funded counties provided Biden with almost 73% of all the votes that he captured statewide. By contrast, a mere \$2.6 million — less than 6% of all CTCL grants distributed across Georgia — were allotted to 26 (of the 128) counties won by Trump. Put another way, CTCL's grants to pro-Biden counties were 16.3 times greater than its grants to pro-Trump counties.
- In Wisconsin, CTCL grants to 20 separate pro-Biden counties amounted to more than 90% of all of the organization's grants in that state.
- CTCL awarded eleven massive grants in Michigan, ten of which went to cities that Hillary Clinton had won in the 2016 presidential election. The total number of dollars given to those Democrat strongholds was 14.7 times greater than the corresponding amount given to the lone Republican jurisdiction.

- The Wisconsin [legislature](#) gave the heavily Democratic city of Green Bay approximately \$7 per voter to manage its 2020 elections, vs. just \$4 per voter to the state’s Republican rural counties. Then, after CTCL got through allocating Zuckerberg’s money in Wisconsin, the Green Bay figure ballooned to an astronomical \$47 per voter, while the figure for most of the state’s rural areas remained steady at just \$4 [per voter](#).

Similar funding [disparities](#) — favoring Democrat areas over Republican areas — occurred in and near Democrat citadels such as Detroit, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Flint, Dallas, and Houston.

The Zuckerberg grants dwarfed the amount of election-related money normally spent by the various Democrat cities that were recipients of those grants. As J. Christian Adams reported in [PJ Media](#), for instance:

“Philadelphia’s election office budget was normally \$9.8 million. The CTCL gave Philadelphia \$10 million, more than doubling the city budget.”

“Those millions were used to hire local activists as city employees to drive around and collect ballots. The millions bought new printers and scanners to accommodate mail ballots. Philadelphia established brand new satellite election offices across the most Biden-friendly neighborhoods in the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The millions bought scores

of convenient drop boxes across the same neighborhoods where mail ballots could be conveniently dropped. Even though laws limited third parties from collecting and dropping off multiple ballots, people were photographed dropping off bundles of ballots at the boxes.

“If voters couldn’t muster the initiative to travel a few blocks to the drop-off boxes or new satellite offices, the city went to them to collect their ballot.

“CTCL dollars flowed through Philadelphia election officials to the pricey public relations firm Aloysius Butler & Clark. They designed billboards, posters, bus advertisements, and print ads. Radio advertisements and street marketing all added to the blitz....

“The hundreds of millions poured into urban election offices by the CTCL and affiliated charities also explains how Trump dramatically increased his share of the black and Hispanic vote and still lost... Even if Trump increased his share of the black and Hispanic vote, the opening of the urban turnout floodgates through private donations to government election offices easily swamped Trump statewide in Pennsylvania, Georgia, and Michigan.

“It doesn’t matter if Trump has 15 percent of the black vote in Detroit if turnout there soared by 92,891 Detroit votes, which it did. It doesn’t matter if Trump has even 20 percent of the black vote in Atlanta if turnout in DeKalb soared by

54,550 votes, which it did.

“This also explains how the GOP was so successful everywhere... except at the top of the ticket. A flood of blue votes gushing out of deep blue urban areas has a statewide effect only for statewide candidates. It doesn’t affect legislative races outside of the cities.”

“The amount of additional money these groups [CTCL and CEIR] poured into elections offices in Democrat-voting areas was truly staggering,” said the *New York Post* in October 2021. “To put it in perspective, federal and state matching funds for COVID-19-related election expenses in 2020 totaled \$479.5 million. The CTCL and CEIR money totaled \$419.5 million. These two private nonprofits were responsible for an 85 percent increase in total additional election funding — and that largesse was concentrated in a relatively small number of heavily Democratic municipalities.”

Summing up, *The Federalist* noted that: “The practical effect of these massive, privately manipulated election-office funding disparities was to create a ‘shadow’ election system with a built-in structural bias that systematically favored Democratic voters over Republican voters. The massive influx of funds essentially created a high-powered, concierge-like get-out-the-vote effort for Biden that took place inside the election system, rather than attempting to influence it from the outside.”

In addition to issuing the aforementioned grants, CTCL collaborated with Facebook to produce a guide and webinar

that taught election officials how to engage and assist voters more effectively. This voter-assistance campaign targeted low-income and nonwhite minorities who typically lean Democrat but shun election participation.

By no means was Facebook the only ally with which CTCL collaborated. As *Real Clear Investigations* explains, a “CTCL partner” nonprofit known as the Center for Civic Design “helped design absentee ballot forms and instructions, crafted voter registration letters for felons, and tested automatic voter registration systems in several states, working alongside progressive activist groups in Michigan and directly with elections offices in Georgia and Utah.” “Still other groups with a progressive leaning, including the [tax-exempt nonprofit] Main Street Alliance, The Elections Group, and the [tax-exempt nonprofit] National Vote at Home Institute, provided support for some elections offices,” added *RCI*. In other words, leftwing activists were infused directly into the elections offices of various cities and towns.

The effects that the funding patterns of CEIR/CTCL had on the composition of the electorates in their targeted recipient areas were noteworthy. In Georgia, for instance, counties that received money from Zuckerberg and CEIR/CTCL in 2020 were, on average, 2.3 points more Democratic than they had been in 2016. Meanwhile, the political mix of non-funded counties was essentially the same as it had been four years earlier.

Such realities are particularly significant in light of the fact that Biden’s margin of victory in the 2020 presidential race

was razor-thin. The final tally in the Electoral College (EC) was 306 EC votes for Biden, to 232 EC votes for Trump, with 270 being the number required to win the presidency. The popular vote [margins](#) by which Biden allegedly won the three most hotly contested battleground states were as [follows](#): Arizona: 10,457 (EC votes: 11); Georgia: 11,779 (EC votes: 16); Wisconsin: 20,682 (EC votes: 10). The presidential election of 2020 was decided by a mere 42,918 out of the 159 million votes that were cast overall, or 0.027 percent of all the votes that were cast.

If Trump had won Arizona, Georgia, and Wisconsin, he would have gained their 37 combined EC votes, bringing his total up to 269. Biden, conversely, would have lost 37 EC votes, bringing his total down to 269 as well. In the event of a 269-269 tie, the election would have been decided by the House of Representatives. Even though the Democrats held a majority in terms of total House members, the Republicans held a majority of seats in 26 separate states while the Democrats held a majority of seats in 23 separate states, and 1 state had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans. Each state delegation would have been permitted to cast 1 vote for president, meaning that Trump would have won the election in this scenario.

The money [donated](#) by CTCL and CEIR bore no resemblance to traditional campaign finance or lobbying. Rather, it enabled left-wing activists to infiltrate city and county elections offices, and use those offices as vehicles for particular administrative practices, voting methods, and outreach campaigns targeting cities and counties with high concentrations of Democratic voters. As Tarren Bragdon, CEO of the Foundation for Government Accountability, told [Fox News](#) in June 2021: “The Zuckerberg funding is an

unprecedented example of using government employees and government resources to put your finger on the scale, to affect the election outcome. It would be like giving private money to police departments to have officers do more stop-and-frisk in certain neighborhoods compared to other neighborhoods. It would be like giving money to the tax department to do increased audits in certain zip codes or neighborhoods versus other neighborhoods.”

Bragdon also noted that although the stated justification for the CEIR/CTCL grants was voter and election-official safety during the COVID-19 pandemic, some counties spent little or no money at all on things like personal protective equipment [PPE] that could have made in-person voting safer for everyone. Fulton, Cobb, and Dekalb Counties, for instance, spent on average only 1.3% of the Zuckerberg-funded Georgia grants on PPE, while most of the money was used to promote mail-in voting statewide. “This had nothing to do with COVID and had everything to do with using government resources and government employees to play politics,” said Bragdon.

In a more timid vein, a group of 14 congressional Republicans sent a letter to CTCL’s executive director on June 21, 2021 that said: “Designated as ‘COVID-19 response grants,’ the hundreds of millions in CTCL grant money were marketed as funds available to election officials to ‘safely serve every voter’ during the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the current data available shows that *less than one percent* of funds were spent on personal protective equipment. If true, the American public deserves to know how the other 99 percent of these grants were spent.”

“This private funding has never been done before,” [said](#) Hayden Dublois, a researcher at the Foundation for Government Accountability. “We hear about dark money and corporations buying ads, but never have we seen hundreds of millions of private dollars going into the conducting of elections. And states didn’t have any laws on the books to stop it.” But the I.R.S. did, and did nothing.

In the 2020 Amistad Project report, Phill Kline [wrote](#) that in 2020 there had been “an unprecedented and coordinated public-private partnership to improperly influence” the election in swing states, a partnership that “effectively placed government’s thumb on the scale to help these private interests achieve their objectives and to benefit the candidates of one political party.” Zuckerberg and his wife were central players on the “private” side of that equation.

Moreover, Zuckerberg continued to use his riches to influence political elections in a major way even after the 2020 presidential race was over. CTCL gave [14.5 million](#) of the Facebook founder’s dollars to select Georgia counties during the open-voting period for the crucial January 2021 runoff elections in Georgia, where radical Democrats [Raphael Warnock](#) and [Jon Ossoff](#) won a pair of U.S. Senate seats that gave their party a majority in the Senate. More than 60% of CTCL’s grants in Georgia were earmarked for Fulton and DeKalb Counties, both of which are heavily Democratic.

Conclusion

In sum, while the I.R.S. authorities turned a blind

eye towards his illegal activities, Mark Zuckerberg used his enormous wealth to help fix the 2020 presidential election for Joe Biden — and the January 2021 Senate runoff races for Raphael Warnock and Jon Ossoff, all the while reducing his own tax bill. Zuckerberg did this on the pretext that he was simply seeking to help ordinary Americans find a way to participate safely in the electoral process during the deadly COVID-19 pandemic. Nothing could have been further from the truth.

Zuckerberg's goal was to massively increase voter turnout in Democrat-dominated jurisdictions by maximizing fraud-breeding practices like ballot harvesting, the use of unmonitored ballot drop boxes, and mail-in voting without strict signature-matching requirements. To achieve his political ends, Zuckerberg poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the coffers of a pair of politically partisan, tax-exempt nonprofit organizations that were more than willing to do his dirty work and secure the presidency for a doddering, contempt-for-the-law-and-the-truth, Alzheimer's case.

None of these travesties could have taken place without the seditious collusion of I.R.S. Commissioner Charles Rettig and his 63,000 agents whose duty is to protect the integrity of our tax laws — and, as it turns out, our elections.

3. Black Lives Matter Subsidies

The recently revealed purchase of multi-million-dollar properties by Black Lives Matter leaders, using unaccounted-for, tax-exempt funds, tells us what we already should have known: Black Lives Matter is a gang of street criminals who think nothing of stealing money donated to help “marginalized and under-served” communities, and pocketing it for themselves.

Because Black Lives Matter is a criminal organization responsible for violent mob actions in over 200 American cities in 2020, including the burning of federal buildings and police stations, causing several billion dollars in property damage, and sparking a national crime wave that resulted in 4,901 more homicides in 2020 than in the previous year, it is not surprising that they do not respect the causes they advocate, let alone the laws and regulations governing tax-exempt organizations. Yet throughout the mayhem and criminal violence orchestrated by Black Lives Matter, the I.R.S and its commissioner, Charles Rettig, watched from afar and did nothing to prevent taxpayer monies from being used to bail out those Black Lives Matter thugs who had been arrested for breaking the law. Instead, Rettig and his cohorts returned them to the streets to commit more crimes.

From 2016 to July 2020, BLM was a fiscally sponsored project of Thousand Currents, a left-wing, 501©(3) tax-exempt foundation. A “fiscal sponsor” allows an organization that does not have its own IRS tax-exempt status to collect tax-deductible donations under its umbrella. The Vice Chairman of Thousand Currents - Susan Rosenberg - is a convicted terrorist who in

1984 was arrested with 740 pounds of dynamite, an arsenal of automatic weapons, and plans to blow up government buildings. Rosenberg was a member of the May 19th Communist Organization responsible for enabling convicted cop-killer and patron saint of Black Lives Matter, Assata Shakur, to escape from prison in 1979 and flee to Cuba. On his last day in office, a sympathetic President Bill Clinton commuted Rosenberg's 58-year sentence to time served, shaving 42 years off her penalty and allowing her to return to her radical activities.

Because of the political bias that has been injected into government institutions like the I.R.S., virtually no attention has been paid to the network of so-called charitable organizations the I.R.S. has authorized to underwrite the destructive, criminal activities of Black Lives Matter. Thousand Currents is only one avenue by which political donors, under the guise of philanthropic interests, have funded the riots that have looted major American cities, assaulted their inhabitants, burned their city centers, and polarized the nation. In July 2020, the Tides Center, a \$100 million tax-exempt foundation that funnels money from anonymous donors into “progressive” causes, replaced Thousand Currents as the fiscal sponsor of Black Lives Matter and its criminal activities. The Ford Foundation and the charitable arms of Fortune 500 companies like Apple and Amazon are also part of the network of otherwise law-abiding organizations that fund lawlessness as a charitable venture.

In December 2020, the IRS granted the BLM Global Network Foundation — the primary organizational umbrella of the BLM movement — its own tax-exempt status, authorizing it to operate as a charitable organization independent of any fiscal sponsor. That newly conferred tax-exempt status made it

legally necessary for BLM to submit an annual filing to the IRS known as Form 990, disclosing information about its donors and expenditures. But BLM submitted no such forms in either 2020 or 2021.

The money streams that have poured into Black Lives Matter's coffers fund an operation that is not only lawless but is a willing appendage of the Democrat Party. Until early 2022, whenever individuals clicked the "Donate" button on the Black Lives Matter website, they were redirected to a subdomain called "Act Blue Charities" – a deceptive title if there ever was one. Act Blue describes itself as "a powerful online fundraising platform for Democratic candidates up and down the ballot, progressive organizations and non-profits." If ever a network should have sounded alarms at the I.R.S., this was it. But progressives have become so comfortable breaking the law in the name of "social justice," it didn't.

The ActBlue "donate" button was removed from the Black Lives Matter homepage on February 2, 2022, immediately after reports had surfaced about BLM's massive financial malfeasance which included some \$60 million in previous donations that could not be accounted for.

BLM's close ties to the Democrat Party date at least to August of 2015, when the Democratic National Committee formally approved a resolution stating that "the DNC joins with Americans across the country in affirming 'Black Lives Matter' and the 'Say Her Name' efforts to make visible the pain of our fellow and sister Americans as they condemn extrajudicial killings of unarmed African American men,

women and children.” The alleged extra-judicial killings of unarmed African American men, women and children are a fiction invented by Black Lives Matter to achieve its aim of de-funding the police, swallowed whole by the Democrat Party. There is no Justice Department statistic to support these incendiary claims, but that hasn’t stopped Black Lives Matter from repeating them. Beginning with Michael Brown and Eric Garner, every celebrated Black Lives Matter case has involved an armed criminal resisting arrest – or, as in the tragic case of Tamir Rice, appearing to resist arrest.

Underscoring the Democrats’ sponsorship of Black Lives Matter, President Barack Obama invited BLM leaders to the White House multiple times and used the occasions to praise their efforts. He did so, even after five police officers were assassinated in Dallas by a deranged black racist at a Black Lives Matter march in 2016. In her 2018 autobiography, *When They Call You A Terrorist*, Black Lives Matter co-founder Patrisse Cullors portrayed this psychopath as a black victim of white supremacy.

On September 16, 2015, Brittany Packnett, DeRay Mckesson, and fellow BLM activist Johnetta Elzie met with Obama at the White House. Senior advisor Valerie Jarrett and other administration officials were also present. For Packnett, it was her *seventh* visit to the Obama White House. Afterward, Packnett told reporters that the president personally supported the BLM movement. “He offered us a lot of encouragement with his background as a community organizer, and told us that even incremental changes were progress,” she stated. “He didn’t want us to get discouraged. He said, ‘Keep speaking truth to power.’”

At a White House [event](#) during Black History Month in February 2016, Obama again welcomed BLM leaders DeRay Mckesson and Brittany Packnett. In the course of his remarks, Obama said: “But we’ve also got some young people here who are making history as we speak. People like Brittany [Packnett], who served on our Police Task Force in the wake of Ferguson, and has led many of the protests that took place there and shined a light on the injustice that was happening. People like DeRay Mckesson, who has done some outstanding work mobilizing in Baltimore around these issues. And to see generations continuing to work on behalf of justice and equality and economic opportunity is greatly encouraging to me.... They are much better organizers than I was at their age. I am confident they are going to take America to new heights.”

The BLM-Democrat connection grew closer during the riots that followed the May 25, 2020 death of [George Floyd](#). Floyd was a career criminal high on four times the lethal dose of fentanyl when the police attempted to arrest him and he resisted. His death, most likely from the fentanyl, led to violent BLM-orchestrated riots in 220 American cities. As numerous rioters were arrested, a tax-exempt foundation called the Minnesota Freedom Fund made bail payments to get them released. Senator Kamala Harris made a public statement [supporting](#) the Minnesota Freedom Fund and soliciting contributions. “If you’re able to, chip in now to the [@MNFreedomFund](#) to help post bail for those protesting on the ground in Minnesota,” tweeted the senator. At least 13 staff members of [Joe Biden’s](#) presidential campaign made personal donations to the Fund.

Of course, the culprits whom the Minnesota Freedom Fund (MFF) bailed out weren’t arrested for “protesting.” They

were arrested for assault, arson and other criminal acts. Bailing them out, freed them to continue their criminal attacks. Thanks in part to Harris' endorsement, MFF received more than \$35 million in tax-exempt donations, while a Democrat-supporting I.R.S. did nothing to stop them, even though their sponsor, BLM, had already announced they were a political organization whose goal was to get rid of the Republican Trump and put a Democrat in his place.

The tax code is quite specific about its ban on political activity by tax-exempt entities like Black Lives Matter:

Under the Internal Revenue Code, all section 501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office. Contributions to political campaign funds or public statements of position (verbal or written) made on behalf of the organization in favor of or in opposition to any candidate for public office clearly violate the prohibition against political campaign activity.

During a June 19, 2020 interview on CNN, BLM co-founder Patrisse Cullors said that President Trump was “not fit for office,” and that “he should resign now. Trump needs to be out of office. And so what we are going to push for is a move to get Trump out.... [O]ur goal is to get Trump out.”

Yet the I.R.S. showed no interest in all those tax-exempt dollars going to criminal activities whose stated goal was to replace Trump with a Democrat.

On July 27, 2020, Cullors spoke at the Democratic National Committee's party platform meeting, where she demanded that "sea changes" be made "to the 2020 Democratic platform" in the areas of "the legal system, policing, education, the environment and reparations." She also noted, approvingly, that the policy team of the Movement for Black Lives (M4BL) — an anti-capitalist 501(c)(3) nonprofit coalition that includes BLM and dozens of other radical organizations — had recently met with Biden campaign representatives to discuss the BREATHE Act, legislation seeking to "dives[t] our taxpayer dollars from brutal and discriminatory policing." Of course, the matter of BLM brutality on the streets of America's major cities was one of indifference to Democrats who had chosen whose side they were on.

In a June 17, 2020 appearance on *The Late Show with Stephen Colbert*, an enthusiastic Senator Kamala Harris stated that the BLM riots that were tearing apart city after city should continue indefinitely. Said Harris, a former prosecutor: "They're not going to stop. This is a movement, I'm telling you.... They're not going to let up and they should not and we should not.... The only way we are going to truly achieve change is when there are people in the system who are willing or pushing to do it and when there are those of us who are outside the system demanding it." Change through criminal intimidation is not the American system, and not a privilege that a tax-exempt organization should be arrogating to itself. But again, the I.R.S. adhered to its code of Hear No Evil/See No Evil if it

is perpetrated by the left.

At the 2020 Democratic National Convention, Barack Obama [applauded](#) the spectacle of “Americans of all races joining together to declare, in the face of injustice and brutality at the hands of the state, that black lives matter.” Addressing BLM and its supporters directly, Obama said: “To the young people who led us [in protests] this summer, telling us we need to be better—in so many ways, *you are this country’s dreams fulfilled....*” [emphasis added.]

On October 9th, as the 2020 election approached, BLM [launched](#) a Political Action Committee to “actively [engage](#) in the general election” by supporting Joe Biden, Kamala Harris, and other Democrat political candidates. Patisse Cullors [explained](#) the rationale for the creation of this PAC: “We want to be able to not just speak in ‘get out the vote’ language [i.e., the neutral language of an activity allowed under the rules governing tax-exempt foundations]. Black Lives Matter is launching our PAC so we can talk directly to voters about who we think that they should be voting for and what we think they should be voting on.” These are activities a tax-exempt foundation is clearly barred from pursuing. Again, silence from I.R.S. commissioner Charles Rettig and his organization about this gross violation of I.R.S. rules.

BLM’s [2020 Impact Report](#), which was published in early 2021, named five Democrats BLM had endorsed “for winning [elections] on a platform that invested in Black lives.” These elected officials included [Cori Bush](#) (U.S. House, Missouri), [Jamaal Bowman](#) (U.S. House, New York), Nikema

Williams (U.S. House, Georgia), [Jose Garza](#) (District Attorney, Texas), and Shayla Adams-Stafford (Prince George’s Board of Education District, Maryland). The same *Impact Report* boasted that Black Lives Matter’s PAC had also helped “to ensure [that] both Reverend [Raphael Warnock](#) and [Jon Ossoff](#) were victorious” in the January 2021 Georgia runoff elections which gave Democrats de facto control of the U.S. Senate.

In the immediate aftermath of the November 3, 2020 presidential election, BLM protesters, who had spent months “[preparing](#)” a response in the event of a disputed election, threatened violent unrest if Biden were not declared the winner, and if Trump did not drop his concerns about the legitimacy of the vote. Providing a glimpse of the mayhem that awaited the country if Trump were to prevail, massive throngs of screaming BLM protesters swarmed the streets in city after city with bullhorns, raised fists, and flags and banners demanding a Biden victory.

On November 7 — the day several mainstream media outlets declared Biden and Harris winners of the 2020 election — BLM co-founder Patrisse Cullors sent a [letter](#) to the new President and VP, signing it “on behalf of the Black Lives Matter Global Network.” After effusively congratulating Biden and Harris on their reported victory, Cullors demanded political payback for her organization’s efforts to get them elected:

We want something for our vote. Without the resounding support of Black people, we would be saddled with a very different electoral outcome. In short, Black people won this election.

Alongside Black-led organizations around the nation, Black Lives Matter invested heavily in this election. ‘Vote and Organize’ became our motto, and our electoral justice efforts reached more than 60 million voters. We want something for our vote.

We want to be heard and our agenda to be prioritized. We issue these expectations not just because Black people are the most consistent and reliable voters for Democrats, but also because Black people are truly living in crisis in a nation that was built on our subjugation....

Not only was the IRS unmoved to examine the obvious efforts by BLM and the Democratic Party to promote their electoral agendas on the backs of the American taxpayer, it has up to now failed to investigate BLM’s evident 2020 theft of \$90 million to line the pockets of its leaders.

In October 2020, on terminating its role as BLM’s fiscal sponsor, Thousand Currents transferred \$66.5 million directly into the coffers of Black Lives Matter. Two weeks later, a man named Dyane Pascall — in a transaction that would be kept secret for the next 18 months — took nearly \$6 million from BLM’s bank account and used it to pay cash for a vast southern California estate that included a 6,500 square-foot mansion with multiple fireplaces, a soundstage, a pool and bungalow, and parking facilities that could accommodate more than 20 vehicles. Pascall was: (a) the financial manager for Janaya and Patrisse Consulting, a Limited Liability Corporation run by BLM co-founder Patrisse Cullors and her spouse, Janaya Khan;

and (b) the chief financial officer for Trap Heals, a nonprofit organization headed by Damon Turner, the biological father of Cullors' only child.

Within a week of the aforementioned purchase of the southern California estate, Pascall transferred ownership of that property to a Delaware LLC that had been established for BLM by [Perkins Coie](#), the Democrat law firm that in 2016 was paid by the Hillary Clinton presidential campaign to fabricate an election-interference conspiracy theory tying Donald Trump to Russian political operatives.

As is usually the case with grifters and swindlers, there was no shortage of leeches in BLM's orbit, eager to hop aboard the \$90 million gravy train. Indeed, a number of people and entities [associated](#) with BLM, "Janaya and Patrisse Consulting," and the "Bowers Consulting Firm" (an entity headed by BLM Deputy Executive Director Shalomyah Bowers), were awarded contracts for the handling of the estate's upkeep, maintenance, and security needs. These individuals were required, without exception, to sign nondisclosure agreements regarding the existence and ownership of the estate.

On March 30, 2022, investigative reporter [Sean Campbell](#) asked BLM a series of questions about the southern California estate, which was known internally by BLM as the "Campus." Soon thereafter, BLM leaders circulated an internal strategy memo asking "Can we kill the story?" and suggesting that they should try to distance themselves from the potentially embarrassing facts: "Our angle — needs to be to deflate ownership of the property."

Dyane Pascall's purchase of the Southern California estate was not the only questionable transaction made in recent years by someone with close ties to BLM. For example:

- In 2016, BLM co-founder Patrisse Cullors purchased a three-bedroom, 1.5-bathroom home in Inglewood, California for \$510,000.
- Two years later, she paid \$590,000, in cash, for a four-bedroom, 1,725 square-foot home in South Los Angeles.
- In January 2020, Cullors paid \$415,000 for a three-bedroom, two-bath "custom ranch" on 3.2 acres of land in Conyers, Georgia. The house included a private airplane hangar with a studio apartment above it; an indoor swimming pool; the use of a 2,500-foot community runway capable of accommodating small airplanes; and a large "RV shop" where a mobile home or small aircraft could undergo maintenance or repair.
- In April 2021, it was reported that Cullors had purchased her fourth home, a secluded mini-compound in Los Angeles' semi-remote Topanga Canyon for more than \$1.4 million.
- It was also reported in April 2021 that Cullors had recently looked at property in an ultra-exclusive resort in the Bahamas, where luxury beachfront apartments and townhouses were priced in the range of \$5 million to \$20 million.
- In June 2021, it was reported that Cullors had spent \$35,000 to have contractors install fencing around the entire perimeter of her Topanga Canyon home, as well as an electronic gate.

- In the summer of 2019, a consulting firm owned by Asha Bandele — who had co-authored Cullors’ 2018 autobiography *When They Call You a Terrorist*— paid out nearly \$26,000 on behalf of Reform LA Jails (RLAJ), a reform initiative chaired by Cullors. And what was that money used for? It was used to pay for the use of a 200-acre luxury beach resort in Malibu, California as the venue for a series of RLAJ “meetings.”

For a while this was one of the most successful scams in American history. Exploiting what was supposed to be among the most government-regulated and monitored institutions, Black Lives Matter leaders were able to gin up a national hysteria over non-existent racial offenses by police departments with black police chiefs and overseen by black mayors and liberal city councils. The massive vigilante movement spawned by Black Lives Matter was financed by fleecing American taxpayers of tens of millions of dollars, and powered by a lynch-mob mentality that insisted on verdicts in advance of investigations, let alone trials on pain of suffering unprecedented violence in America’s streets: “No Justice, No Peace.” Its agenda – alarmingly successful – was to hang white cops as neanderthal racists intent on ending innocent black lives because they were black.

There never was any truth to this claim, but large numbers of Americans and a major political party bought into the fiction because the racist attacks on white cops served their own agendas and needs. It all came to an end with Patrisse Cullors’ petty greed, which exposed the smallness of a mind that cannot encompass empathy for its victims both black and white – victims who suffered because of her lies and the criminal

crusade they inflamed.

The crimes committed by Black Lives Matter were in part enabled by a derelict and politically corrupted I.R.S., and also a Democrat Party that has been seduced by America-hating radicals and lost its way. Only time will tell if the integrity of the institutions the left has destroyed – the White House, the Department of Justice, the I.R.S. - can be restored by well-meaning people on both sides of the political aisle. If they cannot, even darker times lie ahead.

4. Broken Border Charities

In an earlier [chapter](#) about Facebook billionaire Mark Zuckerberg's efforts to fix the 2020 presidential election, we observed that the root cause of America's current problems, beginning with broken borders and off-the-charts urban violence – is lawlessness. We also observed that this lawlessness originates in the White House, and includes the Justice Department, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Executive Branch generally.

Discussions of the border problem often touch on the criminal element that violates our unenforced border laws beginning with drug dealers, sex traffickers, and migrant smugglers. But the crime problem is vastly understated in these references which give the impression that it is largely confined to the countries they have left, and has no impact on the country they have invaded. In July 2018, the Government Accountability Office issued a [report](#) containing “Criminal Alien Statistics,” which serves to correct this false impression. Among its conclusions, the report [states](#) that one in five federal prisoners in the United States is a criminal alien. And this is just the tip of the iceberg.

The G.A.O. report covered the period between 2011 and 2016. During that time frame, approximately 2 million foreigners crossed the southern border into the United States illegally – which is just about the number of unvetted foreigners whom border officials predict will cross the border illegally this year alone. In that same time frame, there were more than 730,000 criminal aliens in U.S. prisons, federal and state, and

local jails. Criminals are not usually arrested the first time they commit a crime, and are often released with minimal time served when they are. So while there were 730,000 criminal aliens in U.S. prisons, they accounted for 4.9 million arrests and 7.5 million offenses – which would translate into a 10 times greater number of victims than offenders.

The offenses of these criminals, according to the report, included more than 1 million drug crimes (number of victims unknown); 500,000 assaults; 133,800 sex offenses (number of actual victims who may have been reluctant to report the crimes also unknown); 24,200 kidnappings; 33,300 “homicide-related events”; and “1,500 terrorism-related crimes.”

How many lives were damaged or destroyed by these aliens who entered the country illegally and should never have even been here in the first place, will never be known, and yet the lawless Biden administration, which will not enforce existing immigration laws, is planning to continue the outrage and pile up the victims at an even greater rate.

And worse. On July 14, 2021, Fox News Channel host Tucker Carlson revealed that the Biden Administration had suborned the U.S. military to ship tens of thousands of illegals into cities across the country at taxpayer expense. Laughlin Air Force Base in Texas was used as the platform from which to secretly board illegals and fly them, under dark of night, to locations across the U.S. Many other illegals were being sent to occupy the American interior, also at taxpayer expense, but by bus rather than by jet. In the words of Center for Immigration Studies fellow Todd Bensman, “a conveyor belt of commercial

and charter buses ... are carrying tens of thousands, sight unseen, from Texas, Arizona, and California borderlands northward, and they are dropping their Haitian, Venezuelan, Cuban, and Central American family units in Florida and New Jersey, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and to large cities in Texas such as Dallas and Houston.”

The fact that the Biden administration chose the middle of the night to ship illegals secretly is a clear indication that the White House was quite aware it was conducting an illegal operation. Its goal, as Tucker Carlson claimed, was “changing the electoral map” of the United States and enacting “demographic transformation in our country, without our consent, and in violation of our laws.” Former Trump White House advisor Stephen Miller explained on the same show: “[W]hat is happening now is unprecedented.... This is not about an administration that is unable to protect the border. This is about an administration that in a very purposeful, planned, deliberate, painstaking fashion has turned our Border Patrol and I.C.E. [Immigration & Customs Enforcement] agencies into resettlement agencies.... This is a planned resettlement. The largest of its kind, I would suggest, perhaps in the history of the world, in terms of the number of illegal border crossers being resettled into the interior of our country in violation of plain law.”

In a similar vein, Florida Governor Ron DeSantis reported in early November 2021 that, over the course of the preceding summer, dozens of flights had transported groups of illegals from America’s southern border to Jacksonville, Florida in the middle of the night. “Over 70 air charter flights [on] jetliner airliners coming from the southwest border have landed at Jacksonville International Airport,” said Larry Keefe, DeSantis’ public safety spokesman. “On average, there’s 36 passengers on

each of these flights,” added Keefe. “And that has been going on over the course of the summer through September.... Who is facilitating this travel? How are they getting here? Who are the support people? Who are the sponsors?”

To answer Keefe’s questions, the support people and sponsors of the aforementioned flights were, in many cases, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have long enjoyed tax-exempt status under [Section 501\(c\)\(3\)](#) of the Internal Revenue Code. This status permits donors to give money to NGOs while claiming their donations as tax deductions. In many cases, the cost of the midnight flights was paid in full by faith-based and open-border [NGOs](#) that had [contracted](#) with, and were being [paid](#) by, the federal government.

Using tax-exempt foundations to defraud taxpayers into subsidizing an illegal invasion of the United States was only possible because of the collusion of the White House and the I.R.S. in supporting this subversion of the American immigration system. And this was only the big-picture lawlessness. The smaller details were also full of improprieties. As Breitbart.com reporter [John Binder](#) notes, these illegal aliens often received special privileges unavailable to American citizens and legal residents:

“All of the border crossers and illegal aliens used Department of Homeland Security (DHS) forms as their proof of identification, as Biden has allowed them to bypass standard TSA [Transportation Security Administration] rules where American citizens must show photo

identification to board commercial flights. Most shockingly, perhaps, the forms border crossers and illegal aliens are allowed to use as official forms of identification for TSA include arrest warrants, deportation orders, Notices to Appear (NTA) in immigration court, and federal custody booking records. In addition, TSA officials confirmed that border crossers and illegal aliens boarding domestic commercial flights do not have to undergo health screenings beforehand.”

The obvious injustice of such an arrangement is greatly compounded by the fact that the very activities in which the NGOs are complicit amount to the willful provision of assistance to countless thousands of people who have intentionally broken American immigration laws. Such NGO activities are clearly in violation of the legal requirements that govern 501(c)(3) nonprofits, requirements that explicitly prohibit support for unlawful actions. As the Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) states without ambiguity:

- “[Tax-]exempt purposes may generally be equated with the public good, and violations of law are the antithesis of the public good. Therefore, the conduct of such activities may be a bar to exemption.”
- “Not only is the actual conduct of illegal activities inconsistent with exemption, but the planning and sponsoring of such activities are also incompatible with charity and social welfare.”
- “Violation of constitutionally valid laws is inconsistent with exemption under IRC 501(c)(3).”

- “[A]ll charitable organizations, regardless of their form, are subject to the requirement that their purpose may not be illegal or contrary to public policy.”

It is impossible to read this Code without concluding that the Internal Revenue Service itself is not only derelict in its duty but has operated with criminal intent to violate its own statutes, indeed its own mission – and on a massive scale.

An enormous amount of money flows from the federal government to the various NGOs that help illegal aliens make their way to their ultimate destinations across the United States. The most recent year for which an accurate dollar figure is available is 2020, the final year of Donald Trump’s presidency. Even under the immigration policies of President Trump, which were far more restrictive than those of his successor, the federal government in 2020 alone distributed more than \$1.5 billion among 42 separate nonprofit organizations that provided housing, educational, medical, and legal services for illegals. The leading recipient of this government largesse in 2020 was an Austin, Texas-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit named Southwest Key Programs, which received \$400 million in taxpayer funds. The second-leading recipient was BCFS Health & Human Services, a San Antonio-based 501(c)(3) which took in at least \$253.1 million from the federal government.

In short, aiding and abetting people who break America’s immigration laws has become a very lucrative enterprise for these NGOs, thanks to the contempt the Biden White House and its bureaucratic agencies have for the law itself.

Another Texas-based [501\(c\)\(3\)](#) organization, the Val Verde Border Humanitarian Coalition (VVBHC), [processes](#) large numbers of illegal aliens for airline flights or bus trips [from](#) Texas to places like Florida, Indiana, New York, Tennessee, and Utah. It also provides those passengers with basic necessities such as food, drink, and access to shower facilities. Moreover, VVBHC is [assisted](#) in these endeavors by two additional 501(c) (3) nonprofits, the [Salvation Army](#) and the [United Methodist Committee on Relief](#).

In a similar spirit, Catholic Charities of the Rio Grande Valley (CCRGV) plays an active role in [providing](#) food and shelter to illegal migrants who have been released from federal custody, before they make their way to their final destinations in various locations across the United States. CCRGV also [collaborates](#) with a [fellow](#) 501(c)(3) nonprofit named [Team Brownsville](#) to provide such items as food, clothing, and diapers — as well as assistance in coordinating travel plans — for illegal aliens in Brownsville, Texas.

Also in Texas, [Mercy Ministries](#) works with fellow 501(c)(3)s like Catholic Charities and the [Holding Institute](#) to [shelter](#) illegal migrants in Laredo.

The Biden Administration has quietly [flown](#) enormous numbers of illegal alien minors from Texas to New York between the hours of midnight and 6:30 a.m. Many of those illegals are then dropped off at the Syosset, Long Island campus of MercyFirst, a [501\(c\)\(3\) nonprofit](#) sponsored by the Sisters of Mercy, a fellow Catholic [501\(c\)\(3\) nonprofit](#). From there, they are helped to find permanent homes.

On July 28, 2021, Texas' Republican Governor, Greg Abbott, issued an executive order barring all citizens and residents of that state from providing transportation services for any migrants who had crossed the southern U.S. border illegally. Abbott's order sparked the ire of the Catholic Legal Immigration Network Inc. (CLINIC), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit that characterized the governor's edict as "an affront to human dignity and morality." "It promotes racial profiling and punishes organizations, including CLINIC affiliates, for providing vital, life-saving services to immigrants," said Viviana Westbrook, CLINIC's state and local advocacy attorney. "This order, its origins and its goals," she added, "are a direct attack on all of us, undermining the core value shared by Catholics and other people of faith across this country — we can and must welcome."

These sentiments may seem noble, but even the Church must obey the law, as its Divine Authority famously said, "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, and unto God what is God's." Sedition is not a holy obligation or rite.

Republican Congressman Lance Gooden of Texas has warned that in collaboration with the Biden Administration, tax-exempt NGOs are not only "facilitating human smuggling and child trafficking in our country," but are also "allowing these migrants, many of whom are unknown to U.S. law enforcement agencies, to board commercial aircraft, creating one of the greatest threats to U.S. national security since September 11, 2001."

In February 2022, Rep. Gooden introduced The Stop Federal Funding for Human Trafficking and Smuggling Act, legislation designed to deny the flow of government dollars

to nonprofit organizations that help facilitate illegal entry into the United States. As Gooden said in a statement: “The Biden administration is working with nonprofits, U.S. corporations, and international agencies to operate an illegal immigration network that spans from South America to every community in the United States. Taxpayer dollars should not be subsidizing a mass invasion of our country, and it is time to put a stop to this corrupt operation.”

Former White House Office of Management & Budget Director Russ Vought, who now serves as president of [Citizens for Renewing America](#), [lauded](#) Gooden’s bill: “Many NGOs openly encourage the flaunting of our border and immigration laws, providing ‘how-to’ guidance on how to come to the United States illegally, and then reward such activity by facilitating and funding housing, food, utilities, and legal support. The net effect of these activities either directly promotes or provides cover for human trafficking operations, and the exploitation of men, women, and children at the border under the guise of ‘helping’ migrants. I support Rep. Gooden’s efforts to make sure groups that facilitate these activities are no longer funded with the hard-earned tax dollars supplied by the forgotten men and women of America.”

When Chris Cabrera, chief of the National Border Patrol Council in South Texas, was asked in February 2022 whether open-borders NGOs “are working at [cross purposes](#) to you,” he replied: “Most definitely. And they should not be allowed to, but our government allows it. And that’s a problem. And it’s one reason [Border Patrol] morale is so low.”

Like Texas, California is another state that serves as a destination for countless thousands of illegal border crossers

from Mexico and Central America. California-based nonprofits like the San Diego Rapid Response Network (SDRRN) and Jewish Family Service of San Diego (JFS) — both of which receive significant funding from American taxpayers — have helped the Biden Administration fly illegal aliens into the U.S. interior at no cost to them, while allowing them to evade normal airport-security requirements. Indeed, the illegals are asked to do nothing more than pledge that they will check in with the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agency at some future date — a pledge that is almost always broken.

The San Diego Rapid Response Network — which was launched in 2017 by two California ACLU chapters, the San Diego Organizing Project, and SEIU Local 221 — professes to combat “dehumanizing immigration enforcement activities, including checkpoints, raids, arrests, and harassment, occurring in San Diego County.”

In other words, the lawlessness of the Biden administration has spawned a mentality that is seditious and insurrectionary, and, thanks to the complicity of the I.R.S., funded by taxpayer donations that were never intended for such illegal and subversive purposes

Jewish Family Services is a tax-exempt NGO that colludes with the Homeland Security Department to provide illegal aliens with shelter. Moreover, JFS furnishes illegals with information packets that explain how they can: find an immigration attorney, apply for asylum, get past TSA agents at airports without showing proof of ID, get free access to high-quality hotels, contact immigration NGOs that can help them break the law, and enroll their children in U.S. public

schools. “[W]e ...stand with all Dreamers and their families,” JFS proclaims, “and all estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants who consider the United States to be their home.” So much for the rule of law.

In November 2021, *Just The News* reported that Jewish Family Services, in its most recent financial statement, indicated that it had received more than \$16 million in government support during the preceding fiscal year.

JFS’s subversive attacks on U.S. immigration law predate the Biden demolition project. JFS opposed virtually all Trump-era immigration policies, including the so-called Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP), a government action stipulating that foreign individuals traveling northward through Mexico and seeking asylum in the U.S. without proper documentation, could be required to remain in Mexico while waiting for their asylum hearings in America to eventually make their way onto a court calendar. Prior to the implementation of MMP, American border agencies had been required to release such illegals into the country’s interior, on the shaky expectation that they would someday show up for their asylum hearings. By JFS’s calculus, MMP was a “cruel and inhumane” policy. JFS is entitled to its opinion, but not to subverting the law and abusing taxpayer monies to implement its own agendas.

Other California-based 501(c)(3) nonprofits that help illegal aliens access free food, hotel rooms, and commercial flights into the American interior include Catholic Charities of San Diego and the Los Angeles-based Shapiro Foundation. In San Diego, many illegals have been housed at hotels including The Four Points by Sheraton, where rates start at \$159 per night.

Elsewhere in southern California, various nonprofit NGOs have negotiated [arrangements](#) with the Biden Administration and the state to provide illegals with hotel rooms costing \$71 to \$90 per night — again, all courtesy of the U.S. taxpayer, and a derelict I.R.S.

Another center of illegal entry into the United States is Arizona, where, between March 2021 and March 2022, a [501\(c\)\(3\) non-profit](#) called the [Regional Center for Border Health](#) helped more than 16,700 illegal migrants obtain food, clothing, and transport to far-flung locations across the United States where they could provide a demographic basis for future Democrat majorities – at least according to the assumptions of their Democrat sponsors.

Catholic Charities, meanwhile, has operated regular [shuttle](#) buses to Arizona’s Yuma International Airport, where illegal aliens are provided free commercial flights to their ultimate destinations. Many of those flights are paid for by Miles4Migrants, a tax-exempt NGO that uses donated air-miles to cover the costs.

No account of nonprofit organizations’ complicity in lawbreaking would be complete without some mention of what was done in 2018 by [Pueblo Sin Fronteras](#) (PSF, “People Without Borders”), a Chicago-based organization founded in 2001 by Roberto Corona, a [Mexican](#)-born activist dedicated to promoting the alleged rights of illegal aliens in the United States. PSF is the [project](#) of another Chicago-based nonprofit, the [now-defunct](#) La Familia Latina Unida (“The United Latin Family”). Describing itself as “a collective of

friends” who stand “in permanent solidarity with displaced peoples,” PSF has led numerous [caravans](#) of migrants and refugees from Central America to the U.S. The organization not only pledges to “provide humanitarian aid and legal advice” for such sojourners, but also candidly declares that its overriding objective is to “[abolish borders](#)” and facilitate the free, unregulated movement of Central American migrants into the United States. It proposes to do this by dismantling the immigration system and legal order that made America such a desirable destination in the first place, and replacing it with the lawless attitudes and practices that made Central America a slum.

In the spring of 2018, People Without Borders helped organize a caravan of hundreds of people from Central America seeking to enter the United States illegally. The [co-organizer](#) of that caravan was the CARA Family Detention Pro Bono Project, a coalition composed of the [Catholic Legal Immigration Network](#), the [American Immigration Council](#), the [Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services](#), and the [American Immigration Lawyers Association](#). Three of those four coalition members are tax-exempt NGOs.

On March 23, 2018, People Without Borders publicized the caravan by issuing a [press release](#) demanding that Mexico and the United States “respect our rights as refugees and our right to dignified work to be able to support our families”; “open the[ir] borders to us because we are as much citizens as the people of the countries where we are and/or travel”; and end all “deportations which destroy families.” Notice that everything in this statement is an unsubstantiated claim beginning with the presumption that the caravan members are refugees with rights. Asylum seekers do have rights, but only because America honors them, and the

current crisis at the border is in large part the result of would-be asylum seekers failing to show up for the court appointments designed to establish that they are indeed asylum seekers and not just liars seeking the bounties that the rule of law made possible before the Biden progressives began destroying them.

In mid-October of 2018, People Without Borders spearheaded an effort to overwhelm America's border-control apparatus when it helped launch yet another large caravan — composed of several thousand people from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador — that began migrating northward for the declared purpose of breaking America's immigration laws and occupying the United States.

In an October 21, 2018 [press release](#), People Without Borders accused President Trump and the U.S. of using “repressive tactics” to inflict “fear and racism” on the people of Central America. These preposterous claims indicate what little chance there is that such people would make a positive contribution to American life should they succeed in their malign agenda. This agenda was made clearer in the statement of one of its funders, [Freedom For Immigrants](#), an Oakland, California-based tax-exempt advocacy group which [claims](#) that America's “immigration detention system is built upon a long history of white supremacy, capitalism, and imperialism.” Sure, that's what America needs – more racist Marxists who want America to look like Communist Cuba.

The I.R.S. is the patron saint of a movement to break America's immigration laws, occupy its cities, bilk its taxpayers, overwhelm its health, welfare, and education services, fill its prisons, and destroy its constitutional order. By their words and

actions alike, this movement has shown its utter contempt for America's integrity as a sovereign nation, and for the hard-won principles that have made it the object of their envy. The I.R.S. has abandoned its responsibilities and betrayed its mandate in order to turn a blind eye to its own brazen complicity in advancing chaos and lawlessness through the length and breadth of a once proud nation.

5. Racist Health Care

During the COVID-19 pandemic, it was not uncommon to hear progressives identify the distribution of the virus as “racist,” and to call for a species of reverse racism to remedy the offense. In the words of Ibram X. Kendi – one of the most influential, widely read and intellectually vapid spokesmen for this cause: “The only remedy to racist discrimination is antiracist discrimination. The only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination. The only remedy to present discrimination is future discrimination....” In medical practice, this now means providing special resources and special care to black patients whose medical conditions are allegedly caused by white racism. It is not only not scientific, but also unconstitutional and a nullification of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which specifically outlaws systemic racism, even against white people.

It would be a relief to learn that this is a view confined to an academic fringe – and a mediocre one at that. But Ibram X. Kendi is not only a best-selling author and self-styled “anti-racist” advocate, he is also the head of a multi-million-dollar, tax-exempt, “anti-racism” institute at Boston University.

Moreover, his racist remedies have taken root in America's medical schools, hospitals, and professional associations, and have become an integral policy of the American public health system.

The Equity in Health Movement I: The Ideology

In 2021, the Biden administration issued an instruction to Medicare physicians to “create and implement an anti-racism plan.” Issued as [a final rule](#) in the Federal Register last November, it states, “The plan should include a clinic-wide review of existing tools and policies, such as value statements or clinical practice guidelines, to ensure that they include and are aligned with a commitment to anti-racism and an understanding of race as a political and social construct, not a physiological one.” Under this rule, doctors who create and implement an “anti-racism” plan and discriminate in favor of black patients will receive a [financial bonus](#) for doing so – in the form of higher reimbursements for their services.

An even more prestigious proselytizer of this racial perspective is [Lisa A. Cooper](#), Bloomberg Distinguished Professor and director of the [Johns Hopkins Urban Health Institute](#) and the [Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity](#). Cooper's evidence for concluding that the coronavirus pandemic has a racist dimension, which is “structural,” is the shared view of the entire progressive effort to politicize the medical profession. It is the product of Critical Race Theory and other Cultural Marxist ideas, whose “structures” erase individuals and their choices in favor of ideological categories, which allegedly lead to disparities in outcomes between different

racial and gender categories. But as Thomas Sowell has pointed out, there are disparities in the achievements and outcomes of all racial and ethnic groups globally, which have nothing to do with racism.

Thus, the faux evidence for COVID-19 having “racist” effects is that it impacts black Americans disproportionately to their representation in the general population. In the words of the Johns Hopkins magazine that interviewed Lisa Cooper: “Nationally, African American deaths are nearly two times greater than would be expected based on their share of the population, according to The COVID Racial Data Tracker.” Q.E.D.

But why is that? According to the director of the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Equity, Lisa Cooper:

“Before COVID-19, minority communities were already disproportionately impacted by health inequities. People in those communities already have higher rates of obesity, diabetes, heart disease, and lung disease, so these are the folks who were actually going to be at more risk of getting seriously ill with COVID-19. These health inequities result from the financial stresses of being poor and the social stresses of being from a marginalized group with a history of institutionalized, sanctioned mistreatment by law enforcement and other societal institutions. There’s a confluence of all these different factors—not having access to food, not having access to good quality housing,

being crowded in small houses where there are multiple generations and unable to engage in social distancing or stock up on groceries for several weeks at a time, having to use public transportation, to work in essential jobs, and having less access to health care. These are all manifestations of structural racism.”

There are so many false statements and misrepresentations in these sentences, it is hard to know where to begin. In the first place, it is an insult to black Americans (even though Cooper herself is black) to describe black America as living in inner-city poverty, beset by the unhealthy conditions associated with that status. In fact, more than eighty percent of American blacks are living above the poverty line and the majority are comfortably middle class. If eighty percent of blacks live like other Americans of all colors, how can racism be an explanation for the plight of the less-than-twenty percent who don't? The missing pieces here, vital to the diagnosis of a human condition, are the choices individuals make.

As it happens, black Americans suffer from obesity more than any other group. Obesity is not only in itself a co-morbidity factor for the coronavirus, but it also leads to two other major morbidity factors – diabetes and high blood pressure, which, along with age, would account for the prevalence of fatalities among this group. If medical professionals send the message that obesity is a structural imposition and not a choice, they deprive patients of the insight and motivation they need in order to improve their health. Taking responsibility and being held accountable are the keys to improving one's life and health. In other words, it's actually damaging to black patients to tell them

that they are victims and not responsible for their unhealthy conditions, and therefore powerless to affect them. If you are persuaded that stress is caused by the color of your skin, and by “structures” that make life hard for you, which you can’t affect, then you are helpless to do anything to change that.

The idea that blacks are structurally oppressed and whites are responsible for this – whatever their actual attitudes, actions and beliefs – is based on similarly fallacious (and bigoted) grounds of Cultural Marxist theory. It is absurd to call blacks a “marginalized” community when they have been the center of national attention since the triumph of the civil rights movement fifty years ago. Blacks are a dominant force in the nation’s culture, a ubiquitous presence in its media, the icons of American youth through their dominance in national sports, and the beneficiaries of many privileges based on their skin color. The equity movement in medicine, loaded with special privileges for black medical students, doctors and patients, is in itself a refutation of these claims.

The Equity in Health Movement II: Its Influence and Success

Despite the lack of a scientific grounding, despite the fact that discrimination by race, which is the core of the Equity in Health crusade, is illegal, unconstitutional, and a slap in the face of the civil rights movement, the medical profession and its guiding institutions have surrendered to this destructive, anti-scientific crusade. Of the 25 most prestigious medical schools in the United States – including Harvard, Yale, Stanford, and the Mayo Clinic – at least 23 require their students to take classes or undergo training grounded in the tenets of Critical Race

Theory. Worse, still, medical students are subjected to constant brainwashing sessions with “Diversity Equity and Inclusion” commissars, which are run like Communist re-education camps where dissent and questioning – the very basis of the scientific method – is forbidden, under pain of losing a medical career that you have spent a decade and more, at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars, training for.

A 2022 [study](#) of America’s [50 most prestigious](#) medical colleges and universities found that 39 have some form of mandatory student training or coursework built around the ideas and worldviews espoused by Critical Race Theory Marxists. Thirty-eight of those 39 schools offer materials by Robin DiAngelo, author of the book *White Fragility*, and Ibram X. Kendi, both of whose writings regard challenges to their views as prima facie evidence of racism. At 28 of the 50 medical universities, the general curriculum is embedded with school-wide mandatory fields of study such as Critical Race Theory or “Diversity, Equity and Inclusion” (DEI). Similarly, 28 of the 50 schools also have some sort of mandatory training for faculty or staff in topics like “anti-racism,” “cultural competency,” “DEI,” “equity,” “implicit bias,” and Critical Race Theory. In some cases, the training is school-wide, in others department-specific. “The national alarm should be sounding over the racialization of medical school education,” says William A. Jacobson, founder of LegalInsurrection.com. “The swiftness and depth to which race-focused social justice education has penetrated medical schools reflects the broader disturbing trends in higher education.”

The most prominent [medical journals](#) are also steeped in these contemporary racist theories. *The New England Journal of*

Medicine, for instance, touts its “commitment to understanding and combating racism as a public health and human rights crisis,” while *Health Affairs* intends to help “dismantle racism and increase racial equity” in healthcare. Toward that end, *Health Affairs* has recently decided to include the consideration of race and other nonacademic factors – rather than strict, objective intellectual rigor – in its peer-review process. But since when is the corruption of intellectual standards an advancement of medical science?

The National Library of Medicine [database](#) shows more than 2,700 recently published papers on “racism and medicine,” which for the most part claim that racial disparities in health outcomes are largely a consequence of “structural” racism. But as Dr. Stanley Goldfarb, former Dean of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, observes: “[T]he most commonly cited studies are shoddily designed, ignore such critical factors as pre-existing conditions, or reach predetermined and sensationalized conclusions that aren’t supported by reported results. These papers in turn are used to source even more shoddy research. This is a corruption of medical science in the service of a political ideology.”

Indeed, medical authorities are sounding more like ranting ideologues than scientifically trained experts. At a June 9, 2020 “Advancing Racial Equity” webinar, for example, Dr. José Ramón Fernández-Peña, president-elect of the American Public Health Association (APHA), [declared](#): “Racial injustice is a shameful part of the history of this nation. The genocide that started in the earliest days of the republic, along with the scars of human trade and slavery, the indignity of the internment of Japanese and Japanese Americans during World War II, and the

disgraceful caging of Latino children at the US/Mexico border, are all part of the legacy that has shaped the nation and its ethos since its foundation.”

In June 2020, the “Task Force on Diversity and Inclusion” at Harvard Medical School (HMS) issued a 63-page report advocating the use of race as a key consideration in all decisions regarding the recruitment of students and professors, the promotion of faculty and administrators, and the entire infrastructure of the school and its affiliated hospitals and research facilities. The word “diversity” appears 214 times in the report, while the word “inclusion” appears 118 times. This is nothing less than a movement to make skin color and leftwing racism the basis for reforming the entire health care system on the unproven claim that anti-black racism in the medical profession is the cause of disparities in black health.

The Harvard plan calls for a strengthening “the frequency, quality, impact, and reach of current unconscious bias training” for faculty members. The objective is to advance “social justice” by compelling professors, at every opportunity, to “discuss and learn about unconscious bias and microaggression.” The plan also intends to achieve racial quotas, under the antiseptic euphemism of “internal benchmark[s].”

Residency programs across the country have deliberately lowered their admissions standards so as to promote racial “diversity.” Dr. Joel Katz, vice chair for education in the Department of Medicine at Brigham and Women’s Hospital – one of Harvard Medical School’s teaching hospitals – explains approvingly that this is being done as a way to compensate for

the alleged injustices of a “system [that] is inherently racist and based on privilege—not just the medical system but the society we live in.” A common method of lowering standards is to de-emphasize test scores – even though such scores were specifically created as the best predictors of a physician’s ability to care effectively for patients. In place of actual standards, *Harvard intends to substitute ill-defined “holistic reviews of all applicants.”* In other words a perfect recipe for introducing personal prejudices, biases, and confusions into the medical process.

In March 2021, Brigham and Women’s announced its plan to use race as a factor in determining who would be able to access certain types of medical care – all on the undocumented premise that “Black and Latinx patients and community members” had long been discriminated against and were therefore entitled to receive “appropriate restitution” for what they had lost to “the pervasiveness of structural racism” in the medical profession. This is ideological gibberish designed to produce inferior medical care for all patients.

In 2021 the Indiana University School of Medicine (IUSM) proposed that faculty tenure decisions be made on the basis of “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion [DEI] Standards” having nothing whatsoever to do with medicine. Dr. Stanley Goldfarb, former Dean of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, explains how this policy will inevitably damage the quality and intellectual integrity of the faculty: “Forcing candidates to declare their support for DEI when so many of them undoubtedly oppose it would compel dishonesty. Forcing candidates to show a track record of involvement in DEI would compel participation in and allegiance to a belief

system. All of this is deeply illiberal and violates IUSM's own professed commitment to academic freedom." Goldfarb also points out that this policy will "incentivize faculty to engage in racial discrimination in who they hire, promote, mentor, and to whom they provide scholarships and grants."

One of the more noteworthy emblems of this race-obsessed approach to medical care is the so-called "race calculator," which an ever-increasing number of doctors and hospitals are using as a means of determining how to best allocate scarce medicines and therapeutics to a needy public. Consider, for instance, the treatment of COVID-19. If a patient's health profile earns him or her enough "points," he or she will be given priority over patients with lower scores when it comes to qualifying for such highly prized interventions as monoclonal antibodies. In addition to points awarded for various underlying co-morbidities or risk factors like advanced age, diabetes, heart disease, cancer, asthma, chronic lung disease, immunodeficiency, obesity, kidney disease, and liver disease, such "calculators" factor race into the equation as yet another co-morbidity/risk factor. In short, they award extra points to nonwhites as a form of compensation for the many racial injustices to which they are allegedly subjected on a daily basis in the United States.

The Internal Revenue Service: Enabler of Corruption

The medical schools, hospitals, and associations advancing these illegal agendas which violate the Civil Rights Act and the Constitution are tax-exempt institutions under the Internal Revenue Service's 501(c)(3) tax code. Because they are tax-exempt, the taxpaying public subsidizes their work. Consequently the I.R.S. rules explicitly prohibit tax-exempt institutions from supporting unlawful actions. The Internal Revenue Code (I.R.C.) states without ambiguity:

- “[Tax-]exempt purposes may generally be equated with the public good, and violations of law are the antithesis of the public good. Therefore, the conduct of such activities may be a bar to exemption.”
- “Not only is the actual conduct of illegal activities inconsistent with exemption, but the planning and sponsoring of such activities are also incompatible with charity and social welfare.”
- “Violation of constitutionally valid laws is inconsistent with exemption under IRC 501(c)(3).”
- “[A]ll charitable organizations, regardless of their form, are subject to the requirement that their purpose may not be illegal or contrary to public policy.”

In other words, none of these travesties could have taken place without the collusion of a corrupt government overseer, who turned a blind eye to the breaking of America's most important principle: equality before the law, regardless of gender or race.

The medical schools and associations were not the only tax-exempt groups promoting illegal and unconstitutional agendas at taxpayer expense. An army of 501(c)(3) radical groups pushing the racist “equity in health” agenda reveals the massive scope of the forces behind these changes. The tax-exempt White Coats 4 Black Lives, for instance, is a national organization of medical students that seeks to “dismantle racism in medicine and fight for the health of Black people and other people of color.” Proclaiming that “we do not believe in reformist policies,” White Coats 4 Black Lives leaders “demand intentional, community-centered, transformative change” that would mean the termination of “dominant, exploitative systems in the United States, which are largely reliant on anti-Black racism, colonialism, cis heteropatriarchy, white supremacy, and capitalism.” White Coats 4 Black Lives, funded by taxpayer dollars, supports doctors “prioritizing black patients over white patients,” and “unlearning toxic medical knowledge and relearning medical care that centers [on] the needs of Black people and communities.”

White Coats 4 Black Lives should be a fringe entity, but the radical takeover of American universities has ensured that it is not. White Coats 4 Black Lives consists of more than 70 chapters at medical schools across the United States, including such prestigious institutions as the University of North Carolina, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin.

The Health & Medicine Policy Research Group is a tax-exempt entity that was founded in 1980 by Quentin Young, who in the late 1970s was associated with a Marxist organization known as the New American Movement, and in 1979 was a founding member of the Citizens Party, which had close ties

to the pro-Soviet [Institute for Policy Studies](#). In 1982, Young helped establish the [Democratic Socialists of America](#), where he continued to be a [prominent](#) member until the end of his life. In 1983 he sat on the national advisory board of the All-People’s Congress, a group heavily influenced by the Marxist-Leninist [Workers World Party](#).

Emphasizing “[systems](#) of inequity and oppression that harm health and deny people of their inherent dignity,” the Health & Medicine Policy Research Group advocates an “intersectional approach” that focuses on “overlapping and compounding systems of oppression that affect individuals with various marginalized identities.” These systems of oppression, according to the organization, “include but are not limited to racism, anti-Blackness, white supremacy, socioeconomic class inequity, gender inequity, sexism, heterosexism, transphobia, xenophobia, anti-immigrant bias, white nationalism, ableism, ageism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and other identity-based discrimination, hatred, and deprivation.”

Physicians for a National Health Program (PNHP) is a tax-exempt advocacy group with dozens of chapters nationwide that promotes comprehensive single-payer national health insurance – in other words, a communist health care system under the absolute control of the state. In January 2021, PNHP held what it described as a “virtual [forum](#) on systemic racism in medicine,” with the aim of “dismantling the systemic racism deeply rooted in healthcare.”

The Society for Public Health Education is a tax-exempt advocacy group that [claims](#), “in order to improve the

health and wellness of all citizens, racism must be eliminated from public health infrastructure and practice.” Toward that end, public health professionals should “work strategically and collectively to adopt antiracist policies within their agencies and communities of practice.”

The Student National Medical Association is a multi-chapter, tax-exempt organization that **claims**: “Systematic racism, defined as a system of advantage based on race, drives economic instability, health inequity, mass incarceration, and food insecurity, which are just some of the significant contributors to disparate health outcomes seen in those with hypertension, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and now COVID-19. Racism affects not only communities of color but the entire healthcare system. Health inequities strain the resources of our medical system and affect how medicine is both regarded and carried out in *every* community. Now more than ever, it is crucial that we counteract the effects of racism on our most vulnerable communities to end all health disparities.” Of course, the Student National Medical Association doesn’t even bother to explain how it would be possible to end health disparities caused by genetic defects which are specific to races and ethnic groups, such as Tay-Sachs disease (Jews) and Sickle Cell anemia (blacks).

Far from being inspired by medical concerns or guided by the principles of scientific inquiry, these are just a panoply of anti-American, anti-capitalist, anti-white ideological radicals who have extended the radical assault on America’s constitutional foundations to a field which affects – and will now affect adversely – all Americans. And the Internal Revenue Service of the United States Government is ready with a taxpayer-funded hand-up to help them.

6. The War on Fossil Fuels

With the 2022 midterm elections less than four months away, a *New York Times*/Siena College [poll](#) revealed that just 1 percent of registered voters viewed climate change as a “top priority,” let alone the most important issue facing the nation. The poll placed climate change far behind concerns about inflation, the economy, record crime rates, and the humanitarian crisis on America’s southern border. Even among voters younger than 30 – the demographic that is typically most energized by debates about environmental policy – the corresponding figure was a mere 3 percent.

The same poll showed that public concern about climate change has actually declined significantly from the already-low levels of concern documented by previous surveys. In the summer of 2020, climate change ranked a lowly eleventh in a [Pew Research Center poll](#) measuring registered voters’ preoccupation with various issues. In September 2020, a [Gallup poll](#) likewise found that climate change ranked eleventh in a list of registered voters’ top concerns – well behind such items as the economy, terrorism/national security, the COVID-19 pandemic, health care, education, race relations, gun policy, crime, abortion, and immigration.

Notwithstanding the public’s consistent and overwhelming lack of concern about climate change as an urgent problem, the main concern of the Biden administration and the entire agenda of the Democrat Party has been, and continues to be, driven by this issue. In the words of President Joe Biden, “climate change [poses](#) an existential threat” – and the chief existential threat to the United States – greater

than terrorism, or Chinese expansionism, or the invasion by 2,400,000 unvetted illegal migrants annually across America's broken southern border. Senator Joe Manchin is a pariah in his own party for being the lone dissenter from this consensus.

So obsessive is the focus of Democrat leaders on the alleged "existential threat of climate change," that a centerpiece of their policies to oppose it is the war on fossil fuels, beginning with the cancelling of the Keystone pipeline, the shutting down of the ANWR oil field in Alaska, and the refusal for more than 17 months to sell oil-and-gas drilling [leases](#) on federal lands. An economic consensus, which includes such influential voices as former Obama Treasury Secretary Larry Summers, has singled out the war on fossil fuels as the chief driver of rising gas prices and the record inflation in the economy as a whole. Yet, despite the lack of public support, and the immediate destructive consequences of the anti-climate change policies, the radical leadership of the Democrat party is adamant in pursuing them. According to [Bernie Sanders](#), a lifetime supporter of communist dictators and socialist regimes, "the climate crisis is not only the single greatest challenge facing our country," but "is also our single greatest opportunity to build a more just and equitable future."

How is it possible that there should be such a disconnect between a democratic government and its constituents? How was such a radical consensus formed over such a controversial and contested issue – a consensus so strong and so anti-democratic that by 2022 it had resulted in the lowest approval ratings ever recorded for a sitting president and his political party? The answer can be found in the vast network of tax-exempt foundations and advocacy groups, unscrutinized and accountable to no one, that developed the analyses and policy

recommendations that make up the “Green New Deal” over the decades prior to its official launch in 2019.

When Democrat Senator Ed Markey and former bartender and current congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez first announced the Green New Deal in February 2019, it was already supported by 600 leftist organizations as well as 67 House Members and 11 U.S. Senators -- all Democrats. What was this Shadow Party’s agenda? The Green New Deal calls for the U.S. economy to achieve “net zero greenhouse gas emissions” by the year 2030 and, in the words of Rep. Ocasio-Cortez, to “transition off all nuclear and all fossil fuels as soon as possible.” The Green New Deal would also mandate: (a) trillions of dollars in inflationary public expenditures on government-approved, energy-saving “upgrades” and “retrofits” of all existing homes and businesses in the United States, and (b) zero-carbon standards for all new building construction.

In addition to doing away with nuclear reactors and fossil fuels, the GND seeks to raise the living standards of “low-income communities, communities of color, indigenous communities, [and] the front-line communities most affected by climate change, pollution, and other environmental harm.” Toward that end, it aims to guarantee that members of those demographics will be preferentially trained and hired to fill federal “green jobs” that will pay them at least \$15-per-hour to implement the aforementioned upgrades, retrofits, and construction projects, thereby helping them to enjoy a “just transition” from their previous occupations to the new “green economy.” The premise underlying these training/hiring policies is that some form of economic reparations or wealth transfer program should be put in place to counteract America’s historical discrimination against nonwhites and the poor.

Heartland Institute [president](#) Tim Huelskamp summarizes the Green New Deal agendas as “the most radical socialist proposal in modern congressional history.” He adds:

“[T]heir real desire is to accomplish the Left’s longtime goal of moving the United States toward full adoption of socialism. This isn’t just a theory. Significant provisions of the Green New Deal reveal its true purpose of imposing socialism on an unprecedented scale. The plan would create a ‘basic income program’ and federal jobs guarantee providing a ‘living wage’ to everybody who says they want one. It would impose a federal-government-run, single-payer health care system with bureaucrats and liberal politicians in Washington, D.C. in charge of every American’s health care. It would encourage the Federal Reserve to unleash inflation and create a system of government-owned banks to ‘create’ tens of trillions of dollars needed to fund these immense programs. None of these proposals has anything at all to do with climate change.”

In a July 2019 interview with *The Washington Post*, Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s chief-of-staff, Saikat Chakrabarti, [acknowledged](#) that the GND had not been devised to protect the environment, but rather, to inject socialism into the American economy. The radical Shadow Party behind this campaign to replace America’s incomparably productive and free market economy with a socialist travesty has been made possible by the failure of the Internal Revenue Service to enforce its own guidelines, which allow taxpayer subsidies only to non-

partisan, non-political, and charitable organizations. Beginning with its vast subsidies to universities that have been purged of conservatives and transformed into indoctrination and recruitment centers for the radical left and the Democrat Party, the I.R.S. has enabled the formation of the socialist juggernaut behind the Green New Deal and the war on fossil fuels - a war, by the way, which stops at the water's edge, since Russian pipelines, and oil production by the totalitarian regimes in Saudi Arabia and Venezuela, are apparently kosher for the Biden administration.

The foundations of this Shadow Party of tax-exempt institutions were laid in the 1970s, when the political left launched a campaign inspired by the Italian Communist Antonio Gramsci to build a revolution based on seizing control of the “means of cultural production” – universities, schools, philanthropic foundations and the like. A key component of 501(c)(3) nonprofit entities dedicated to promoting the GND and its leftwing agendas are the vast majority of colleges and universities across the United States. As the American Association of Universities [explains](#), nearly all public and private institutions of higher learning “are tax-exempt entities as defined by I.R.C. Section 501(c)(3) because of their educational purposes — purposes that the federal government has long recognized as fundamental to fostering the productive and civic capacity of its citizens — and/or the fact that they are state governmental entities.”

So much for the boilerplate. The movement to purge universities of conservative faculty and influences has been so successful over the last 50 years that the universities have, for all intents and purposes, ceased to be educational institutions in

any reasonable sense of the word. The total dominance of leftist narratives and values in virtually every academic discipline is as self-evident as it is shameful. How this took place is the subject of a book by one of the authors of this article – *The Professors* (2014) by David Horowitz. A 2020 [study](#) of more than 12,300 professors by the National Association of Scholars found that professors nationwide donate money to Democratic political figures rather than Republicans by a ratio of 95 to 1. And in a 2018 [study](#) of nearly 8,700 tenure-track, Ph.D.-holding professors from 49 of America’s top 66 liberal arts colleges as ranked by *U.S. News*, the professors were 12.7 times more likely to self-identify as Democrats than as Republicans. In the field of environmental science specifically, the ratio of Democrats-to-Republicans was greater than 25 to 1.

In addition to its taxpayer subsidies to left-wing university institutions, the I.R.S. has granted tax-exempt status to a vast number of 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations and charitable foundations that seek to permanently institutionalize the Green New Deal and its totalitarian agendas. With \$12 billion in assets, the Ford Foundation typifies the problem posed by the tax-exempt network of the left, which the I.R.S. has fostered and allowed to flourish. Most significantly, the existence of this taxpayer-subsidized juggernaut disenfranchises ordinary voters. Ford has more assets than either political party, and more discretionary funding opportunities than the federal government. It has a large (and therefore rubber stamp) board which is self-appointed and is accountable to no one. And it exists in perpetuity. If one set out to undermine the democratic system, one could find no better vehicle than an institution like Ford, or for that matter the so-called philanthropies of George Soros, whose agendas have included creating a national crime wave, and rigging the electoral system. These abuses cry out

for reforms to protect the sovereignty of the American citizenry which all these “charities” have put under threat. One could begin by sunseting them within a five- or ten-year window.

Major funding institutions like Ford and Soros’s Open Society Foundations often operate through secondary advocacy organizations that are also tax-exempt. According to a comprehensive survey conducted in 2012, and published as *The New Leviathan: How the Left-Wing Money-Machine Shapes American Politics and Threatens America’s Future* there were, at that time, at least 553 such organizations nationwide. Their combined net assets were approximately \$9.5 billion – a figure that exceeded the annual budget of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). By contrast, there were just 32 identifiable environmental activist groups that were nonradical and pro-free market. Their combined net assets were a mere \$38.2 million – a figure amounting to four-tenths of 1 percent of the assets owned by their environmental-left counterparts. Moreover, the environmental-left organizations at that time were awarding, in aggregate, some \$555 million in grants to their pet causes each year, while their 32 conservative counterparts were able to make grants totaling just \$1.2 million – a ratio of nearly 462 to 1.⁵

As if this imbalance were not bad enough, the coffers of the 553 environmental-left organizations – after they had doled out their \$555 million in yearly grants – were essentially replenished, dollar for dollar, by the federal government, which annually provided some \$569 million in grant money to approximately 247 of those groups. By contrast, the government gave a total of just \$728,190 in federal funds to 7 (of the 32) conservative groups supporting free-market solutions to

⁵ David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin, *The New Leviathan* (New York: Crown Publishing Group, 2012), pp. 156, 209-246.

environmental problems. The dollar-to-dollar ratio of left-to-right funding by the government was an astounding 781 to 1.⁶

A particularly noteworthy coalition of Green New Deal advocates today is an alliance of 15 leftwing activist groups that collectively call themselves the [Green New Deal Network](#). This Network is a fiscally sponsored [project](#) of the Tides Foundation, a \$405 million funder of environmental causes as well as other leftwing priorities. Among the members of the Network are several tax-exempt 501(c)(3) nonprofits such as the following:

- Sunrise Movement, the [foremost](#) organization behind the GND, calls for “an economy-wide [effort](#)” to pursue the “bold vision” that is necessary for “making core tenets of the Green New Deal a reality.”
- The Climate Justice Alliance – a network of [82 organizations](#) and supporting networks which in 2021 received some [\\$5.47 million](#) in tax-exempt donations from foundations, corporations, and individual donors for the purpose of fighting climate change – boasts that its member groups, in their quest to lead “a much needed aggressive national [pivot](#) away from climate denialism to climate action,” have already “[made](#) local versions of the Green New Deal a reality from New York City to Oregon.”
- The U.S. Climate Action Network, whose revenues in 2017 exceeded [\\$5 million](#), asserts that “the massive government investments that are needed” to bring forth “a Green New Deal for all people — Black, Indigenous,

⁶ Ibid.

Brown, and white — ha[ve] never been more [urgent](#).”

- The Center for Popular Democracy, whose 2019 revenues were in excess of [\\$28.9 million](#), states that the GND encompasses “the [bold](#) action that we need to build a resilient future for our planet.”
- The Brooklyn-based [Right to The City Alliance](#) (RTCA) is a tenants’-rights [coalition](#) which claims that the GND holds the key to developing “a [regenerative](#) economy based on cooperation, deep democracy, feminism, and equity.” Among RTCA’s more noteworthy organizational members are fellow 501(c)(3)s like the Ruckus Society, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, and the National Domestic Workers’ Alliance.

Of course, there is also a massive array of highly influential 501(c)(3) nonprofit activist groups that support the GND but are not part of the Green New Deal Network. A small sampling of these organizations includes the following:

- 350.org, which reported a combined [\\$30 million](#) in revenues in 2016-2017, declares: “It’s [time](#) for a Green New Deal” to provide “a just, rapid transition to 100% renewable energy in the timeline we need to avert the worst impacts of climate change.”
- The Natural Resources Defense Council, which in [2019](#) held net assets of almost \$387 million and awarded nearly \$12 million in grants, declares that it “strongly [supports](#) the Green New Deal goal to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas pollution, with social and economic justice at the core of the solution.”

- The Environmental Defense Fund, which in [2018](#) held net assets of more than \$208 million and awarded nearly \$22 million in grants, says: “We look forward to [working](#) with the sponsors of the Green New Deal – and all those across the political spectrum working towards climate solutions – to transform our economy and achieve a healthier, more equitable and prosperous future.”
- The Wilderness Society, which in [2019](#) held net assets of \$67 million and awarded nearly \$34 million in grants, proudly “[applauds](#) Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) and Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA) for leading the Green New Deal resolution,” which “lays out a framework for how to safeguard nature and humanity from the worst effects of climate change while providing sustainable economic opportunities, clean air and water and a just future for all.”
- The Rainforest Action Network, which in [2019](#) held net assets of \$8.5 million and awarded more than \$712,000 in grants, likewise backs the GND with fervent passion. As RAN executive director Lindsey Allen has written: “The Green New Deal brings much-needed urgency to the national conversation around the climate crisis, which is without a doubt the biggest threat to life on this planet.” Allen’s only lament, in fact, is that the GND is not radical enough for his taste: “While I applaud the direction proposed in the Green New Deal resolution, it simply does not go far enough. The hard truth is that we must keep more fossil fuels in the ground.”

Other major [supporters](#) of the GND include such tax-exempt 501(c)(3) nonprofit activist organizations as the

National Audubon Society, which in [2020](#) held net assets of \$585 million and awarded more than \$5.4 million in grants and similar disbursements; the [World Wildlife Fund](#), which in [2019](#) held net assets of \$386 million and awarded grants exceeding \$70 million; and the [Trust for Public Land](#), which in [2019](#) held net assets of \$133 million and awarded over \$58 million in grants.

These and hundreds of other likeminded activist organizations are united in their mission to advance the economic and cultural transformation that the Green New Deal, if it were signed into law, would herald.

The efforts of the aforementioned pro-Green New Deal activist groups are augmented by a second enormous class of 501(c)(3) nonprofits that likewise have been granted tax-exempt status by the I.R.S.: the hundreds of charitable foundations that together award countless thousands of grants, worth many billions of dollars in the aggregate, to environmental activist organizations and causes each and every year. Among the more notable of these foundations are:

- George Soros' Open Society Foundations, which in [2019](#) held \$10.3 billion in net assets and awarded \$431 million in grants and contributions;
- The Pew Charitable Trusts, which in [2019](#) held \$887 million in net assets and awarded over \$142 million in grants and contributions;
- The Ford Foundation, which in [2018](#) held nearly \$12.2 billion in net assets and awarded more than \$534 million in grants and contributions;

- The David and Lucille Packard Foundation, which in [2019](#) held over \$10.3 billion in net assets and awarded \$431 million in grants and contributions;
- The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, which in [2020](#) held \$12.7 billion in net assets and awarded over \$471 million in grants and contributions;
- The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, which in [2019](#) held more than \$1.2 billion in net assets and awarded \$37.7 million in grants and contributions;
- The Nathan Cummings Foundation, which in [2019](#) held \$430.8 million in net assets and awarded \$20.3 million in grants and contributions;
- The Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, which in [2019](#) held more than \$323 million in net assets and awarded over \$9.5 million in grants and contributions;
- The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, which in [2018](#) held \$5.9 billion in net assets and awarded nearly \$308 million in grants and contributions; and
- The Tides Foundation, (the Sunrise Movement’s aforementioned fiscal sponsor), which in [2019](#) held over \$405 million in net assets and awarded \$457 million in grants and contributions.

The agendas of the activist organizations, charitable foundations, and educational institutions discussed above reflect their political rather than charitable intentions, make them agents of the Democrat Party, and should disqualify them from receiving billions in taxpayer subsidies. But thanks to the partisan – and even rogue – nature of the current I.R.S., they don’t.

David Horowitz is the Founder and CEO of the David Horowitz Freedom Center.

*John Perazzo is the Editor of the Freedom Center's website;
www.discoverthenetworks.org*