

TAXPAYER-FUNDED GRANTS
TO THE RADICAL LEFT:
FINANCING THE “RESISTANCE”

HOW TAXPAYER-FUNDED LEFT-WING ORGANIZATIONS UNDERMINE
EFFORTS TO REFORM GOVERNMENT

A PRESIDENTIAL BRIEFING
FOR
THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS FOUNDATION

BY ART HARMAN
AND CHARLES ORNDORFF

SEPTEMBER, 2017

THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS FOUNDATION
TCCF.FOUNDATION
540-219-4536 • INFO@CONSERVATIVEUSA.ORG
332 W. LEE HIGHWAY, SUITE 221
WARRENTON, VA 20186

INDEX

- Introduction
- Case Studies of taxpayer-funded private non-profit organizations:
 - ACORN
 - La Raza
 - LULAC
 - Planned Parenthood
 - SEIU
 - Urban Institute
 - Urban League
 - World Wildlife Foundation
- Examples of grants by Federal Departments and Agencies:
 - Legal Services Corporation
 - National Endowment for the Arts
 - Corporation for Public Broadcasting
 - Health and Human Services.
- Recommendations and Conclusion.
- About The Conservative Caucus Foundation
- TCCF Staff

INTRODUCTION

Why should taxpayers finance the hateful “resistance?” The American people gave a mandate to President Trump to “drain the swamp,” yet the radical organizers and activists of the ‘swamp’ are using taxpayer funds to undermine the president’s agenda.

For decades, the Federal government has financed the far-left through grants and contracts. It has been an often cozy relationship, with liberal administrations funneling money to their ideological allies, which fan the flames of division and push for further budget increases to the welfare state.

However, the ideological grants and contracts are rarely reversed by Republican administrations, who tend to continue and even increase such funding, perhaps out of fear of upsetting the left if they were to zero out their subsidies and contracts. Appeasement never works, and the taxpayer-funded radical organizations undermine conservative values and agendas.

Contracts can often be as bad as grants, as contracts for a specific service can be delivered with a dose of politics. Voter registration projects could, for example, be done exclusively in Democrat areas, thus skewing election returns in a pre-meditated manner. Sanctuary cities can use taxpayers’ money intended to aid the poor to instead aid illegal immigrants escape justice or deportation. Funding intended to offer legal representation to the poor can be used as “lawfare” to challenge restrictions on illegal immigration.

The Conservative Caucus Foundation has tracked this funding to the enemies of honest and limited government since 1976.

Our Founding Fathers would have been horrified to discover that today’s government actively finances politically-oriented organizations, however they would not have been surprised, in fact, Thomas Jefferson predicted this possibility and wrote eloquently against funding political groups in the 1786 Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom:

To compel a man to furnish contributions of money
for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors,
is sinful and tyrannical.

Thomas Jefferson

CASE STUDIES

TCCF investigated in detail several radical left wing organizations. The following case studies reveal political agendas and specific political actions by these taxpayer-funded organizations.

- ACORN
- La Raza
- LULAC
- Planned Parenthood
- SEIU
- Urban Institute
- Urban League
- World Wildlife Foundation

“When government funds legislative advocacy by outside groups, the state abandons its duty of neutrality between pressure groups in a democracy. By funding one ideological position and refusing to fund alternative views, the state is using its massive economic and institutional resources to intervene in the democratic process. Government should spend money to implement the decisions of the political process, not to formulate it.”

Heritage Foundation, Agenda 1983

CASE STUDIES
ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS
FOR REFORM NOW (ACORN)

In 2009, the exposure of scandals and criminal activities involving ACORN brought from obscurity to infamy one of the major players in the left-wing’s arsenal of taxpayer-funded radical organizations. Barack Obama helped train activists for ACORN between 1992 and 2004, as well as directing voter registration drives for an ACORN-associated group, Project Vote. Obama boasted about his involvement in these radical organizations during his 2008 campaign as “community organizing,” and such ‘organizing’ may have aided his campaigns for state senator and later US senator. In fact, ACORN’s political arm endorsed Obama for President and increased their voter registration activities.

ACORN was not a small recipient of taxpayers money.

NBC News reported that the department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) “has given ACORN roughly \$42 million since the 2000 budget year. A July report by Rep. Darrell Issa, R-Calif., a member of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, said ACORN had received more than \$53 million in federal money since 1994.” (1)

According to the U.S. House of Representatives Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s February 18, 2010 report, “Follow the Money: ACORN, SEIU and their Political Allies,” 2

The report makes four crucial findings:

First, ACORN and SEIU’s illegal agreements, and the crimes committed in furtherance of these agreements, constitutes a criminal conspiracy.

ACORN CEO Bertha Lewis, Executive Director Steven Kest, and Political Operations Director Zach Polett have actual or apparent authority for ACORN’s illegal acts. The Committee’s investigation has confirmed previous findings as well as identified a method behind ACORN’s criminal activities.

Second, there is a pattern, signature or “trade secret” of corruption common to all ACORN affiliates called “Muscle for the Money.”

Muscle for the Money involves using non-profit corporations for electioneering activities and an SEIU strategy to threaten corporations and banks into brokering deals for ACORN’s financial benefit. SEIU and Project Vote used litigation to force demands from government officials. ACORN, through Project Vote, threatened State Secretary of State offices with lawsuits, thus forcing political compromises at the expense of taxpayers.

SEIU and ACORN are substantially intertwined. SEIU and ACORN jointly manage SEIU Local 100; SEIU Healthcare Illinois Indiana; SEIU Local 21A; SEIU Local 32BJ; SEIU Local 52BJ; SEIU Local 880; and SEIU Local 1199. SEIU aided and encouraged ACORN to put pressure on banks, to use its federally-funded affiliates to target political candidates, and to threaten public officials with litigation. ACORN took the lead in these activities and SEIU was the willing accomplice. The nexus between SEIU and ACORN constituted an agreement between both organizations to engage in fraudulent activities, which ACORN perpetuated through the use of its affiliates.

The Committee investigation found ACORN prepared for these fraudulent activities by issuing membership letters documenting which banks caved-in to ACORN’s pressure; through political plans targeting congressional districts to get sympathetic candidates elected, and via emails and legal complaints reflecting ACORN’s ability to coerce and compel public officials to meet certain demands. These findings reflect a pattern, signature or trade secret common to all ACORN affiliates. This signature crime is known as Muscle for the Money.

ACORN has received \$5,609,338.00 dollars from SEIU. Anthony Hill, a State Senator from Florida, was simultaneously employed by SEIU and ACORN. Newly reviewed documents show Senator Claire McCaskill (D-MO), former Governor Rod Blagojevich (D-IL), and Congressman Gerry Connolly (D-VA) have received the support of SEIU’s ACORN affiliates. Insiders claim that, despite SEIU Treasurer Anna Burger’s statement to the contrary, SEIU has never cut ties to ACORN.

Third, ACORN, as a corporation, is responsible for thousands of fraudulent voter registrations throughout the United States.

Responses from various state election offices show that ACORN’s late filings of voter registration cards and the sheer amount of fraudulent cards obstructed election administration efforts in many states. Fraudulent voter registrations are not isolated incidents; they reflect ACORN’s criminal motive to compromise the system of free and fair elections promised in the Constitution of the United States.

Fourth, ACORN contributed to the risky lending that led to the financial collapse.

ACORN drafted language to loosen underwriting standards and decrease down payments in the housing industry, paving the way for the high rate of subprime loans millions of Americans eventually defaulted on.

ACORN used provisions in the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 that allowed community groups to challenge bank mergers and acquisitions if a bank did not adequately invest in its own community. These challenges, which featured ACORN’s standard intimidation tactics, successfully forced banks to make lending agreements with

ACORN Housing. If banks refused ACORN’s demands, they jeopardized approval of mergers in a timely manner. ACORN Housing moved to become a conventional service provider for the loans. ACORN reaped profits from over a billion dollars in loans to low-income neighborhoods. Because of the policies and financial instruments developed, in part through ACORN’s lobbying activities, borrowers eventually defaulted on the loans. The end result was the bursting of the housing bubble.

ACORN Housing received a total of \$39,925,620.13 from Bank of America, JPMorgan Chase & Co., CitiBank, HSBC, CapitalOne, and SunTrust. These lenders and banks also provided ACORN with grants, address and bank account information of at-risk homeowners so ACORN could provide free counseling services. Instead, ACORN used the address and bank account information to target struggling Americans who would be signed up as dues-paying members of ACORN. ACORN’s membership recruiting brought in \$48 million a year for ACORN—a boon for their Muscle for Money program.

The Oversight and Government Reform report exposed what previously few Americans knew: ACORN used millions in taxpayer dollars for radical political causes few Americans would ever voluntarily support, and skirted and violated laws in the process.

In 2009, investigative journalists James O’Keefe and Hannah Giles conducted a series of “60 Minutes” style hidden camera investigations at ACORN offices. What they found shocked the nation. Posing as a prostitute and pimp, the team met with ACORN staff at offices across the country, who voluntarily advised them on how to conduct illegal business operations, covering up income sources, and even advising on how to traffic children for prostitution. 3

The videos created a firestorm of outrage, and Congress successfully—but temporarily--defunded the organization. While the then Democrat-controlled Congress caved in and resumed funding, major private donors ran away, leaving the organization not only bankrupt but also facing legal investigations. ACORN closed in 2010.

According to the Capital Research Center (CRC), donors to the “ACORN organization registered in Arkansas and New Orleans [included] \$3 million from the Marguerite Casey Foundation, \$821,000 from the Robin Hood Foundation, \$595,000 from the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation and \$65,000 from the Annie E. Casey Foundation.”

However, not all donations to ACORN were made to the now-tarnished name of ACORN. Various foundations donated tremendous sums to ACORN in their name, allowing like-minded corporate and individual donors to support those foundations to help the cause without the risks to their reputation from directly supporting ACORN.

As CRC reported, “Project Vote has received \$4,047,500 from the Rockefeller Family Fund, \$1,460,801 from the Tides Foundation, and \$2,643,100 from the Vanguard Charitable

Endowment Program, financial records show. ACORN’s American Institute for Social Justice (AISJ) has received almost \$30 million in foundation grants, since 2000.

“Other generous benefactors to AISJ include the Marguerite Casey Foundation, which donated \$5,125,000 and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation which donated \$4,130,000.” 4

CRC also discovered that the Woods Fund of Chicago donated about \$190,000 to the ACORN network—“where President Barack Obama and former Weather Underground leader William Ayers sat as board members.”

Like the mythical Hydra, ACORN was replaced by many new and differently-named organizations, but often with the same ACORN staff, officials and ideology.

One of the ACORN ‘successors’ is Affordable Housing Centers of America (AHCOA), the formerly named ACORN Housing. According to CRC’s research, “in 2010, the Obama administration designated \$7.6 billion for a foreclosure relief program. Of that total, \$445.6 million will be administered by ACORN alumnus Joe McGavin, now a director at the Illinois Housing Development Authority. As Judicial Watch discovered, McGavin was “Chicago Operations Manager” at AHCOA from November 2008 through January 2011, according to his LinkedIn profile.” 5

AHCOA has received an additional \$1,456,300 in grants from HUD from 2011-2016, according to USASpending.gov. 6

Americans deserve far better accountability of their taxes than entrusting almost half a billion dollars to an ACORN successor.

According to USASpending.gov, yet another ACORN successor, Communities United, Inc. received \$55,943,898 from 2008-2017. The corporation also received \$1,847,524 following President Trump’s inauguration, highlighting the need to “drain the swamp” with greater haste. 7

Capital Research Center reports that “on May 5, 2010, “ACORN’s new D.C. spinoff group, Communities United, held a founding meeting in ACORN’s office on 8th Street Southeast in the nation’s capital. The D.C. office is important to ACORN because the embattled advocacy organization runs its congressional lobbying efforts out of it.

“The same office is also home to Project Vote, ACORN’s voter registration arm, which continues to operate. In the 1990s President Obama trained ACORN activists and worked for Project Vote. Communities United is the product of the consolidation of ACORN’s D.C. and Maryland chapters.” 8

Conservative organizations typically operate on a bare-bones budget, provided by voluntary donors, and with transparency that their donations will go for the purposes they desire. The differences with left-wing organizations could not be more dramatic, as best demonstrated with the involuntarily support by American taxpayers of radical ideologically-oriented activist

organizations. Acorn-successor organizations are a core part of the “swamp” that President Trump promised to drain.

Congressman Steve King (R-IA) was the author of an amendment to H.R. 2017, the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2012, that would defund all ACORN affiliate groups. Rep. King summed up ACORN’s agenda as: “ACORN is a corrupt criminal enterprise that threatens our democratic system of government by systematically committing voter registration fraud. American taxpayers should not be asked to fund an organization that is dedicated to corrupting the sanctity of every American's vote.”⁹

H.R. 2017 passed the House with Rep. King’s amendment, which in section 709, would have defunded certain funding from ACORN affiliates and allied organizations. The amendment did not pass in the Senate, leaving many of the organizations eligible for continuing funding. The main office of ACORN filed for bankruptcy in the wake of the investigative video reports and closed down in 2010, however many affiliates continued operations under existing or new names.¹⁰

This is Rep. King’s list of ACORN affiliates, as listed in Section 709 of H.R. 2017:

None of the funds made available by this Act shall be made available to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Acorn Beneficial Assoc., Inc., Arkansas Broadcast Foundation, Inc., Acorn Children’s Beneficial Assoc., Arkansas Community Housing Corp., Acorn Community Land Assoc., Inc., Acorn Community Land Assoc. of Illinois, Acorn Community Land Association of Louisiana, Acorn Community Land Assoc. of Pennsylvania, ACORN COMMUNITY LABOR ORGANIZING CENTER, ACORN Beverly LLC, ACORN Canada, ACORN Center for Housing, ACORN Housing Affordable Loans LLC, Acorn Housing 1 Associates, LP, Acorn Housing 2 Associates, LP, ACORN Housing 3 Associates LP, ACORN Housing 4 Associates, L.P., ACORN International, ACORN VOTES, Acorn 2004 Housing Development Fund Corporation, ACRMW, ACSI, Acorn Cultural Trust, Inc., American Environmental Justice Project, Inc., ACORN Fund, Inc., Acorn Fair Housing Organization, Inc., Acorn Foster Parents, Inc., Agape Broadcast Foundation Inc., Acorn Housing Corporation, Arkansas Acorn Housing Corporation, Acorn Housing Corp. of Arizona, Acorn Housing Corp. of Illinois, Acorn Housing Corp. of Missouri, New Jersey ACORN Housing Corporation, Inc., AHCNY, Acorn Housing Corp. of Pennsylvania, Texas ACORN Housing Corporation, Inc., American Institute for Social Justice, Acorn law for Education, Rep. & Training, Acorn Law Reform Pac, Affiliated Media Foundation Movement, Albuquerque Minimum Wage Committee, Acorn National Broadcasting Network, Arkansas New Party, Arkansas Acorn Political Action Committee, Association for Rights of Citizens, Acorn Services, Inc., Acorn Television in Action for Communities, Acorn Tenants’ Union, Inc., Acorn Tenant Union Training & Org. Project, AWA, Baltimore Organizing Support Center, Inc., Bronx Parent Leadership, Baton Rouge ACORN Education Project, Inc., Baton Rouge

Assoc. of School Employees, Broad Street Corporation, California Acorn Political Action Committee, Citizens Action Research Project, Council Beneficial Association, Citizens Campaign for Fair Work, Living Wage Etc., Citizens Consulting, Inc., California Community Network, Citizens for April Troope, Clean Government Pac, Chicago Organizing and Support Center, Inc., Council Health Plan, Citizens Services Society, Campaign For Justice at Avondale, CLOC, Community and Labor for Baltimore, Chief Organizer Fund, Colorado Organizing and Support Center, Community Real Estate Processing, Inc., Campaign to Reward Work, Citizens Services Incorporated, Elysian Fields Corporation, Environmental Justice Training Project, Inc., Franklin Acorn Housing Corporation, Flagstaff Broadcast Foundation, Floridians for All PAC, Fifteenth Street Corporation, Friends of Wendy Foy, Greenwell Springs Corporations, Genevieve Stewart Campaign Fund, Hammurabi Fund, Houston Organizing Support Center, Hospitality Hotel and Restaurant Org. Council, Iowa ACORN Broadcasting Corp., Illinois Home Day Care Workers Association, Inc., Illinois Acorn Political Action Committee, Illinois New Party, Illinois New Party Political Committee, Institute for Worker Education, Inc., Jefferson Association of Parish Employees, Jefferson Association of School Employees, Johnnie Pugh Campaign Fund, Louisiana ACORN, New York Communities for Change, Affordable Housing Centers of America, Action Now, Pennsylvania Communities Organizing for Change, Arkansas Community Organizations (ACO), The Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment, New England United for Justice, Texas Organizing Project, Minnesota, Neighborhoods Organizing for Change, Organization United for Reform, Missourians Organizing for Reform and Empowerment, A Community Voice, Community Organizations International, Applied Research Center, or the Working Families Party.

ACORN is the “poster child” for taxpayers being forced to fund political activism they would never voluntarily support.

(ACORN endnotes)

(1 http://www.nbcnews.com/id/32925682/ns/politics-more_politics/#.WTts8oWcFV-/, n.d.)

2 (<https://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/02/20100218followthemoneyacornseiuandtheirpoliticalallies.pdf>, n.d.)

3 <http://projectveritas.com/acorn/>

4 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2010/05/17/anonymous-donors-liberal-foundations-and-labor-unions-fuel-renamed-acorn-affiliates/>

5 <https://capitalresearch.org/article/obama-administration-gives-446-million-to-acorn-veteran/>

6 <https://www.usaspending.gov/Pages/AdvancedSearch.aspx?k=%22Affordable%20Housing%20Centers%20of%20America>

7 <https://www.usaspending.gov/Pages/AdvancedSearch.aspx?sub=y&ST=C,G,L,O&FY=2017,2016,2015,2014,2013,2012,2011,2010,2009,2008&A=0&SS=USA&k=053716999&SB=AD&SD=ASC>

FINANCING THE “RESISTANCE”

8 <http://dailycaller.com/2010/05/11/acorn-lobbying-efforts-continue-in-washington-under-communities-united-name/>

9 <https://steveking.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/kings-amendments-funding-border-security-programs-defunding-acorn-pass>

10 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/112th-congress/house-bill/2017/text/rfs>

CASE STUDIES THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

When amnesty for illegal aliens is mentioned, one organization probably comes to mind immediately – the National Council of La Raza, now renamed UnidosUS.

Did you know that during the eight years of Obama’s presidency La Raza received \$28,304,308 in taxpayer funding (and that doesn’t count millions more to their affiliates)?¹ Is that how you want your tax money spent?

There is no question where La Raza stands. Its own website boasts that it is “the largest national Hispanic civil rights and advocacy organization in the U.S.” and points to its support for comprehensive immigration reform (amnesty), affirmative action, welfare programs, and “removing barriers” (i.e. voter identification) to voting.²

La Raza takes a no-compromise attitude toward winning its battle for illegals. When Katherine Steinle was murdered by an illegal alien who would have been deported if not for San Francisco’s refusal to hold him for Federal authorities, most Americans were outraged. A subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the policies of San Francisco and other “sanctuary cities” (cities which refuse to cooperate with Federal immigration authorities and protect illegal aliens from deportation). La Raza’s statement to the subcommittee blamed the murder on the failure of Congress to pass an amnesty bill instead of the failure to deport the murderer.³

La Raza showed an equal lack of concern when it came to dealing with terrorism, opposing a bill to require that all airport baggage screeners be American citizens.⁴

Since the 2016 election, La Raza has joined the liberal coalition opposing repeal of ObamaCare,⁵ demanded that Congress pass legislation to codify Obama’s amnesty program for younger illegal aliens,⁶ and called for the rejection of Sen. Jeff Sessions, nominated by Trump as Attorney

¹ Found at USASpending.gov.

² “Letter from Janet Murguia, NCLR President and CEO”, add website address as of January 4, 2017.

³ Statement of the National Council of La Raza: Hearing on “Sanctuary Cities: A Threat to Public Safety, July 23, 2015, submitted to the Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Security.

⁴ Hawkins, William and Anderson, Erin, “The Open Borders Lobby and the Nation’s Security, Part Two”, *FrontPageMag.com*, January 22, 2004 at <http://archive.frontpagemag.com/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=14478> at of January 4, 2017.

⁵ “National Groups Call on Congress to ‘Protect our Care,’ Announce New Coalition to Fight Health Care Repeal”, <http://familiesusa.org/press-release/2016/national-groups-call-congress-protect-our-care-announce-new-coalition-fight> as of January 4, 2017.

⁶ “NCLR Praises Senators Durbin and Graham As They Announce Intention to File a Bill to Grant Extended Status to DACA Residents”, <http://www.nclr.org/about-us/media/press/releases/press-statement-bridge-act-120916> as of January 4, 2017.

General. The statement against Sessions was especially revealing, since it labeled his opposition to putting left-wing Sonia Sotomayor on the Supreme Court as alleged proof that Sessions is “at best indifferent, and at worst actively hostile to more than half the country”⁷

It should come as no surprise that La Raza moves in lockstep with liberals on issues besides amnesty. It supports gun control,⁸ homosexual marriage,⁹ anti-energy environmental regulations,¹⁰ and shorter sentences for criminals.¹¹

La Raza’s Political Action Committee endorsed the candidacy of Hillary Clinton, who promised to work with the organization for amnesty and citizenship for illegal aliens.¹² La Raza itself was heavily involved in the election by conducting registration drives to increase the number of Hispanic voters. They claimed to have registered an additional 50,000 just in the state of Florida.¹³

La Raza refused to invite Trump to speak at their national convention, accusing him of “a concerted effort to denigrate and demonize not just immigrants, but the entire 55-million plus Latinos in this country”¹⁴

Twenty-eight million dollars buys a lot of publicity and influence. President Trump should not allow it to continue.

In July, 2017, La Raza changed its name to the less openly divisive, UnidosUS. President Janet Murguia insisted “it was not a reaction to outside critics, including conservatives and others who

⁷ “NCLR Opposes Nomination of Sen. Jeff Sessions as U.S. Attorney General”, <http://www.nclr.org/about-us/media/press/releases/press-statement-jeff-sessions-111816> as of January 4, 2017.

⁸ Miller, Harvey, “Following Orlando Shooting, National Council of La Raza Passes Gun Safety Resolution”, July 23, 2016, Human Rights Campaign website at <http://www.hrc.org/blog/following-orlando-shooting-national-council-of-la-raza-passes-gun-safety-re> as of January 4, 2017.

⁹ “National Council of La Raza Endorses Marriage Equality”, *Huffington Post*, June 27, 2012 at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/27/nclr-marriage-equality-_n_1631493.html as of January 4, 2017.

¹⁰ Jacquez, Albert, “Clean Power Plan Protects the Health – and Pocketbooks – of Latino Families”, *Huffington Post*, August 9, 2015 at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/nclr-action-fund/clean-power-plan-protects_b_7962788.html as of January 4, 2017.

¹¹ “We Support Federal and State Sentencing Reform Legislation”, National Council of La Raza website at <http://www.nclr.org/issues/civil-rights/criminal-justice-reform/> as of January 4, 2017.

¹² “National Council of La Raza PAC endorses Hillary Clinton”, <https://www.hillaryclinton.com/briefing/statements/2016/10/18/national-council-of-la-raza-action-pac-endorses-hillary-clinton/> as of January 4, 2017.

¹³ Perry, Mitch, “La Raza Says They’ve Registered More Than 50,000 Latino Voters in Florida”, *Florida Politics*, October 18, 2016, at <http://floridapolitics.com/archives/224850-national-council-la-raza-says-theyve-registered-50000-latino-voters-florida> as of January 4, 2017.

¹⁴ Cordeiro, Monivette, “National Council of La Raza Kicks Off Orlando Conference With Naturalization Ceremony”, *Orlando Weekly*, July 23, 2017 at <http://www.orlandoweekly.com/Blogs/archives/2016/07/23/national-council-of-la-raza-kicks-off-orlando-conference-with-naturalization-ceremony> as of January 4, 2017.

say the term promotes ethnic exclusivity. It comes as the group gears up for a wider fight for Latino rights with many in the community seeing hostility from President Donald Trump.”¹⁵

La Raza kicked-off the Trump administration with protests, including around the Inauguration, where they cosponsored Al Sharpton’s “We Shall Not Be Moved” demonstration in Washington, DC with other radical organizations. On May 1, the international communist “International Workers Day,” Refuse Fascism and other radical organizations staged demonstrations across the country, including La Raza.¹⁶

¹⁵ Key US Latino group says new name will help fight vs. Trump <https://apnews.com/37c5218e79a0458abedb00096a113d9a>

¹⁶ <https://refusefascism.org/2017/04/14/may-1st-protests-across-the-country/>

CASE STUDIES

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) describes itself as dedicated to advancing “the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, housing, health, and civil rights of the Hispanic population of the United States.” Note that it does not say the *legal* Hispanic population.¹⁷

Not surprisingly, LULAC has supported amnesty for illegal aliens (“comprehensive immigration reform” in liberal-speak) while claiming that the failure to grant amnesty and open the border would be “bad for national security, public safety, and the economy.”¹⁸ The organization even complained that amnesty legislation introduced by liberals was insufficient because it would exclude those who did not speak English, were guilty of crimes, and could not afford to pay fees, fines and back taxes.¹⁹ They opposed increased security along the porous Mexican border, claiming that it was “more secure than it has ever been.”²⁰

LULAC President Roger Rocha boasts of LULAC’s influence on the amnesty issue, especially on Democrats in Congress. According to him, LULAC’s successful opposition to a bill that did not go far enough “demonstrates the power of LULAC’s grassroots efforts. . . . We will continue to fight for comprehensive immigration reform that supports family unification, respects the human rights of immigrant workers, and provides a pathway to citizenship for the millions of immigrants already making positive contributions to this country.”²¹

And your tax dollars help provide the “power” of which Rocha boasts. LULAC received \$232,000 from the U.S. taxpayer during the Obama years, and the LULAC Institute pulled in even more -- \$838,303.²² The LULAC Institute might deny a connection between the two (their annual IRS returns do not acknowledge that they are “related”) but they share office space, a

¹⁷ LULAC website at <http://lulac.org/about/mission/> as of January 17, 2017.

¹⁸ Lemus, Gabriela, “Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/advocacy/issues/immigration_comprehensive_reform/ as of January 17, 2017.

¹⁹ “How Millions Could Get Cut Out of Immigration Reform”, Feb. 5, 2013 at LULAC website at <http://www.colorlines.com/content/how-millions-could-get-cut-out-immigration-reform-infographic> as of January 17, 2017. For background information, see also Rosenblum, Mark, Capps, Randy, and Yi-Ying Ling, Serena, “Earned Legalization: Effects of Proposed Requirements on Unauthorized Men, Women, and Children”, Migration Policy Institute, January 2011 at <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/earned-legalization-effects-proposed-requirements-unauthorized-men-women-and-children> as of January 17, 2017.

²⁰ “5 Things to Know for Comprehensive Immigration Reform”, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/5_things_to_know_for_comprehensive_immigration_reform/ as of January 17, 2017.

²¹ LULAC’s Impact on the Hill Echoes on the Democratic Presidential Debate Stage”, Feb. 12, 2016, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/LULAC_impact_Hill_democratic_debate/ as of January 17, 2017.

²² Found at USASpending.gov.

website, and staff (including the same executive director).²³ Their 2014 IRS forms (the most recent available) show them with the same president and seven of eleven Institute board members were also on the LULAC board.²⁴ The Institute’s IRS form openly states that it was “created to further LULAC National operations”²⁵

Should more than \$1 million of our tax dollars have gone to LULAC? Is that the best way to spend our hard-earned dollars when we are suffering from a huge deficit and an ever-growing Federal debt?

And do not think that LULAC confines its liberal politics to the amnesty issue. They have put their influence behind the American Left on many others.

They praised ObamaCare, describing it as legislation that would help make health care “a civil right”²⁶ – i.e. something provided by taxpayers regardless of the character and actions of the person. In LULAC’s eyes, no one is unworthy of becoming a burden on the taxpayer.

As soon as Barack Obama nominated Judge Merrick Garland for the Supreme Court seat left by the death of Antonin Scalia, LULAC rushed to praise Garland as “eminently qualified”. They claimed that failing to vote on Garland would be against “the interests of the American people.”²⁷

Calling homosexual marriage one of “the most important issues for Latinos,” LULAC passed a resolution of support in 2012.²⁸ They proceeded to hold public rallies on the issue²⁹ When the Supreme Court announced that it had invented a new Constitutional right to homosexual marriage, LULAC praised the decision.³⁰

²³ LULAC and LULAC Institute IRS Forms 990, FY 2014, address line on page one and board listings in Part VII, Section A, line 1a; LULAC website at, for example, <http://lulac.org/about/reports/index.html> as of January 18, 2017.

²⁴ LULAC and LULAC Institute IRS Forms 990, FY 2014, Part VII, Section A, line 1a.

²⁵ LULAC Institute IRS Form 990 for FY 2014, Part I, line 1.

²⁶ “Nearly 10 Million Latinos May Benefit from Affordable Care Act”, July 15, 2010, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/Nearly_10_Million_Latinos_May_Benefit_from_Affordable_Care_Act/index.html as if January 18, 2017.

²⁷ “Statement on Nomination of Merrick Garland to the U.S. Supreme Court”, March 16, 2016, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/nomination_merrick_garland_supreme_court/ as of January 18, 2017.

²⁸ “Resolution: Supporting Marriage Equality”, June 30, 2012, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/advocacy/resolutions/2012/resolution_Supporting_Marriage_Equality/index.html as of January 18, 2017.

²⁹ “Organizations Hold Rally in Support of the LGBT Community’s Search for Marriage Equality”, March 26, 2013, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/organizations_hold_rally_in_support_of_lgbt_communitys_search_for_marriage_equality/index.html as of January 18, 2017 and “United for Marriage Equality Rally”, March 26-27, 2013, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/events/united_for_marriage_equality_rally/index.html as of January 18, 2017.

³⁰ “Supreme Court Invalidates Discrimination Against Gay Marriage”, June 27, 2013, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/supreme_court_invalidates_discrimination_against_gay_marriage/index.html as of January 18, 2017.

No good liberal organization could fail to demand strong action against gun owners. LULAC fell into step by calling for banning some weapons and making it more difficult to buy even those that remained legal.³¹

Establishment Republicans in Congress have done nothing to prevent our tax dollars from going to LULAC and similar left-wing groups. Is there any hope?

It may well be that President Trump will decide to do something about this scandal. LULAC denounced Trump as soon as he began his candidacy.³² They later claimed that Trump rejected American values, described him as the candidate of “hate”, and claimed he intended to establish a “police state.”³³

Nor has LULAC moderated its stance since Trump was elected. Trump’s nomination of Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-AL) as Attorney General quickly brought out a smear by LULAC, which called Sessions “racist and anti-immigrant.” According to LULAC, a Justice Department with Sessions at its head would become “the dispenser of terror and racial intolerance”³⁴

LULAC has continued to participate in and organize protests around the country, and lobbying Congress against the administration’s efforts to secure the border. ³⁵

Perhaps the Trump administration will finally bring common sense to how our tax dollars are spent.

³¹ “Resolution on Gun Violence Prevention”, June 22, 2013, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/advocacy/resolutions/2013/resolution_on_gun_violence_prevention/index.html as of January 18, 2017.

³² “LULAC Denounces Donald Trump’s Anti-Immigrant Campaign Speech”, June 25, 2015, LULAC website at <http://lulac.org/news/pr/LULAC-denounces-Donald-trump-speech/> as of January 18, 2017.

³³ “Uniting in the Face of Hate, LULAC Responds to Trump Nomination”, July 22, 2016, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/response_Trump_nomination/ as of January 18, 2017.

³⁴ “LULAC Condemns the Choice of Jeff Sessions for Attorney General”, November 18, 2016, LULAC website at http://lulac.org/news/pr/jeff_sessions_AG_statement/index.html as of January 18, 2017.

³⁵ <http://lulac.org/advocacy/alerts/>

CASE STUDIES PLANNED PARENTHOOD

“We do not want word to go out that we want to exterminate the Negro population,” Planned Parenthood founder and eugenist Margaret Sanger wrote in a letter to Dr. Clarence Gamble on December, 10, 1939. Sanger founded the American Birth Control League in 1921, which was renamed to Planned Parenthood Federation of America in 1942.

Their website highlights Sanger as their founder, though it downplays and tries to refute her published eugenist and racist views. The organization states they have over 600 clinics across the country.

“Thanks a billion,” is what Planned Parenthood might say to American taxpayers who unwittingly subsidized the organization through government funding. \$393,813,507 actually, and that’s just during the Obama years, 2009-2016.

During the Trump administration, Planned Parenthood helped lead demonstrations, such as “running the logistics, safety, security, volunteers and digital promotion of the” nationwide May Day left wing protests. (1)

While Planned Parenthood’s abortion mills are run by their Federally-funded (c)3, they spend millions through their 501(c)4 lobbying arm, Planned Parenthood Action Fund to keep their taxpayer subsidies and keep legal abortion on demand up through birth through Planned Parenthood Action Fund

The Planned Parenthood Action Fund spent \$800,000 on trying to elect John Ossoff in the 2017 Georgia special election to replace Rep. Tom Price. “Planned Parenthood was a major force, knocking on 20,000 doors before the special election and another 80,000 leading up to the runoff —more than double the effort of any other independent group supporting Ossoff.”

“Planned Parenthood Action Fund has launched a five-figure GOTV digital ad buy in support of Jon Ossoff in the April 18th Special Election for Georgia's 6th Congressional District. The digital ads round out a six-figure investment in the race, complementing a ground effort which has reached over 15,000 people in door to door canvasses and over 70,000 people in a mail campaign. The geo targeted GOTV digital ads will run through election day, April 18.”

<https://www.plannedparenthoodaction.org/pressroom/in-ga-06-planned-parenthood-action-fund-running-gotv-digital-ads-in-support-of-jon-ossoff>

<http://www.lifenews.com/2016/11/04/tax-funded-planned-parenthood-spending-38-million-to-push-hillary-and-pro-abortion-democrats/>

“The GAO report found the Planned Parenthood abortion corporation and its affiliates received \$344.5 million in federal funds and another \$1.2 billion in funding from Medicaid (which includes a combination of federal and state funds) for a total of \$1.5 billion over three years from federal programs. The abortion giant receives \$1.2 billion from Medicaid, \$201 million from the Title X family planning program \$40.6 million from Title XX Social Services block grants and \$25.9 million from the Title V Maternal and Child health Services block grant.”

(1) <http://www.peoplesworld.org/article/huge-rallies-to-protest-trumps-inauguration/>

https://www.plannedparenthood.org/uploads/filer_public/b5/d4/b5d47c32-89f2-45d9-b28c-243cb85f3f55/sanger_fact_sheet_oct_2016.pdf

<http://www.lifenews.com/2016/04/18/how-much-of-your-tax-money-does-planned-parenthood-get-a-new-report-will-tell-you/>

<http://www.lifenews.com/2015/03/25/report-shows-americans-forced-to-send-1-5-billion-to-planned-parenthood-abortion-business/>

CASE STUDIES

THE SEIU EDUCATION AND SUPPORT FUND

The Service Employees International Union (SEIU) has been described as “the nation’s most highly visible and politically influential labor organization. No other union did more to get Obama elected”³⁶ When it endorsed Hillary Clinton for President on November 15, 2015, it was rightly treated as a major campaign development and a significant boost to her chances of becoming president.³⁷

At the union’s 2016 convention, it adopted resolutions putting it squarely on the political left, supporting amnesty for illegal aliens, “climate justice”, “equality for . . . lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people”, more government spending, and ObamaCare.³⁸

According to the Washington Free Beacon, SEIU “spent \$60 million on politics and lobbying as well as \$19 million on the Fight for 15 movement in 2016, and now finds itself laying off headquarters staff.

“The union's federal filing to the Department of Labor reveal that it experienced marginal growth in 2016, adding about 15,000 members from 2015. However, that increase did not correlate with financial growth as revenue fell by \$17 million, fueling a \$10 million budget deficit.

“The union, which represents healthcare and public sector workers, spent \$61.6 million on political activities and lobbying in 2016, roughly 20 percent of its \$314.6 million budget, according to the filing.

“However, those figures may underestimate its political spending. The union spent \$19 million on activist groups and public relations consultants to assist with the Fight for 15 campaign, which has successfully pushed for dramatic minimum wage increases in New York, California, and Washington, D.C., according to an analysis from the Center for Union Facts.” (htt2)

Therefore, it should be a matter of concern that its affiliate, the SEIU Education and Support Fund, has received \$5,232,435 in Federal taxpayer funds during the past eight years.³⁹ In fact,

³⁶ Early, Steve, *The Civil Wars in U.S. Labor: Birth of a New Workers Movement or Death Throes of the Old?* (Haymarket Books, 2011), pg. xi.

³⁷ “Hillary Clinton Wins Major Endorsement from the SEIU”, *Time*, Nov. 17, 2015 insert web address <http://time.com/4116700/hillary-clinton-seiu-endorsement/> as of December 28, 2016.

³⁸ “Nineteen Resolutions Adopted at SEIF 2016 Convention”, SEIU Local 1984, July 12, 2016 <http://www.seiu1984.org/2016/07/12/nineteen-new-resolutions-adopted-at-seiu-2016-convention/> as of December 28, 2016.

³⁹ Found using USASpending.gov for 2009-2016.

government grants make up more than 92% of the Fund’s revenue during the five-year period on their 2014 IRS filing.⁴⁰

It might be objected that the SEIU and its Education and Support Fund are separate organizations, and that money that goes to the Education and Support Fund does not support the political agenda of the SEIU. However, the facts show that the Fund (which is located in the SEIU’s Washington headquarters) is completely subordinate to SEIU. The IRS Form 990 of the SEIU not only identifies the Education and Support Fund as a related organization, it also lists the SEIU as the “Direct controlling entity” of the Fund.⁴¹ If further evidence were needed, the Fund’s three directors are all officers of SEIU and are paid by the SEIU, receiving no salary from the Fund.⁴² Follow the money, and you will find where their loyalty lies.

The Education and Support Fund’s own description of its mission points toward political goals, stating that it is “educating the general public” on such issues as “healthcare access and affordability, community economic development, clean economy, and worker rights issues.”⁴³

An example of how the Fund can use what appeared to be an innocuous project to send a political message can be found when it dealt with workplace violence against homecare workers. It managed to slip into its materials propaganda supporting more welfare spending and more restrictive gun control.⁴⁴ The pamphlet stated that the “material was produced under grant number SH-20861-SHO from the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.”

The SEIU has a First Amendment right to speak out in favor of its political views, but it should not receive a taxpayer subsidy. The SEIU Education and Support Fund is an obvious example of the need for defunding of the left.

SEIU joined battle against the Trump administration. They participated in the May Day “Resist Fascism” demonstrations

⁴⁰ IRS Form 990 2014 of the SEIU Education and Support Fund, Schedule A, Part IIA, line 4 and Part IIB, line 11. <http://freebeacon.com/issues/least-20-seius-budget-went-politics/>

⁴¹ IRS Form 990 2013 of the Service Employees International Union, Schedule R, Part II, line 4.

⁴² IRS Form 990 2014 of the SEIU Education and Support Fund, Part VIIA, lines 1-3 and IRS Form 990 2013 of the Service Employees International Union, Part VIIA, lines 2, 5, and 6.

⁴³ IRS Form 990 2014 of the SEIU Education and Support Fund, Part III, line 1.

⁴⁴ HomeCare Workplace Violence, SEIU Education and Support Fund, 2011, pg. 6.

CASE STUDIES

THE URBAN INSTITUTE

In the landscape of non-profits, The Urban Institute is one of the towering mountains. With an annual income of more than \$88 million and assets topping \$163 million, few others even come close.⁴⁵ That much money buys a lot of publicity and influence. *The New York Times* described the Urban Institute as “a major research organization, evaluating every aspect of national domestic affairs from taxes to the performance of the President.”⁴⁶ *The Los Angeles Times* labeled it a “leading liberal think tank.”⁴⁷ When it released a report claiming that repeal of ObamaCare would be a disaster for Americans, the report was all over the news.⁴⁸

The Institute’s President, Sarah Rosen Wartell, previously worked for the Clinton administration in the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), then moved on to become executive vice-president of the left-wing Center for American Progress.⁴⁹ Senior Vice President Margery Turner also worked at HUD under Clinton,⁵⁰ and has been a strong advocate of government policies to move poor people out of the inner city to other neighborhoods.⁵¹ A look at the Board of Directors finds that several have worked in Democratic administrations⁵², and the

⁴⁵ Urban Institute IRS Form 990 for FY 2014, page 1 (\$88,254,534).

⁴⁶ Herbers, John, “The Urban Institute, Then and Now”, *The New York Times*, August 20, 1986 at <http://www.nytimes.com/1986/08/20/us/washington-talk-the-urban-institute-then-and-now.html> as of January 6, 2017.

⁴⁷ “The 50 Most Influential Think Tanks in the United States”, *The Best Schools* at <http://www.thebestschools.org/features/most-influential-think-tanks/> as of January 9, 2017.

⁴⁸ Aaron, Henry J., and Reischauer, Robert D., “Repealing ObamaCare without Replacing It Would Be a Disaster”, *The Washington Post*, December 7, 2016 at https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/repealing-obamacare-without-replacing-it-would-be-a-disaster/2016/12/06/74ce1fc2-bbf5-11e6-91ee-1addfe36cbe_story.html as of January 9, 2017; Hiltzik, Michael, “The Real Reason the GOP Is Gung-Ho on Repealing ObamaCare: It Would Give the Rich a Huge Tax Cut”, *The Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 16, 2016 at <http://www.latimes.com/business/hiltzik/la-fi-hiltzik-obamacare-tax-cut-20161216-story.html> as of January 9, 2017; Chapman, Steve, “The Risks of Repealing ObamaCare”, *Chicago Tribune*, January 5, 2017 at <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/chapman/ct-gop-blamed-repeal-obamacare-perspec-0105-20170104-column.html> as of January 9, 2017.

⁴⁹ Urban Institute website at <http://www.urban.org/author/sarah-rosen-wartell> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵⁰ Urban Institute website at <http://www.urban.org/author/margery-austin-turner> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵¹ “Adopting a Place-Conscious Approach to Community Development: A Conversation with Margery Austin Turner of the Urban Institute”, *Community Dividend* at <https://www.minneapolisfed.org/publications/community-dividend/adopting-a-placeconscious-approach-to-community-development-a-conversation-with-margery-austin-turner-of-the-urban-institute> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵² Len Burman at the Treasury Department under Clinton (see <http://www.urban.org/author/leonard-e-burman> as of January 9, 2017), Alanna McCargo in the Treasury Department under Obama (see <http://www.urban.org/author/alanna-mccargo> as of January 9, 2017), and Nancy La Vigne at Justice under Clinton (see <http://thecrimereport.org/2009/09/16/la-vigne-to-head-urban-institute-justice-center/> as of January 9, 2017),

only one to serve under a Republican started in government with an appointment from Jimmy Carter.⁵³

Such a well-funded and well-connected organization should have no need for a taxpayer subsidy, yet it received \$268,840,561 during the eight years of President Obama.⁵⁴

It is no surprise that an organization led by liberal Democrats and funded in large part by the Obama administration has been outspokenly on the side of the American Left. In fact, it has weighed in on virtually every issue being pushed by liberals.

When President Obama unveiled his Deferred Action for Parents of Americans (DAPA) amnesty program after the 2014 elections, the Urban Institute produced a report casting it in a favorable light.⁵⁵ It has also argued against building a wall along the Mexican border, against deporting illegal aliens, and denied that illegals take jobs from Americans.⁵⁶

Obama’s anti-energy, anti-jobs Clean Power Plan was criticized only for its relative moderation, which made it “a hard pill to swallow”, but it was praised for its alleged benefits, especially for low income Americans.⁵⁷

A study of sentencing reform bemoaned the resistance and “changes in the political climate” that made it difficult to reach the goal of putting criminals back on the streets, attempting to reverse two politically-incorrect decades in which reduced crime rates and increased prison populations went hand in hand.⁵⁸

The 1996 welfare reform forced on a reluctant President Clinton by conservatives in Congress was strongly criticized by the Institute at the time, claiming that all the criticisms of welfare were wrong and that the bill was really “designed to dismantle the welfare state that has existed for the

⁵³ Urban Institute website at <http://webarchive.urban.org/publications/901081.html> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵⁴ Obtained through USASpending.gov.

⁵⁵ Capps, Randy, Koball, Heather, Bachmeier, James D., Ruiz Soto, Ariel G., Zong, Jie, and Gelatt, Julia, “Deferred Action for Unauthorized Immigrant Parents”, Urban Institute, February 2016 at <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/2000631-Deferred-Action-for-Unauthorized-Immigrant-Parents-Analysis-of-DAPA%27s-Potential-Effects-on-Families-and-Children.pdf> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵⁶ Woods Tyler, “Seven Myth-Busting Facts on Undocumented Immigration”, Urban Institute at <http://www.urban.org/2016-analysis/seven-myth-busting-facts-undocumented-immigration> as of January 9, 2017.

⁵⁷ Martin, Carlos and Latham, Sierra, “How the Clean Power Plan Could Affect Low Income Families”, Urban Institute, August 4, 2015 at <http://www.urban.org/urban-wire/how-clean-power-plan-could-affect-low-income-families> as of January 10, 2017.

⁵⁸ Harvell, Samantha, Welsh-Loveman, Jeremy, and Love, Hanna, “Reforming Sentencing and Corrections Policy: The Experience of Justice Reinvestment Initiative States”, Urban Institute, December, 2016 at http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/86691/reforming_sentencing_and_corrections_policy_final.pdf as of January 10, 2017.

past 60 years.”⁵⁹ Although the results of reform won praise from many, the Institute was still hostile 15 years later, calling for increased spending on welfare programs.⁶⁰

The Death Tax is portrayed as something wonderful that must be preserved, a “cornerstone” of a good tax system,⁶¹ while studies finding negative effects from the tax on Social Security benefits were firmly denied.⁶²

Lack of gun control is put forth as the reason for homicides,⁶³ homosexual marriage is described as a good policy,⁶⁴ and the increase in the number of people on Food Stamps is a positive development.⁶⁵

No doubt most liberals would consider the Urban Institute a good investment for their donations, but should American taxpayers be sending them tens of millions each year? That is a decision the Trump administration will need to face.

⁵⁹ Sawhill, Isabel V., “Welfare Reform: An Analysis of the Issues”, Urban Institute, May 1, 1995, at <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/306620-Welfare-Reform-An-Analysis-of-the-Issues.pdf> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶⁰ Zedlewski, Sheila, “Welfare Reform: What Have We Learned in Fifteen Years?”, Urban Institute, April, 2012, at <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/412539-Welfare-Reform-What-Have-We-Learned-in-Fifteen-Years-.PDF> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶¹ Burman, Leonard, “Don’t Bury the Estate Tax”, Urban Institute, June 14, 2002, at <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/900761-Don-t-Bury-the-Estate-Tax.pdf> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶² Burman, Leonard, Coe, Norma, Pierce, Kevin, and Tian, Liu, “The Effects of the Taxation of Social Security Benefits on Older Workers’ Income and Claiming Decisions”, *National Tax Journal*, June 2014, at <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/2000027-the-effects-of-taxation-of-social-security.pdf> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶³ Irvin-Erickson, Yasemin, Schwabish, Jonathan, and Weissman, Nicole, “What We Know About Gun Violence in the United States: Who’s Affected”, Urban Institute, October 5, 2016 at <http://www.urban.org/urban-wire/what-we-know-about-gun-violence-united-states-whos-affected> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶⁴ Witeck, Bob and Gates, Gary, “Same-Sex Marriage: What’s at Stake for Business”, Urban Institute, July 21, 2004, at <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/same-sex-marriage> as of January 10, 2017.

⁶⁵ Zedlewski, Sheila, “SNAP’s Role in the Great Recession and Beyond”, Urban Institute, July 12, 2012, at <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/snaps-role-great-recession-and-beyond> as of January 10, 2017.

CASE STUDIES THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE

Should more than \$22 million in donations be enough for a nonprofit organization to carry out its activities? You might think so, but the Obama administration decided that the National Urban League should get another \$20 million in tax dollars, according to the League’s most recent annual IRS filing.

In fact, during the eight years of the Obama administration, the League received \$128 million from the taxpayers. That doesn’t count another \$169 million to eight of the League’s local affiliates. (It must help to have someone from your state in the White House. The Springfield, Illinois Urban League took in \$65 million, more than double what any other city received.)

Just what does the National Urban League do with all that money? It functions as one important part in the left-wing coalition that promoted the policies of Barack Obama for eight years and is now working to make sure those policies survive despite the verdict of the 2016 election.

They praise ObamaCare, saying that it’s only faults are that it needs to be expanded, with more spending.⁶⁶ Of course, such praise is hardly surprising when one HHS publication lists the Urban League and two of its affiliates as receiving grant money under ObamaCare.⁶⁷

Affirmative action, which can be a form of reverse discrimination, is defended by the League on the grounds that it does not believe minorities can successfully compete without preferential treatment.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Morial, Marc, “Obama Cares: Celebrating Six Years of the Affordable Care Act”, March 23, 2016, NUL website at <http://nul.iamempowered.com/content/tbe11-obama-cares-celebrating-six-years-affordable-care-act> and “Affordable Care Act – Medicaid Expansion in Resisting States”, Jan. 20, 2016, NUL website at <https://nulwb.iamempowered.com/content/affordable-care-act-%E2%80%93-medicaid-expansion-resisting-states> and “Obama Administration Scorecard”, pg. 10, NUL website at <https://org2.salsalabs.com/o/5666/images/2017-Obama-Scorecard-FINAL.pdf> as of March 8, 2017.

⁶⁷ “The Affordable Care Act Resource Kit”, National Partnership for Action to End Health Disparities, Office of Minority Health, US Department of Health and Human Services, pages 17 and 19 at <https://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/NPA/Materials/AffordableCareActResourceKit.pdf> as of March 8, 2017.

⁶⁸ Decker, Jonathan, “Urban League Defends Affirmative Action”, *The Christian Science Monitor*, July 27, 1995, at <http://www.csmonitor.com/1995/0727/27042.html> as of March 8, 2017.

The League is a strong supporter of Common Core,⁶⁹ abortion on demand,⁷⁰ gun control,⁷¹ and weak protection against voting fraud.⁷²

The sort of “criminal justice reform” pushed by Hillary Clinton, which would put all blame on police officers and release many criminals from jail, is one of the League’s priorities.⁷³

When both Clinton and Donald Trump declined to appear at the League’s 2016 convention, Clinton was praised anyway while Trump was accused of showing that he would ignore black Americans if elected president.⁷⁴ (One year earlier, the League had made a big deal of the fact that they would not allow Trump to speak at the 2015 convention, declaring that if Trump tried to attend he would be told “You’re fired.”)⁷⁵

Since the election, the League has continued to act as a foe of President Trump, opposing the nomination of Attorney General Jeff Sessions⁷⁶ and pledging to keep an eye on Trump and fight him whenever he fails to support their agenda.⁷⁷

Now the question is, will the Trump administration continue to give our taxpayer money to this adversary? Does the President believe he should be funding his enemies?

⁶⁹ Morial, Marc, “National Urban League Endorses Common Core State Standards – Here’s Why, Part I”, *The Huffington Post*, April 28, 2014 at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marc-h-morial/national-urban-league-end_b_4858809.html as of March 9, 2017.

⁷⁰ “Women’s March”, January 25, 2017, NUL website at <http://www.iamempowered.com/content/womens-march> as of March 9, 2017.

⁷¹ “Strategies for Reducing Gun Violence in American Cities”, June 2016, National Urban League and Mayors Against Illegal Guns, pages 17-18, 35-38 at <http://everytownresearch.org/documents/2016/06/strategies-reducing-gun-violence-american-cities.pdf>

⁷² “Obama Administration Scorecard”, National Urban League, January 2017, pg. 5 at <https://org2.salsalabs.com/o/5666/images/2017-Obama-Scorecard-FINAL.pdf> as of March 9, 2017.

⁷³ “Urban League’s Morial Urges Passage of Criminal Justice Reform Legislation, Juvenile Incarceration Reform”, *Dogon Village*, at <http://www.dogonvillage.com/2015/07/urban-leagues-morial-urges-passage-of-law-enforcement-trust-and-integrity-act-juvenile-incarceration-reform/> and “10 Point Justice Plan: National Urban League Police Reform and Accountability Recommendations”, NUL website at <http://nul.iamempowered.com/content/10-point-justice-plan> as of March 8, 2017.

⁷⁴ Wenger, Yvonne, “Rawlings-Blake Criticizes Trump’s Decision to Skip Urban League Conference”, *The Baltimore Sun*, August 3, 2016 at <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/maryland/baltimore-city/politics/bs-md-ci-urban-league-starts-20160803-story.html> as of March 9, 2017.

⁷⁵ Man, Anthony, “If Donald Trump Sought to Address National Urban League, He’d Be Told ‘You’re Fired’”, *Sun Sentinel*, July 29, 2015, at <http://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/fl-urban-league-convenes-20150729-story.html> as of March 9, 2017.

⁷⁶ “National Urban League Statement on the Confirmation of Senator Sessions for U.S. Attorney General”, NUL website at <http://nul.iamempowered.com/content/national-urban-league-statement-confirmation-senator-sessions-us-attorney-general> as of March 9, 2017.

⁷⁷ “Civil Right Orgs Vow to Keep Eye on Trump Admin”, *Jet*, at <http://www.jetmag.com/news/civil-rights-trump-admin/> as of March 9, 2017.

FINANCING THE “RESISTANCE”

CASE STUDIES WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

One of former President Obama’s most reliable allies on the “climate change” issue has been the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), whose description of its mission includes influencing “decisions made by individuals, communities, governments, and businesses.”⁷⁸ Their message is clear and simple – “Climate change poses a fundamental threat to everything we love” and extreme reductions in the use of fossil fuels must be made.⁷⁹ WWF boast of being able to “mobilize hundreds of millions of people” on behalf of its causes.⁸⁰

With assets of more than \$471 million and donations in fiscal year 2015 of almost \$156 million dollars, it appears that WWF could carry out its liberal propaganda without help from the taxpayers.⁸¹ However, WWF received a taxpayer subsidy of more than \$48 million in fiscal year 2015 and more than \$191 million Federal tax dollars during the Obama administration.⁸²

They certainly earned that financial backing. Obama’s anti-energy “Clean Power Plan” was praised as a “game changer”, even while warning that it was actually inadequate and that stronger actions against energy would be “needed to avoid runaway climate change.”⁸³ After the House of Representatives voted to block implementation of the plan, WWF stated its certainty that “Americans of all stripes [are] demanding climate action.”⁸⁴

WWF correctly recognized the fundamental radicalism of Obama’s Paris Agreement, noting that it was not a finished work but just the first of many steps in the war against energy. As WWF Vice President Lou Leonard put it, “Stronger commitments in the near term will be necessary. . . . The agreement hammered out over the last weeks in Paris creates a blueprint for progressively bolder action with regular moments when nations come back to the table to do more. The first of these moments is in 2018 when the national targets offered by countries this year will be strengthened.”⁸⁵

⁷⁸ IRS Form 990, FY 2015, Schedule O, first item.

⁷⁹ WWF website at http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/footprint/climate_carbon_energy/ as of January 30, 2017.

⁸⁰ IRS Form 990, FY 2015, Schedule O, first item.

⁸¹ IRS Form 990, FY 2015, Part X, line 16 and Part VIII, lines 1a and 1f.

⁸² IRS Form 990, FY 2015, Part VIII, line 1e and USPSpending.gov.

⁸³ WWF website at <https://www.outsideonline.com/2138391/whats-worst-can-happen-environment-under-trump> as of January 30, 2017.

⁸⁴ WWF website at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/press-releases/wwf-statement-on-house-of-representatives-vote-to-block-clean-power-plan> as of January 30, 2017.

⁸⁵ WWF website at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/stories/landmark-climate-deal-struck-in-paris> as of January 30.

Within hours after Hillary Clinton’s defeat by Donald Trump became undeniable, WWF put out a statement insisting that “ambitious climate action is necessary” and calling on Trump to adopt Obama’s policies.⁸⁶ One former WWF executive was quoted as predicting Trump would bring “the most important and, from an environmental point of view, disastrous impacts in the last 40 years.”⁸⁷ When President Trump took office, WWF quickly made the transition to opposition leader. Its supporters were asked to contact their Senators, demanding the Trump appointees to key cabinet level posts be required to “support and enforce laws and regulations put in place” by the Obama administration.⁸⁸ In other words the election results would be nullified and Obama’s policies would continue despite the decision of the voters.

There is no reason to expect WWF’s leaders to have a change of heart. President and CEO Carter Roberts held an advisory position in the Obama administration.⁸⁹ Vice President Brad Ack worked for two Democratic governors.⁹⁰ Former Democratic Senator Chris Dodd is on the Board and Democratic Governor of Arizona Bruce Babbitt is a Director Emeritus.⁹¹

No wonder that when Barack Obama was looking for post-presidential office space, he chose to rent rooms from the World Wildlife Fund.⁹² He will be right at home.

But is the World Wildlife Fund a proper home for our tax dollars?

⁸⁶ WWF website at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/press-releases/wwf-statement-on-the-us-presidential-election> as of January 30, 2107.

⁸⁷ Solomon, Christopher, “What’s the Worst That Can Happen to the Environment Under Trump?”, *Outside* at <https://www.outsideonline.com/2138391/whats-worst-can-happen-environment-under-trump> as of January 30, 2017.

⁸⁸ WWF website at https://support.worldwildlife.org/site/Advocacy?cmd=display&page=UserAction&id=922&_ga=1.155020219.242854631.1485546563 as of January 30, 2017.

⁸⁹ WWF website at http://www.worldwildlife.org/leaders/carter-roberts?_ga=1.217493269.242854631.1485546563 as of January 30, 2017.

⁹⁰ WWF website at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/leaders/brad-ack> as of January 30, 2017.

⁹¹ WWF website at <http://www.worldwildlife.org/about/leadership> as of January, 2017.

⁹² Levy, Gabrielle, “Obama Picks World Wildlife Fund Building for Post-Presidency Office”, *U.S. News*, December 12, 2016. At <http://www.usnews.com/news/national-news/articles/2016-12-12/obama-picks-world-wildlife-fund-building-for-post-presidency-office> as of January 30, 2017.

AGENCY REVIEWS

The waste of taxpayers money as well as use of such subsidies for ideological gain is rampant across most of the government. For this review, we analyzed grants and actions from one cabinet department and three agencies.

- Legal Services Corporation
- National Endowment for the Arts
- Corporation for Public Broadcasting
- Health and Human Services

AGENCY REVIEW THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

The then president of the Legal Services Corporation, John Erlenborn, was asked in 2003 by “Human Events” what language in the U.S. Constitution authorizes the federal government to run a legal services corporation. “Probably the same one that lets the federal government build highways,” said Erlenborn. “I don’t know. The general welfare clause.” (1)

The correct answer would have been “none.”

Erlenborn should have learned if there was a constitutional justification for the agency before he took the oath of office as a Federal employee, which requires supporting and defending “the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.”

The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) is a Federal agency with an intended mission to deliver legal assistance to the poor. However, virtually from its birth in 1974, it became one of the key funding mechanisms for radical left wing private organizations.

LSC was created in 1974 with a budget of \$90 million (2), which equates to \$44,677,000 in 2017 dollars. (3) Hillary Rodham helped shape LSC’s ideological activism as a board member when she was appointed to the board by President Jimmy Carter in 1977 and became chairman from 1978 to 1981). Under her tenure, the LSC budget increased from \$96 million during the Ford administration to over \$300 million by 1981 (5)

The agency requested \$502 million for fiscal year 2017, and received \$385 million in the Continuing Resolution. President Trump’s 2018 budget zeroes out all funding for LSC as per the below excerpt from the 2018 budget request, save for \$33 million to cover close-out expenses. If Congress passes this budget instead of a CR, the agency would close after 43 years of financing legal warfare by the radical Left.

Major Savings and Reforms BUDGET OF THE U. S. GOVERNMENT Fiscal Year 2018

ELIMINATION: LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION Other Independent Agencies

The Budget seeks to end the one-size-fits-all model of providing legal services through a single Federal grant program, the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). This proposed elimination puts more control in the hands of State and local governments which better understand the needs of their communities.

Funding Summary (In millions of dollars)

FINANCING THE “RESISTANCE”

	2017 CR	2018 Request	Change from 2017
Budget Authority:	\$384,000,000	\$33,000,000	-\$351,000,000

Justification:

This proposed elimination will encourage nonprofit organizations, businesses, law firms, and religious institutions to develop new models for providing legal aid, such as pro bono work, law school clinics, and innovative technologies. The proposal also puts more control in the hands of State and local governments which better understand the needs of their communities. Further, the LSC is not subject to the same accountability measures as other agencies, such as the Antideficiency Act and certain public reporting requirements. The LSC's indefinite appropriation authorization expired in 1980. (4)

While many poor people receive legal assistance via LSC funding, a great amount of their financial and human resources are used as the radical left's “lawfare” department; to supply armies of taxpayer-funded lawyers to sue corporations and the government that funds it for ideological gain. The precedents thus created can have wide-reaching liabilities for taxpayers. The 2018 budget states eliminating LSC will encourage charities and localities to find new methods to assist the poor with their legal needs.

“A principal avowed purpose of the Legal Services movement has been “law reform.” That means changing the law wherever possible to suit the left-wing ideology of the Legal Services activists.

The very essence of that ideology is class warfare, organizing tax-users, as a class, against tax-payers, for the purpose of taking from those who have, to give to those who don't.”

Howard Phillips and Peter Ferrara in “The Real Cost of the Legal Services Corporation” 1995

LSC is prohibited by law from aiding illegal immigrants, however loopholes in the law rendered this protection useless. Dale Wilcox investigated how the law has been exploited in his March 7, 2016 report in Front Page Mag, “Lawyers For Illegals Getting Taxpayer Dollars? How the Left is circumventing the law.” (7)

“Perhaps unknown to either side is that open-borders legal advocates representing Unaccompanied Alien Minors (UAMs) and illegal immigrants in general have been receiving taxpayer dollars for years although the practice is indeed a prohibited one. The Legal Services Corporation (LSC), a government entity created in 1974 that distributes federal grants to non-profit law firms, has been

blocked since the eighties from providing funds for the use of representing illegal aliens. Congressional appropriations law as it relates to LSC is clear: “LSC funds cannot be used to engage in litigation and related activities with respect to a variety of matters including... representation of illegal aliens.” Due to gaping loopholes, however, taxpayer dollars continue to flow to these groups.

“The legislative effort to block this use of taxpayer funds was written specifically for the National Immigration Law Center (NILC), the first open-borders law firm in the country. The group, which also receives funding from George Soros and the Ford Foundation, has several class-action lawsuits going each challenging the Obama Administration on the issue of detaining illegal alien-minors (including one which alleges detainees were treated inhumanely by being given cold bean burritos). The firm grew out of the National Lawyers Guild, an association of public interest law firms whose parent organization the CIA once described as a Soviet front. According to its early newsletters, NILC’s primary duty is to “protect, defend, and extend the rights of documented and undocumented immigrants in the United States.” Little’s changed since.

“When NILC’s precursor, the National Immigrants’ Rights Council (NIRC), was barred from receiving LSC funds in the eighties it simply shifted its illegal alien program to a “mirror corporation.” NIRC, *Inc.*, the new “separate” organization, was allowed to share staff and office space with its grant-receiving vessel and with the help of its large foundation-backers it went on rack up several successful challenges against illegal alien detainment, including the landmark settlement in *Flores v. Reno* (1995). Today, the group still receives LSC funding.

“One of the Immigration Reform Law Institute’s current cases involves an attempt to strike down a citizens’ ballot initiative in Oregon that denied driving privileges to illegal aliens in that state. The illegal aliens’ counsel there, the Oregon Law Center, receives numerous grants from the federal government, including from the LSC. But without having proof that their private and public-funds are being commingled, there’s little we or anyone else can do.

“The Congressional Research Service has recognized this problem. On the subject of lobbying, which LSC also prohibits, they’ve pointed out that “the restrictions on lobbying with federal funds generally follow *only the funds themselves*” and don’t apply to advocacy activities paid for by “one’s own, private resources.” Groups like OLC, in other words, are allowed to spend on prohibited activities, such as illegal alien representation, if they use “private funds” instead of federal funds. This abstract separation should give taxpayers pause. Whether it be funds sourced from the government or a private entity, like the Ford Foundation, that money is fungible and interchangeable between one source and another.

Following a recent policy change in the UK which prohibited grant-funded lobbying, commentators there rightly pointed out that with regards to separating private and public funds “it would be difficult to draw a distinction between the two.” But even if non-profit law firms like OLC are properly segregating LSC funds from private funds, at the very least, the taxpayers’ support allows them to *free up* private funds to be used for lobbying, which of course has the same basic effect.”

All funds are fungible, and poorly-written laws offer the opportunity for skirting the law: Tell a kid he can’t use his allowance money for junk food, but pay him for mowing the lawn without such a restriction, and he will be able to honestly state he used none of his allowance for junk food.

In 1995, The Conservative Caucus Foundation published a landmark study of the costs to the taxpayers of the Legal Services Corporation’s lawfare for the Left in the publication, “The Real Cost of the Legal Services Corporation: A Two Trillion Dollar Bypass of Electoral Accountability?” by Howard Phillips, President The Conservative Caucus Foundation and Peter J. Ferrara, Senior Fellow, National Center for Policy Analysis.

President Clinton proposes to spend \$415 million in his budget next year for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC). But this does not begin to measure the real costs of the LSC.

That \$415 million goes to fund a legal and political crusade by left-wing lawyers and political activists to hold up middle-class taxpayers for unbounded income redistribution and welfare schemes.

From the beginning, a principal avowed purpose of the Legal Services movement has been “law reform.” That means changing the law wherever possible to suit the left-wing ideology of the Legal Services activists. The very essence of that ideology is class warfare, organizing tax-users, as a class, against taxpayers, for the purpose of taking from those who have, to give to those who don't.

This is all the more insidious because these left-wing activists can bring their cases before left-wing judges, whose avowed legal philosophy is not to rule in accordance with their personal biases.

In this and other ways, left-wing activists bypass the democratic process in enacting their ideology into law.

This also occurs when left-wing bureaucrats in Federal or state agencies settle lawsuits brought by left-wing Legal Services activists on an ideologically “sweetheart basis” creating precedents which effectively change the law in accordance with left-wing ideology.

Republican Congressional leaders should be especially concerned about such anti-democratic lawmaking, because it effectively undercuts them as the duly elected, Constitutionally authorized legislators, in favor of nonelected lawmakers who hold opposite philosophical views.

Measuring the true cost of the LSC, therefore, should be included in the impact of actual, threatened, and feared LSC-related suits and other activities, on Federal, state, and local government spending for increased welfare or other government benefits. Viewed in this way, the LSC is properly seen as a central player in our current national deficit and debt problem.

LSC grantees also carry on their left-wing crusades outside of court. For example, these tax-subsidized "public interest" law firms have conducted vigorous public campaigns trying to defeat the Proposition 13 tax limitation referendum in California in 1978, and last year, they campaigned heavily against California's Proposition 187 which sought to eliminate mandatory subsidies and benefits for illegal aliens and their relatives.

LSC grantees consider group representation, community education, grass-roots organizing, and other forms of lobbying as central to their mission, all the while opposing tax cuts and social spending reductions, while seeking to expand all welfare and income redistribution efforts without limit.

Taxpayers also receive for their LSC contribution about 200,000 divorces each year facilitated by LSC grantees.

The total financial burden imposed on American taxpayers by LSC activities during the past thirty years amounts to many hundreds of billions of dollars.

A total of more than two trillion of the Federal government's five trillion dollar debt can reasonably be ascribed to the efforts of Federally-funded legal service activists, whether by litigation, procuring of grants and contracts, grass-roots organizing, lobbying, or legislative impact.

Budget crisis or not, for a Republican Congress to pay left-wing lawyers several hundred million dollars per year to sue Federal, state and local officials before liberal activist judges, in order to accomplish the opposite of what the elected Congress is trying to do, would be the height of folly. The LSC must be zeroed out.

How can these ideological abuses be avoided?

In 1983, Richard B. Dingman, president of the Fairness Committee, testified before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, advising on one way to help restore accountability. Merely monitoring grantees for illegal and political activities was a failure even back in 1983.

“Instead of saying once we give you the money, we will watch you closely to see how you spend it; rather we will say you tell us up front whether your organization is going to engage in certain prohibited activities or not, and if it is

going to engage in these advocacy activities, then you are not eligible for Federal funds.

“That is not going to make it a pure system. It is not going to clean out all of the violators, but it will certainly put a great many people on notice that they face very stiff penalties if indeed they do engage in advocacy activities which would have to be spelled out in the law.

“There has to be a way to preempt the giving of funds to people that you know are engaged heavily in advocacy programs, rather than trying to audit them after the fact. The auditors have just told us it is not possible.”

The lessons of 1983 and 1995 continue to be valid in 2017, however the total cost of the effects of LSC’s ideological lawsuits have multiplied many times since. The conclusion must also remain the same: The LSC still must be zeroed out. President Trump agrees, and if Congress concurs, LSC will finally end its multi-trillion dollar ideological legal war against the American taxpayers.

- (1) <http://humanevents.com/2003/03/10/emspecial-reportembrten-most-outrageous-government-programs/>
- (2) Brock, David (1996). *The Seduction of Hillary Rodham*. The Free Press. ISBN 0-684-83451-0. pp. 96–97.
- (3) Calculated by usinflationcalculator.com
- (4) www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/msar.pdf
- (5) <https://blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/dueprocess/2014/07/09/1991-oral-history-interview-with-hillary-rodham-clinton-focusing-on-her-career-in-legal-services-now-available-online/>
- (6) https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/709428/nejl009_Hillary_Clinton_OH_1991.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- (7) <http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/262065/lawyers-illegals-getting-taxpayer-dollars-dale-wilcox>

Legal Services Corporation Grant Recipients (Source Wikipedia)

Every state and territory has at least one LSC grantee corporation

Alabama

Legal Services Alabama, Inc.

Alaska

Alaska Legal Services Corporation

American Samoa

Uunai Legal Services Clinic

Arizona

Community Legal Services, Inc.

Southern Arizona Legal Aid, Inc.

DNA-Peoples Legal Services, Inc. (acronym for the Navajo phrase "Dinébe'iiná Náhiina be Agha'diit'ahii" which means "attorneys who work for the economic revitalization of The People")

Arkansas

Legal Aid of Arkansas, Inc.

Center for Arkansas Legal Services, Inc.

California

California Indian Legal Services, Inc.

Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance, Inc.

Central California Legal Services

Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County

Inland Counties Legal Services, Inc.

Legal Services of Northern California, Inc.

Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc.

California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc.

Bay Area Legal Aid

Legal Aid Society of Orange County, Inc.

Colorado

Colorado Legal Services

Connecticut

Statewide Legal Services of Connecticut, Inc.

Delaware

Legal Services Corporation of Delaware, Inc.

District of Columbia

Neighborhood Legal Services Program of the District of Columbia

Florida

Community Legal Services of Mid-Florida, Inc.

Florida Rural Legal Services, Inc.

Legal Services of Greater Miami, Inc.

Legal Services of North Florida, Inc.

Bay Area Legal Services, Inc.

Three Rivers Legal Services, Inc.

Coast to Coast Legal Aid of South Florida, Inc.

Georgia

Atlanta Legal Aid Society, Inc.

Georgia Legal Services Program

Guam

Guam Legal Services Corporation

Hawaii

Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation

Legal Aid Society of Hawaii

Idaho

Idaho Legal Aid Services, Inc.

Illinois

Legal Assistance Foundation of Metropolitan Chicago

Land of Lincoln Legal Assistance Foundation, Inc.

Prairie State Legal Services, Inc.

Indiana

Indiana Legal Services, Inc.

Iowa

Iowa Legal Aid

Kansas

Kansas Legal Services, Inc.

Kentucky

Legal Aid of the Bluegrass

Legal Aid Society of Louisville

Appalachian Research and Defense Fund of

Kentucky

Kentucky Legal Aid

Louisiana

Acadiana Legal Service Corporation

Southeast Louisiana Legal Services Corporation

Maine

Pine Tree Legal Assistance, Inc.

Maryland

Legal Aid Bureau, Inc.

Massachusetts

Volunteer Lawyers Project of the Boston Bar Association

New Center for Legal Advocacy, Inc.

Merrimack Valley Legal Services, Inc.

Massachusetts Justice Project, Inc.

Michigan

Legal Services of South Central Michigan

Legal Services of Eastern Michigan

Legal Services of Northern Michigan, Inc.

Legal Aid of Western Michigan

Legal Aid and Defender Association, Inc.

Michigan Indian Legal Services, Inc.

Micronesia

Micronesian Legal Services, Inc.

Minnesota

Legal Aid Service of Northeastern

Minnesota

Central Minnesota Legal Services, Inc.

Legal Services of Northwest Minnesota Corporation

Southern Minnesota Regional Legal Services, Inc.

Anishinabe Legal Services, Inc.

Mississippi

North Mississippi Rural Legal Services, Inc.

Mississippi Center for Legal Services

Missouri

Legal Aid of Western Missouri

Legal Services of Eastern Missouri, Inc.

Mid-Missouri Legal Services Corporation

Legal Services of Southern Missouri

Montana

Montana Legal Services Association

Nebraska

Legal Aid of Nebraska

Nevada

Nevada Legal Services, Inc.

New Hampshire

Legal Advice & Referral Center, Inc.

New Jersey

Legal Services of Northwest Jersey

South Jersey Legal Services, Inc.

Northeast New Jersey Legal Services

Corporation

Essex-Newark Legal Services Project, Inc.

Ocean-Monmouth Legal Services, Inc.

Central Jersey Legal Services, Inc.

New Mexico

New Mexico Legal Aid

New York

Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York, Inc.

Neighborhood Legal Services, Inc.

Nassau/Suffolk Law Services Committee, Inc.

Legal Services NYC

Staten Island Legal Services

Legal Assistance of Western New York, Inc.

Legal Aid Society of Mid-New York, Inc.

Legal Services of the Hudson Valley

North Carolina

Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.

North Dakota

Legal Services of North Dakota

Ohio

Community Legal Aid Services, Inc.

Legal Aid Society of Greater Cincinnati

Legal Aid Society of Cleveland

The Legal Aid Society of Columbus

Ohio State Legal Services

Legal Aid of Western Ohio, Inc.

Southeastern Ohio Legal Services, Inc.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma Indian Legal Services, Inc.

Legal Aid Services of Oklahoma, Inc.

Oregon

Legal Aid Services of Oregon

Pennsylvania

Philadelphia Legal Assistance Center

Laurel Legal Services, Inc.

MidPenn Legal Services, Inc.

Neighborhood Legal Services Association

North Penn Legal Services, Inc.

Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services,
Inc.

Northwestern Legal Services

Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania

Puerto Rico

Puerto Rico Legal Services, Inc.

Community Law Office, Inc.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island Legal Services, Inc.

South Carolina

South Carolina Legal Services, Inc.

South Dakota

East River Legal Services

Dakota Plains Legal Services, Inc.

Tennessee

Legal Aid of East Tennessee

Memphis Area Legal Services, Inc.

Legal Aid Society of Middle Tennessee and
the Cumberland

West Tennessee Legal Services, Inc.

Texas

Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas

Lone Star Legal Aid

Texas RioGrande Legal Aid, Inc.

Utah

Utah Legal Services, Inc.

Vermont

Legal Services Law Line of Vermont, Inc.

Virgin Islands

Legal Services of the Virgin Islands, Inc.

Virginia

Southwest Virginia Legal Aid Society, Inc.

Legal Aid Society of Eastern Virginia

Central Virginia Legal Aid Society

Virginia Legal Aid Society, Inc.

Blue Ridge Legal Services, Inc.

Potomac Legal Aid Society, Inc.

Washington

Northwest Justice Project

West Virginia

Legal Aid of West Virginia, Inc.

Wisconsin

Legal Action of Wisconsin, Inc.

Wisconsin Judicare, Inc.

Wyoming

Wyoming Legal Services, Inc.

AGENCY REVIEW NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) was founded in 1965 with a mission “dedicated to supporting excellence in the arts, both new and established; bringing the arts to all Americans; and providing leadership in arts education.” (1)

President Trump’s budget request would zero-out NEA, however the 2017 budget deal not only included full funding for NEA, but gave the agency a slight raise, from \$148,000,000 to \$150,000,000.

Unaware citizens might imagine the agency eagerly promoting upcoming artists and skilled performers who would inspire intriguing thoughts and uplifting emotions in their audiences, however they may be disappointed by the dark reality of NEA’s preferred focus. NEA could indeed seek out the best, the most uplifting and inspirational artwork, and offer the artists greater visibility, but for decades, the agency has done too much of the opposite.

NEA has a record of seeking out and awarding taxpayer funds to blatantly left wing propaganda art and plays, even during Republican administrations.

One of the most infamous cases was Andres Serrano’s “Piss Christ.” Wikipedia concisely summed up Serrano as “an American photographer and artist who has become famous through his photos of corpses and his use of feces and bodily fluids in his work, notably his controversial work “Piss Christ.”” (2) That focus alone should be a disqualifier for any taxpayer funding of anything, yet this blasphemous and revolting piece was promoted by the NEA, the “artist” rewarded with \$20,000 in taxpayer funds, and his career was boosted by the resulting attention. (3)

The effects of promoting and funding “artists” of such offensive artwork has a secondary effect of crowding out uplifting artists. The Federal ‘seal of approval’ could help former gain easier access to important galleries and exhibits, while the latter may be relegated to minor venues if any at all, and receive little or no financial support from the private sector.

Buyers of art for the mass market might be influenced by the governmental attention and support given repulsive artwork, and might stock shelves with more of that variety than traditional or uplifting artwork. Creative and wholesome artists might even be forced to create more repulsive artwork to gain support.

Even if the agency did not promote repulsive art at the expense of the uplifting, and ignoring the unconstitutionality of the agency, NEA simply wastes hard earned taxpayers' money. Consider this from a Heritage Foundation report:

"Like any federal bureaucracy, the NEA wastes tax dollars on administrative overhead and bureaucracy. Anecdotes of other forms of NEA waste are legion. The Cato Institute's Sheldon Richman and David Boaz note that "Thanks to an NEA grantee, the American taxpayers once paid \$1,500 for a poem, 'light.' That wasn't the title or a typo. That was the entire poem." In addition to such frivolities, the Endowment diverts resources from creative activities as artists are lured from producing art to courting federal grant dollars and even attending demonstrations in Washington, D.C.

"There are other ways that the NEA wastes tax dollars: Author Alice Goldfarb Marquis estimates that approximately half of NEA funds go to organizations that lobby the government for more money. Not only has the NEA politicized art, but because federal grant dollars are fungible, they can be used for other purposes besides the support of quality art. In addition, approximately 19 percent of the NEA's total budget is spent on administrative expenses-an unusually high figure for a government program." (4)

According to a Cato report, Senator Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) successfully passed "restrictions on the kinds of art eligible for NEA subsidy.

A modified version of the Helms amendment was finally enacted; it bars the endowment from funding work that is "obscene, including but not limited to depictions of sadomasochism, homoeroticism, the sexual exploitation of children, or individuals engaged in sex acts which, when taken as a whole, do not have serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value." (5)

While this might have helped rein in the most offensive grants, any taxpayer funding of the arts will have some bias, and NEA staff may tend to favor those that match their ideological interests. Americans, not leftist radicals at NEA should decide what art they most enjoy.

Certainly there thousands of performances and concerts funded by the NEA for which taxpayers may find no ideological bent. Mozart is not Andres Serrano, after all. However, the reflexive conclusion that absent the NEA, culture would evaporate in the U.S. cannot be taken seriously.

Corporations, foundations, wealthy benefactors as well as state and local governments have and would continue to support the arts.

President Trump is correct in requesting in his budget to end NEA, and return the selection of notable art to the market, charities and private benefactors. American taxpayers should not be further insulted by their taxes being used to award the high life to the most degrading possible “artists.”

-
- (1) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Endowment_for_the_Arts
 - (2) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Andres_Serrano
 - (3) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Piss_Christ
 - (4) <http://www.heritage.org/node/20425/print-display>
 - (5) <https://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa137.pdf>

AGENCY REVIEW CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

What we know of as “public broadcasting” is comprised of three taxpayer-funded entities. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is a Federal non-profit corporation, and National Public Radio (NPR) and Public Broadcasting System (PBS) are privately-owned non-profit corporations. These entities fund 362 TV and 1,136 radio stations, and various internal and external content providers.

CPB has a 2017 budget of \$494,000,000, and is in the first year of a unique two-year funding appropriation cycle. While President Trump zero-funded CPB in his budget request, the 2017 budget deal continued CPB’s full subsidy for two years, making defunding more difficult.

Calculating the exact percentage of taxpayer subsidy in the budgets of NPR and PBS is somewhat complex, and somewhat obscured to perhaps create the impression that subsidies are essential to their existence. Propublica did the math, which reveals how easy it would be for public broadcasting to drop the shackles of taxpayer funding, and become truly independent:

“PBS draws roughly 15 percent of its revenue from the CPB. NPR’s revenue mostly comes from member station dues and fees, with 2 percent coming from CPB-issued grants. Member stations, in turn, receive about 11 percent in federal grants.

“According to this [CPB report](#) (1), most revenue to both public radio and television (about 59 percent) consists of donations from individuals, corporate underwriters and private grants, followed by state and local support (roughly 20 percent).” (2)

Interestingly, according to Wikipedia, anti-religious and anti-educational biases are hardwired in, because NPR stations may “not be designed solely to further a religious broadcasting philosophy or be used for classroom distance learning programming.” (3)

According to Wikipedia, NPR has amassed an endowment of \$258,000,000, reported revenue in 2016 from all sources of \$208,004,728, and had a net income of \$18,900,000. With both the endowment and a revenue surplus, all taxpayer subsidies might be eliminated with no effect. (4)

Regardless of the apparently high-minded goals when CPB was established, the fact remains that news, educational and entertainment media must not be funded by the taxpayers, nor should the media use taxpayers money to promote their views. (5)

With funding comes at least a degree of control. No matter how many “firewalls” and best intentions may exist, government-funded media will be inclined act to protect their funding, and may be at least somewhat sympathetic to governmental or liberal ideologies and agendas.

“Don’t Kill Big Bird”

The few times Republicans have threatened to cut or reduce taxpayer funding of CPB and therefore to NPR and PBS, the left NPR supporters trot out Big Bird to cry that the sky is falling, and children will forever lose Sesame Street and other PBS programs. The implication is that kids couldn’t possibly learn without Sesame Street and public broadcasting programming.

The truth is that Sesame Street is actually a model other public broadcasting programs should follow, because the series is very profitable, independently owned and would continue to rake in profits and viewers even if PBS closed down entirely. The independent corporation that owns the show has a deal with HBO to air its new shows, and PBS can air them only after nine months. This is a successful free enterprise model for other “public” programming.

Guaranteed and unquestioned government funding also perpetuates the twentieth century model of expensive high-wattage transmitters at a time when the public is abandoning traditional broadcasting and cable in favor of low-cost streaming services and free online channels; often on their phones rather than a conventional TV or radio.

Educational and specialty programming would not die if public broadcasting stations lost their taxpayer funding. In fact, starting with the explosion of cable programming and outlets nationwide in the 1980s, non-subsidized educational and cultural programming attracted millions on channels such as Nat Geo (National Geographic), Discovery, History, A&E and many others. The 1960s argument that absent taxpayer-subsidized programming and broadcasting, that the arts and education would cease is a false narrative.

Additionally, many colleges and even prestigious universities offer free online classes, proving that educational programming is not captive to one specific model of delivering educational programs to the public.

If the goal was only to deliver non-commercial programming to the widest possible audience, this could be better accomplished by streaming companies and free websites at a fraction of the current cost.

In truth, the existing PBS and NPR stations would be free to maintain their legacy transmitters and stations without taxpayer funding by just increasing underwriters and greater fundraising efforts or selling ads. Liberals might cringe at either advertisements or more fundraising telethons, but this would free them from any oversight of their often left-wing programming.

Duplicative Programming:

Over the decades, PBS and NPR stations have run duplicative programming within or overlapping individual markets. In the Washington, DC market alone, there are several PBS-affiliated TV stations, each of which runs some degree of identical programming. Such duplication could only occur when there is no accountability by the funding source.

No investor would invest in multiple stations in one market that offer such a degree of identical programming. From the start, CPB's oversight of grantees should have prohibited any funding of duplicative stations, and NPR would be well-advised to institute such measures if President Trump's defunding becomes law.

Does Anyone Watch or Listen?

Beyond the constitutional questions, the forced taxpayer subsidization, and the ideological agenda, is the practical question of listenership.

LA Weekly reveals that the radical leftist Pacifica radio has essentially no listeners. In just the years 2001-2005, Pacifica received \$6,637,826 in taxpayer grants. (6)

"Listenership [on Pacifica stations], according Reese, is "extraordinarily low." During an average 15-minute period, just 700 people listen to its Los Angeles station, 90.7 FM KPFK, for at least five minutes, according to Nielsen Audio, which monitors radio ratings.

“For L.A.'s other public radio stations, KCRW and KPCC, that number is 8,000 and 20,000, respectively. KPFB draws roughly one one-thousandth of all radio listeners in the Metro Los Angeles area.

“Pacifica's New York station, WBAI, is even worse off, with too few listeners to register on the Arbitron rankings, and is all but bankrupt. Last year, most of the staff was laid off, including the entire news department.

“Making matters worse, the federal government, via the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, is withholding Pacifica's grant money, thanks to the network's "failure to provide documentation" for a 2012 audit.” (7)

The good news is that CPB eventually cut off Pacifica's funding. The bad news is that it took so long. More puzzling is why the most liberal public broadcasting network can't attract an audience in the largest and most liberal cities in America. While it may feel good to see liberals waste money and time broadcasting their radical agenda to nobody, it would be far better to spare American taxpayers the possibility that Pacifica will regain a space to feed at the Federal trough.

The Washington Post showed that the core of NPR's audience has always been 1960s and 1970s liberals, and the network never really appealed to younger demographics.

“Many of the listeners who grew up with NPR are now reaching retirement age, leaving NPR with a challenge: How can it attract younger and middle-aged audiences — whose numbers are shrinking — to replace them?

“Perhaps more troubling are the broader demographic trends. NPR's signal has gradually been fading among the young. Listening among “Morning Edition's” audience, for example, has declined 20 percent among people under 55 in the past five years. Listening for “All Things Considered” has dropped about 25 percent among those in the 45-to-54 segment.

“The graying of NPR, and the declines overall, are potentially perilous to the public radio ecosystem. (federal tax dollars supply only a small part of stations' annual budgets, and virtually none of NPR's).” (9)

Partnering with Soros:

An ombudsman for NPR, Alicia C. Shepard, revealed that NPR had taken \$1,800,000 from George-Soros' Open Society Foundations. There are two problems with this. One is that if NPR has such success in fundraising from wealthy individuals and foundations, pleas of poverty demanding taxpayers to be more generous ring hollow. The other is that money from ideological organizations like those funded by George Soros rarely come without strings.

This money would not likely be used, for example, to investigate crimes caused by illegal immigrants, or how America’s cities are dying from over-taxation and over-regulation.

From Shepard’s report: “George Soros founded The Open Society Institute, which donated \$1.8 million to NPR's Impact of Government project. But the organization made a judgment last fall that taps into that credibility account. The decision was to take \$1.8 million from the Open Society Foundations. It's funded by left-leaning billionaire financier-philanthropist George Soros, who made his fortune in hedge funds and currency speculation.

“Adding to this, Soros' foundation also announced last October a \$1 million grant to Media Matters, a liberal activist group with a goal to hold Fox News (no fan of NPR) accountable. Soros has also given millions of dollars to other liberal groups, including MoveOn.org and the Center for American Progress.

“This grant was by no means the only Soros money that ended up at NPR stations. Shepard also revealed that, “On the other hand, Soros' foundations gave 34 grants from 1997 to 2010 to local NPR member stations and specific programs that have totaled nearly \$3.4-million, said the foundations' Archuleta. Recipients included WNYC and Minnesota Public Radio.” (10)

Those familiar with both George Soros’ and NPR’s political agendas would not be surprised that Soros would favor NPR with grants for certain programming, nor that NPR would accept it. Were the taxpayers not subsidizing PBS’s operations and programming, these Soros grants would still be scorned by most Americans, but that would be the end of it. Change the station if you don’t like the foreign influence. The problem arises when taxpayers are forced to subsidize the stations and programming which could include in part, foreign-influenced programming.

The taxpayers would not have to police such abuses if NPR was fully privatized.

Liberal media bias is often easy to spot, either in commission or omission. However, even PBS felt compelled to report on their own bias. Cal Thomas reported in 2005 that PBS’ own internal newspaper, “Current,” found examples of liberal bias in their news:

“Writer Louis Barbash watched the "NOW" program and found that of the 19 segments Moyers did on the Iraq war, only four included a guest or interview subject who supported it.

“It was the same with other topics on the show. According to Barbash, of the 75 segments he monitored over a six-month period that addressed controversial issues like the Iraq war, the condition of the economy and the corrupting influence of corporate money on politics, just 13 included anyone who took a view contrary to the thrust of the show.

“A 17-minute segment, accusing the Pentagon of understating U.S. troops' injuries in Iraq, offered a Defense Department spokesman 90 seconds to reply. That's unbalanced by any objective standard.” (11)

Taxpayer-subsidized “public” broadcasting is an endangered species by its aging audience and the shift by Americans from watching traditional television to streaming services and free content from the vast panoply of programming available in today’s connected world.

President Trump was correct in recommending an end to taxpayer subsidization of public broadcasting.

-
- (1) <http://www.cpb.org/stations/reports/revenue/2010PublicBroadcastingRevenue.pdf>
 - (2) <https://www.propublica.org/article/big-bird-debate-how-much-does-federal-funding-matter-to-public-broadcasting>
 - (3) <http://www.wikiwand.com/en/NPR>
 - (4) <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NPR>
 - (5) <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NPR>
 - (6) <http://www.aim.org/special-report/the-case-for-de-funding-public-broadcasting/>
 - (7) <http://www.laweekly.com/news/left-wing-darling-pacifica-radio-is-sliding-into-the-abyss-4521218>
 - (8) Nielsen research that NPR has made public
 - (9) https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/npr-is-graying-and-public-radio-is-worried-about-it/2015/11/22/0615447e-8e48-11e5-baf4-bdf37355da0c_story.html
 - (10) <http://www.npr.org/sections/ombudsman/2011/05/24/136216017/worthy-cause-controversial-funding-source>

FINANCING THE “RESISTANCE”

(11) <http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2005/jun/23/oped3/>

AGENCY REVIEW HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

At the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), as with other agencies, the radical agenda of the Left is furthered not just by grants to left wing organizations, but through contracts to left wing organizations as well.

The creation of the welfare state in the 1960s put millions into a tragic state of dependency, but far worse, HHS and its predecessor, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, spent billions in support of abortion providers under the ruse of “family planning.” The result was literally to eliminate great percentages of minority populations. Students For Life reveals the terrifying statistics for just African-Americans:

“Since 1973, abortion has reduced the black population by over 25%. Planned Parenthood operates the nation’s largest chain of abortion clinics and almost 80% of its facilities are located in minority neighborhoods. About 13% of American women are black, but they submit to over 35% of the abortions.

“While these statistics are shocking, they are embedded in the history of Planned Parenthood. Margaret Sanger, founder of Planned Parenthood, was active with the Klu Klux Klan and the eugenics movement in the beginning of the twentieth century.

“Today, Planned Parenthood is the number one provider of abortions in the United States and received over 350 million dollars in taxpayer in 2009. While they claim that they do much more than abort children, their own figures tell a different story: in 2007, they made only 5,000 adoption referrals, while aborting over 300,000 children.” (1)

Planned Parenthood and Sex Change Operations

Since FY 2008, Planned Parenthood has received \$534,456,831 in taxpayer grants and contracts, almost all from HHS. Both the president and Congress intend to defund Planned Parenthood, and to support non-abortion providers for medical care for pregnant women. (2)

While Congress has not yet passed such legislation, Law360 reports how the president signed into law H.J.Res.43 that allows states to block abortion providers from offering subsidized family planning services.

“President Donald Trump on Thursday overturned a Obama administration rule that bars states from excluding health care providers from a federal family planning program for any reason other than inadequate medical care, a rule that had been enacted to ensure continued funding for Planned Parenthood and similar organizations.” (3)

This is an important step in the right direction, although it is up to the states to actually block such funding. Zero funding for all abortion providers would be the next step.

Another area that the administration is making progress is with liberal sex education grants. HHS has, according to the Family Research Council, cancelled at least 81 such grants to date.

“With the help of former FRCers Charmaine Yoest and Teresa Manning, HHS leaders are making deep cuts in funding for the liberal sex education programs that have plagued parents for almost a decade. More than 81 "teen pregnancy prevention" programs have already been notified that their checks are already canceled or will be as soon as the fiscal year ends. "Due to changes in program priorities, it has been determined that it is in the best interest of the federal government to no longer continue [your] funding,"” (4)

Beyond giving money to advance leftist ideology, agencies can use denial of funding as another weapon to advance their battle. The Federalist reports how HHS imposed requirements to require hospitals to perform “sex change” operations or lose funding, and the Little Sisters of the Poor had to battle all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court to be able to offer health insurance without coverage of contraceptives:

“President Obama’s Department of Health and Human Services implemented a rule change to the Affordable Care Act (a.k.a. Obamacare) last week mandating that all health providers receiving taxpayer dollars must perform sex-change operations or lose their federal funding.

“The final rule states that, under Title IX, any hospital receiving funding from HHS must “treat individuals consistent with their gender identity.” The rule provides no religious exemption. In other words, religious hospitals that receive taxpayer dollars via Medicaid or Medicare will be required to perform sex-change operations or get cut off financially.

“The rule change is not the only directive from the Obama administration forcing individuals to embrace the transgender agenda. Just last week, the administration sent letters to every school district in the country mandating that they open bathrooms, locker rooms, and showers to all students, regardless of their biological sex. Meaning that under Obama’s directive, male students must be allowed to shower with female students if the former call themselves a girl.

“HHS is currently embroiled in a legal fight with The Little Sisters of the Poor, a Catholic organization that provides housing and care for the elderly poor. In accordance with their religious beliefs, they do not provide contraceptives to their female employees, which the Obama administration says violates the contraceptive mandate in Obamacare.” (5)

Head Start Helps Kids Finish Last

One of the liberal welfare-state icons, Head Start is rolled out with any hint of budget cuts as an unqualified success for access to educational day care. The facts tell a sad and different tale. The

FY 2017 Budget includes \$9,600,000,000 for Head Start, an increase of \$434,000,000 over FY 2016—an increase in a program that should instead be eliminated. (6)

Lindsey Burke of the Heritage Foundation reveals that HHS’s own study proved that kids are better off without the Federal day care program.

“After 48 years and \$180 billion in taxpayer money, the program [Head Start] has yet to demonstrate any lasting improvement in educational or social outcomes.

“The promise of Head Start is a deception propagated on America's low-income families. For nearly a half-century, poor parents have enrolled their children in what they believed was an "educational" program.

“But a recently released evaluation of Head Start, mandated by Congress, reveals the hollowness of that promise. Published by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HSS), the report reveals that Head Start failed to improve the cognitive abilities of children, their access to health care, and the parenting practices of participants.

“What's particularly alarming is that access to Head Start actually has some negative impacts on enrolled children. In addition to having little to no impact on the cognitive, social-emotional, health, or parenting practices of its participants, federal researchers reported worse peer relations and lower teacher-assessed math ability for Head Start children.

“This design (of the study) is scientifically rigorous. It allows us to say, without a shadow of a doubt, that exposure to Head Start itself results in poorer outcomes for poor children.” (7)

America’s poorest children deserve better. Head Start must be abolished, and if merely replaced, it should offer the poor funds good at any day care center of their choice.

ACORN is Back:

Following the closure of ACORN, the radical leftist activist organization that was exposed as corrupt and criminal in 2010, its staff and supporters created a variety of new organizations, and tried to get back on the taxpayer dole. Judicial Watch discovered one such spin-off group, Southern United Neighborhoods, succeeded to the tune of a \$1,300,000 HHS grant.

“Despite a 5-year-old congressional ban on federal funding for the notably corrupt Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), Judicial Watch has obtained documents that show a chunk of taxpayer money went to an affiliate serving as an Obamacare “navigator.”

“The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) violated the ACORN funding ban by awarding a Louisiana nonprofit called Southern United Neighborhoods (SUN) a \$1.3 million

Obamacare navigator grant to recruit customers for the president’s disastrous healthcare law and help them “navigate” the complicated insurance exchanges. Headquartered in New Orleans, SUN is dedicated to combating poverty, discrimination and community deterioration that keep low-income people from taking advantage of their rights and opportunities, according to its website.

“The group shares its address—and government grants—with another like-minded nonprofit called United Labor Unions Council Local 100, established by Wade Rathke, the radical left-wing community organizer that also founded ACORN. It’s not clear in the documents obtained by JW how much of the \$1.3 million HHS grant actually went to Rathke’s local, which is one of SUN’s four partner organizations, but the point remains that the group is an ACORN successor specifically prevented by federal law from receiving taxpayer dollars.

“In fact, the “crominbus” bill that funds HHS and the departments of Labor and Education contains specific language restricting any money from going to ACORN. “None of the funds made available under this or any other Act, or any prior Appropriations Act, may be provided to the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, allied organizations, or successors,” the bill says. This language is not included in the acts to fund any other government agency, though technically the law still forbids it.” (8)

Ending the welfare culture of dependency, ending taxpayer financing of abortions, ending grants to radical organizations, and letting parents care for their children as they chose would be valuable contributions to society by President Trump. Zero-funding these and other examples would be a good start.

-
- (1) <http://studentsforlife.org/planned-parenthood-and-racism/>
 - (2) <https://www.usaspending.gov/Pages/AdvancedSearch.aspx?k=%22planned%20parenthood%22>
 - (3) <https://www.law360.com/articles/913241/trump-nixes-hhs-rule-protecting-abortion-clinic-funding>
 - (4) <http://www.frc.org/updatearticle/20170719/hhs-cut-above>
 - (5) <http://thefederalist.com/2016/05/23/obama-to-religious-hospitals-perform-sex-changes-or-else/>
 - (6) <https://www.hhs.gov/about/budget/fy2017/budget-factsheet/index.html>
 - (7) <http://www.heritage.org/education/commentary/head-start-fails-poor-children>
 - (8) <http://www.judicialwatch.org/blog/2014/12/hhs-violates-acorn-funding-ban-pay-obamacare-navigators>

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The president’s conservative agenda is in danger of being defeated by the “swamp” that feeds at the trough of the taxpayers.

The president will be judged by citizens on his ability to carry out his agenda. One of his goals has been to cut wasteful and abusive funding, which can help rebuild our military and reduce the deficit.

The political groups feeding at the trough will scream as their unearned wealth is removed. Yet they will scream just as loudly against the president’s agenda whether funding is continued or increased—appeasement never works.

Progress:

The president’s budget request marks the first serious steps to defund left wing groups and to de-politicize Federal agencies. In particular, the budget would eliminate funding for the Legal Services Corporation, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, U.S. Institute for Peace, and many other agencies.

Recommendations:

Beyond these initial efforts, there is much more that the administration can accomplish. One place to start would be to defund all politically-oriented private organizations.

Another common-sense step would be to audit all Federal grantees for political activities.

Then, find new, non-political charitable organizations or non-profits to replace necessary or legally-required functions governmental responsibilities.

Issue regulations to prevent grants or contracts from being awarded to organizations with a political agenda.

Appoint a “Neutrality Czar” to investigate grants and contracts at all department and agencies for political neutrality.

ABOUT THE CONSERVATIVE CAUCUS FOUNDATION

The Conservative Caucus Foundation (TCCF) is a nonprofit research foundation (501(C)3 under the IRS code), donations to which are tax-deductible. It was founded in 1976 to provide a thoroughly constitutional and conservative view of American public policy questions.

Howard Phillips, the founder and first President of TCCF, was the pioneer in uncovering taxpayer funding of left wing groups. TCCF’s work on this issue led many other conservative groups to adopt the slogan of “Defunding the Left”. TCCF’s newsletter, *Eye on Bureaucracy*, exposed unconstitutional spending within the Federal government.

TCCF has also been involved in foreign policy and national defense issues. Arms control treaties, the Panama Canal, and the threat from Red China have been the subject of TCCF policy studies.

The First 100 Ways Project featured expert opinion on policy changes that could be taken by a U.S. president using his constitutional powers as chief executive, even if Congress was hostile to his policies.

Topics related to government reform have included term limits, congressional pay, and federal courts. TCCF has also published studies defending the electoral college.

The Constitutional Budget Project takes selected cabinet departments and examines the President’s proposed budget, line by line, to determine whether each program is constitutional. Some departments have been found to consistently spend more than 90% of their budget on unconstitutional programs.

During 2013, TCCF participated in the national discussion concerning amnesty for illegal immigrants. One study found that security measures along the Mexican border were much less effective than claimed, while another examined the Senate-passed immigration reform bill.

Donations to TCCF are fully tax deductible.

KEY TCCF STAFF

Peter Thomas, President



Peter Thomas has a long history of activity in conservative politics, and as a political appointee in Republican administrations going back to Ronald Reagan. He became President of TCCF in 2013.

Thomas was a founding board member of The Conservative Caucus and served as National Field Director from 1975-1981, seeking to establish a grass roots network in each state and congressional district. He played a key role in organizing citizen opposition to the Panama Canal Treaties, the SALT II Treaty, and the proposed Constitutional Amendment that would have given the District of Columbia voting representation in Congress.

President Reagan appointed him as the New England Regional Administrator of the General Services Administration in 1981, a position he held until 1985. Thomas returned to the Federal government in 1990, working in the Small Business Administration for two years. He gained first-hand experience with Congress as Chief of Staff to Rep. Peter Torkildsen (R-MA) from 1995-1997. He later served President George W. Bush in the Department of Agriculture, rising to the position of Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration.

Charles Orndorff, Administrative Vice President

Charles Orndorff has worked at TCCF since 1987, and also serves as Administrative Vice Chairman of The Conservative Caucus.

He was a leader in Virginia Young Americans for Freedom during the 1970's, and was a founder of the Virginia Conservative Education and Research Institute.

Orndorff has written about the US Constitution and various other topics for TCCF.

Art Harman, Director of Research and Outreach

Art Harman served with The Conservative Caucus over three decades, where he produced TCC's nationwide-distributed television program, Conservative Roundtable, directed national lobbying, media and grassroots campaigns, and advised on policy issues.

During the 113th Congress, Mr. Harman was the Legislative Director for Congressman Steve Stockman (R-TX), where he drafted legislation, and advised the Congressman on foreign policy, border security, and science and space policy. He served on the boards of directors of two non-profit organizations and currently serves as TCCF's Director of Research and Outreach, and serves on the board of directors of The Conservative Caucus.