

Eco-Terrorism:

When Violence Becomes An Environmentalist Tactic

by John Berlau

Summary: Violence by environmental radicals has become depressingly common in the U.S. Radical eco-terrorists commit arson and corporate sabotage, and some groups have a decentralized structure that seems modeled after jihadists' diffuse networks of terrorist cells. Regrettably, mainline environmentalist groups have not taken a lead in denouncing direct-action radicals who care little about human life.

It was September 19, 2001, little more than a week after September 11th. A deeply wounded nation was in shock and on high alert. Fearful of follow-up al-Qaeda attacks, public officials rushed to secure from terrorist threats any buildings or structures that might be considered symbols of America and the West. Americans went about their business, but kept looking over their shoulders.

Still, who would think a terrorist would attack a Ronald McDonald House? These residential facilities serve the families of sick children receiving medical treatment at nearby hospitals. Although often nondescript in appearance, they provide temporary home-like settings for those who anxiously wait to learn the fate of their kids. Ronald McDonald Houses are financially supported by the McDonald's Corporation and local owners of franchised McDonald's restaurants. There are over 240 around the world.

But on that September morning, parents, their children, and employees at a Ronald McDonald House in Tucson, Arizona came upon a frightening sight. The four-foot statue



A man demonstrates tree-spiking (above): eco-terrorists drive spikes deep into trees in order to injure loggers and thereby deter lumber companies from harvesting forests.

of Ronald McDonald, a welcoming face for children, was vandalized. Swastikas and obscenities swirled around Ronald from his face to his feet.

With the attacks on Manhattan's Twin Towers and the Pentagon in mind, the staff at the House was frightened, in part because some McDonald's restaurants had already been targets of arson by eco-terrorists. "I became concerned because of the arson and the fact that we've got a full house right now," executive director Mary Kay Dinsmore told the Arizona Daily Star.

Near a swastika on Ronald's face there appeared sets of three letters that were all too

familiar to investigators of domestic terrorism: ELF and ALF.

Bad Elfs

The Earth Liberation Front and its sister organization, the Animal Liberation Front, are the nation's "number-one domestic terrorism threat," according to FBI deputy as-

February 2007

CONTENTS

Eco-Terrorism

Page 1

Briefly Noted

Page 6

Organization Trends

sistant director John Lewis. The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee estimates that ELF and ALF have caused more than \$110 million in damage. And the acts these groups commit are growing ever more sophisticated, leaving no doubt that eco-terrorism can be as destructive as the terrorism of any other group. As the Christian Science Monitor reports, "somewhere along the way, vandalizing log trucks and 'liberating' labrats escalated into firebombs, plots to blow up electrical towers and dams, code names, and anonymous communiqués boasting of destroying millions of dollars in property."

As of press time, members of an ELF cell called "The Family" were under indictment, accused of using "vegan jello," a napalm-like substance made of soap and petroleum, and homemade time-delayed fire-setting devices to blow up a ski resort in Vail, Colorado, in 1998. When the eco-bomb detonated, eight buildings were left in cinders. The loss was estimated at \$12 million. "When the timers went off, the entire mountain would go up in smoke," reports Vanessa Grigoriadis in Rolling Stone.

The eleven members of The Family (a twelfth committed suicide in police custody) also stand accused of destroying animal research

facilities, biotech labs, forest ranger stations, a meatpacking plant, and three timber company headquarters. The U.S. Justice Department has presented mountains of evidence—including some 35 compact discs of recorded conversations—in a 65-count indictment against them. Several members of The Family have entered guilty pleas.

The Family, many of whose members are connected to "mainstream" environmentalism, has shattered other perceptions of eco-terrorism as well. As Grigoriadis writes in Rolling Stone, a magazine not exactly known as hostile to the green movement, "It's long been assumed that those who counted themselves members of the ELF . . . were angry suburban boys in their late teens or early twenties who worked in small cells, performing one or two misdeeds and then disbanding. In fact, nearly every member of the Family was an adult committed to environmental activism."

ELF, an offshoot of the group Earth First!, has claimed it always makes sure people are not in the way when it commits violent acts against property. One set of its guidelines claims that members "take all necessary precautions against harming any animal—human and nonhuman."

But other statements made by ELF, ALF and their intermediaries indicate they are willing to countenance physical harm. The North American Animal Liberation Press Office, which acts as a spokesman for ALF, has said that "an animal liberationist shooting a vivisector dead on his doorstep," is an appropriate activity for a "revolutionary cell." ALF defines "vivisector" as anyone who engages in medical research. The Press Office lauded what it called "extensional self-defense," a term, it explained, that means "humans who stand up for animals and stop their suffering, using, in the words of Malcolm X, 'any means necessary.'"

Similarly, according to Rolling Stone, a press release announced ELF's responsibility for setting fire to a Pennsylvania laboratory in 2002. It said: "[W]here it is necessary we will no longer hesitate to pick up the gun to implement justice and provide the needed protection for our planet that decades of legal battles, pleading, protest and economic sabotage have failed so drastically to achieve. The

diverse efforts of this revolutionary force cannot be contained, and will only continue to intensify as we are brought face to face with the oppressor in inevitable, violent confrontation."

So far, no one has been killed in the attacks ALF and ELF have claimed credit for, but not for lack of trying, as the FBI seems to realize. And Tom Randall, a conservative environmental consultant, thinks the groups may have more direct casualties on their hands than they let on: "My suspicion is if they did kill someone, they wouldn't take credit for it." So while there may have been fatal fires set by ELF members, the national leaders wouldn't take credit for them, leading the public to think the groups are nonviolent.

But that couldn't be further from the truth. ALF and ELF know full well when they set timing devices that research scientists can work anytime during the day, Randall says. And he knows of research scientists who have received life-threatening phone calls.

Extremism In The Defense of Tufted Titmice Is No Vice

Eco-terrorist activity indirectly kills thousands more people, among them the most vulnerable members of our society. People with debilitating diseases depend on animal research and on amazing biotechnology innovations such as gene-splicing, which environmentalists criticize as "unnatural." In the third world, food derived from biotechnology can be fortified with special ingredients to make sure poor children get the nutrients they need. When terrorist acts or threats delay or curtail life-saving research, the real casualties are the sick and the poor who depend on the ability of scientists to do their work.

Susan Paris, president of Americans for Medical Progress, which represents scientific researchers, has detailed the human costs of this type of terrorism: "Because of terrorist acts by animal activists . . . crucial research projects have been delayed or scrapped. More and more of the scarce dollars available to research are spent on heightened security and higher insurance rates. Promising young scientists are rejecting careers in research. Top-notch researchers are getting out of the field."

Editor: Matthew Vadum

Publisher: Terrence Scanlon

Organization Trends

is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization, classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity.

Address:

1513 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1480

Phone: (202) 483-6900

Long-Distance: (800) 459-3950

E-mail Address:

mvadum@capitalresearch.org

Web Site:

<http://www.capitalresearch.org>

Organization Trends welcomes letters to the editor.

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

The good news is that people from diverse fields—fields vital to public health and our standard of living—have recognized the threat of eco-terrorism and are coming together to fight it. In Pennsylvania, the state legislature passed a bill toughening penalties for the use or threat of force against facilities involved with animals, plants, and natural resources.

As one news report noted, “The coalition supporting the legislation includes industries, academic institutions and professional associations that ordinarily have little in common.” Supporters included the Pennsylvania Farm Bureau, the Pennsylvania Forestry Association, pharmaceutical firms, biotech entrepreneurs, and the academic institutions of Pennsylvania State University, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania’s bill against eco-terrorism was passed in April 2006 by the Republican-controlled General Assembly and signed by Democratic governor Ed Rendell. “Destroying property, intimidating Pennsylvania residents, or illegally confiscating animals as a way of political protest will not be tolerated in Pennsylvania,” Rendell said upon signing the measure into law.

Rendell emphasized that he and the legislature worked hard to ensure that the bill did not infringe on the right to protest, and that it did not punish mere acts of civil disobedience such as trespassing. “If this legislation imposed additional penalties on persons who were only engaged in peaceful protest that did not involve property damage, I would have vetoed the bill,” he remarked. Instead, he noted, the legislation only targets acts “against property with the specific intent to intimidate.” Rendell concluded that this “type of conduct cannot be countenanced in any free society,” and—in an encouraging example of bipartisanship for the common good—put his signature to the bill.

Eco-Ties That Bind

Unfortunately, the eco-terrorists have a lot of people in their corner too, even if they’re not direct supporters. One would think, for instance, that mainline environmental groups would be the first to want to throw the book at those committing violent acts in the name of protecting the environment, for fear that

the whole environmental movement would be tarnished. Yet the Pennsylvania chapter of the Sierra Club has staunchly opposed any bill that would stiffen punishments for eco-terrorism. One of the group’s lobbyists told a reporter that even though the Sierra Club “bars its own members from engaging in civil disobedience and blockading or trespassing on property...there is concern about the bill’s impact on other environmental groups.” Concern over the impact of a bill on groups that resort to violence and destruction of property?

Indeed, some mainline environmental leaders have publicly said that eco-terrorism is



strategically useful because it enables the green movement to pursue a good-cop, bad-cop approach to getting what it wants. The late David Brower, longtime head of the Sierra Club and founder of other groups, put it this way to the radical green magazine *E* in 1990:

“The Sierra Club made the Nature Conservancy look reasonable. Then I founded Friends of the Earth to make the Sierra Club look reasonable. Then I founded Earth Island Institute to make Friends of the Earth look reasonable. Earth First! now makes us look reasonable. We’re still waiting for someone to come along and make Earth First! look reasonable.”

As an organization, Earth First! has little formal structure. One website declares that

the group is “a priority, not an organization.” Although the group is not incorporated and does not appear to file reports with the Internal Revenue Service, the website of the publication, the *Earth First! Journal*, urges supporters to send financial contributions to the Earth First! Direct Action Fund in Canyon, California. Another site states that the fund “has no fancy office, no professional staff, and to avoid cumbersome and restricting regulations against free speech, no non-profit status. This way, our meager resources can be put where they will do the most good—on the frontlines to defend the wild.”

Earth First! might have at least one foundation funding it. The Zzyzx Foundation gave a \$4,500 grant in 2000 to the Trees Foundation for the “Earth First redwoods fund,” according to the FoundationSearch philanthropy database. Zzyzx has also given to the direct action group, the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society.

The EarthFirst.org website acknowledges the group’s reverence for “Deep Ecology, the spiritual and visceral recognition of the intrinsic, sacred value of every living thing.” (For more on Deep Ecology, see “Deep Ecology, Depthless Thinking: How the Foundation for Deep Ecology supports radical environmentalists,” by Philip J. Maslar and David Hogberg, *Foundation Watch*, October 2005) The website also offers would-be eco-terrorists a primer on how to “instigate actions and spread the word on what needs to be done to protect the Earth.”

Collateral Damage

The close links between Earth First! founder Dave Foreman and prominent greens is a chilling example of how important eco-terrorism is to the environmental movement. Foreman has in fact moved with ease back and forth from top-level environmental policy-making jobs to advocacy of the form of eco-terrorism called “monkeywrenching.”

Foreman, who took a job at a regional chapter of Wilderness Society in the early 1970s, was its Washington representative by the end of the decade. But he lost his patience with politics and decided direct force would be more effective. In the early 1980s, Foreman co-founded Earth First!, whose slogan was “No compromise in defense of Mother Earth.” Then in 1985, Foreman published a 350-page

Organization Trends

how-to guide to eco-sabotage. It was entitled *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*.

Foreman's book gave its readers useful instructions on how to down power lines, disable heavy equipment, vandalize billboards, and most infamously, "spike" trees. Tree-spikeing involves driving a metal rod as deeply as possible into trees that might be logged. "Spike a few trees now and then whenever you enter an area," reads the book's dust jacket.

And readers did.

One man who found out all about tree-spikeing was George Alexander. He was a 23-year-old sawmill worker for the Louisiana-Pacific Corp., a building materials company. In 1987, Alexander was cutting a section of a redwood log with a saw when all of a sudden the saw hit a metal rod that had been placed there. According to the San Francisco Chronicle, Alexander then "incurred severe face lacerations, cuts on both jugular veins and the loss of upper and lower front teeth." As Neil Hrab would later write in a report for the Capital Research Center, "Dave Foreman's response was chilling." Foreman told the Chronicle:

"It is unfortunate this worker was injured and I wish him the best. But the real destruction and injury is being perpetrated by Louisiana-Pacific and the forest service in liquidating old-growth forests." ("Greenpeace, Earth First!, PETA: Radical Fringe Tactics Move Toward Center Stage," by Neil Hrab, *Organization Trends*, March 2004)

As consultant Randall points out, it's hard to know how many people have been physically harmed or killed by eco-terrorism, because groups will never take credit for incidents in which those injuries occur. In his 1991 memoir, *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*, Foreman tried to further distance Earth First! and ultimately himself from Alexander's injury. He said it didn't look like an Earth First! sabotage because the "spiked tree was not an old-growth redwood from a sale in a pristine area." He then tried to blame Louisiana-Pacific, because the company may not have put its wood through a metal detector to check for spikes!

Foreman said tree-spikeers should minimize the chances for harm to workers by warning companies through various methods. Yet he

still defended the practice of spikeing, even while acknowledging it could lead to more injuries like those of Alexander. "Safety is a relative concept; nothing in life is entirely safe," Foreman wrote. "The record shows, however, that tree spikeing is one of the least dangers a logger faces."

If Foreman's was a lone voice on the fringe of the environmental movement—shunned by movement leaders—there would be less cause for concern. Instead, what is most alarming about Foreman's book is its back cover. There, even after the injuries of George Alexander had been widely reported, Foreman is warmly embraced by some of the nation's leading environmental thinkers.

Bill McKibben calls Foreman "one of the towering figures, the mighty sequoias of American conservation." McKibben writes widely on environmental issues and is author of the preface to Bill Moyers's new book, *Welcome to Doomsday*. James Lovelock, developer of the "Gaia hypothesis" widely cited by greens, writes that "Dave Foreman is one who truly understands that the Earth must come first." And Kirkpatrick Sale, author of many highly-praised political and environmental tracts, gushes that "if anything is to save this imperiled Earth, it is the kind of biocentric ecological vision [Foreman] here puts so clearly and forcefully."

No, the authors do not expressly support tree-spikeing and Foreman's other recommended "monkeywrenching" activities. But their words of praise do have the effect of condoning the activities Foreman recommends. And they show just how little separates eco-terrorism from environmentalism's "mainstream," McKibben, Sale, and Lovelock—the writers who praised Foreman—are themselves regularly praised by former U.S. Vice President Al Gore, today's most high-profile global warming alarmist.

Foreman has gone back to formulating environmental policy. As a founder of the Wildlands Project, Foreman proposes setting aside vast swaths of land, repopulating it with large predators such as wolves, mountain lions, and grizzly bears, and surrounding these areas by "buffer zones" in which human activity is severely restricted. The Wildlands Project has an extensive board of academic advisers and its proponents like to claim credit for the success of community land-use planning that has set aside land tracts as wilderness preserves. In 2005 a bill misnamed the Rockies Prosperity Act was introduced by Representatives Chris Shays (a Republi-

can from Connecticut) and Carolyn Maloney (a Democrat from New York) and garnered 177 co-sponsors. Had it been enacted, the bill would have banned recreational activities as well as mining and logging 23 million acres of federal lands set aside as wilderness area. So the next time you see a cougar in your yard, Foreman may be the guy you want to thank. He has since left the Wildlands Project and is promoting the same ideas at the Rewilding Institute.

The Rewilding Institute is part of North American Wilderness Recovery, a tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organization, according to the guidestar.org database. In tax year 2004, NAWR reported to the IRS that it had received \$48,614 in contributions and had net assets of just \$5,817 as of the end of the year. As chairman, Foreman received \$62,509 in wages and deferred compensation, according to the group's tax return. Little grant information is available, but the FoundationSearch database reported that the Linnemann Family Foundation awarded \$10,000 to the group in 2003.

The Wildlands Project is a division of the Wild Earth Society Inc., a tax-exempt 501(c)(3) organization, according to the guidestar.org database. In tax year 2005, Wild Earth reported to the IRS that it had received \$655,093 in contributions and ended the year with net assets of \$38,252. Executive Director Margo McKnight received \$36,000 in salary. According to FoundationSearch, the group has received grants from a wide variety of foundations including the MWC Foundation (at least \$125,000 since 2000), Town Creek Foundation Inc. (at least \$115,000 since 2001), Linnemann Family Foundation (at least \$20,000 since 2001), Foundation for Deep Ecology (at least \$205,000 since 2000), and the Weeden Foundation (at least \$60,000 since 2001). Foreman was elected to the board of the Sierra Club in the mid-1990s and stayed there until 1997. That should be enough to persuade anyone who doubts that the radical and the mainstream are getting way too close for comfort.

Eco-Misanthropy

During his Earth First! days, Foreman had one now-famous fan. Theodore Kaczynski, also known as the Unabomber, mailed dozens of letter bombs to people he intended to kill. Kaczynski did kill three people and he

wounded 28 others before he was arrested and found guilty in the late 1990s and sentenced to life in prison.

Kaczynski led a solitary existence, but he was never exactly alone. FBI agents discovered several volumes of the Earth First! Journal when they raided his cabin. They also found an issue of the publication Live Wild or Die, which was reportedly financed by Mike Roselle, an Earth First! co-founder. It featured a "hit list" of individuals and corporations considered most destructive to the environment. You will search in vain through the mainstream media for mention of the connection between Earth First! and the Unabomber's actions. In fact, there is precious little media questioning of mainline environmental groups whose strident rhetoric may be spurring the spike in eco-terrorism.

Contrast the media response to eco-terrorism with its analysis of the terrorism of Timothy McVeigh. When McVeigh blew up a federal building in Oklahoma City in 1995, pundits rushed in to blame any radio talk show host who had harsh words for big government. Richard Lacayo of Time magazine infamously called conservative talk radio hosts "an unindicted co-conspirator" in McVeigh's bombing even though it was clear that McVeigh was influenced primarily by the white supremacy movement.

Of course, those who use strong words are not the same as those who commit violent acts. I am a strong believer in the First Amendment and oppose any restrictions on the freedom of expression, excepting only Justice Holmes's example of falsely shouting "fire" in a crowded theater and speech that directly incites rioting. Strong debate is essential to a free society.

Nevertheless, actions are always preceded by beliefs, and no belief exists in a vacuum. We must expose demagogic speech and false information that encourages violence and terrorism. The anti-government rhetoric that some say led to the bombing in Oklahoma pales in comparison to the vitriolic attacks on those who disagree with environmentalists. Here is a sampling:

In fundraising material for the Natural Resources Defense Council, Robert F. Kennedy Jr. proclaims, "The Bush administration is

quietly putting radical new policies in place that will let its corporate allies poison our air, foul our water and devastate our wildlands for decades to come." Casting his opponents as "evil," Defenders of Wildlife president Rodger Schlickeisen writes, "The evil special interests are still actively trying to cut major loopholes in the Endangered Species Act." Al Gore said in April 2006, "We have been blind to the fact that the human species is now having a crushing impact on the ecological system of the planet."

Anti-human statements like Gore's are actually the most poisonous kind of environmental rhetoric. Statements about the evil of humanity in general are ultimately more destructive than any verbal attacks on individual humans, such as George W. Bush and Dick Cheney. And this is what binds eco-terrorism advocates like Foreman to "mainstream" environmentalists like Stanford biologist Paul Ehrlich, whose book, *The Population Bomb*, has prompted claims that overpopulation is making the earth uninhabitable.

In *Confessions of an Eco-Warrior*, Foreman repeatedly refers to what he calls the "humanpox" plague of too many people. He praises Thomas Malthus, whose hypothesis that human population growth will exhaust natural resources is central to the modern population control movement. But Foreman writes that even if Malthus were wrong, there are still too many humans: "Even if inequitable distribution could be solved, six billion human beings converting the natural world to material goods and human food would devastate natural diversity."

Ehrlich says much the same thing on the website of the Wildlands Project, which was founded by Foreman. Although most of his doomsaying predictions have been proven wrong, Ehrlich continues to speak of limiting human population and development as "the only realistic strategy for enduring the extinction crisis."

Foreman and Ehrlich are Malthusians with a twist. They may no longer believe that humans will starve themselves by exhausting all resources, but that's not really important to them. They think humans roam on too much habitat that should belong exclusively to plants and wildlife. That's why environ-

mental groups continue to push population control measures, even as economists and demographers insist that we have an underpopulation problem. For environmentalists, there will always be too many people and too few species!

As long as environmentalists see humans as the enemy, eco-terrorism against human beings by radical elements will continue. This should cause people marching under the umbrella of the environmentalist movement to rethink their premises. It should also be cause for the general public, who are rightly concerned about wildlife and public health, to be skeptical of modern environmentalism.

John Berlau is the director of the Center for Entrepreneurship at the Competitive Enterprise Institute and a former staff writer for Insight and Investor's Business Daily.

OT

(This article is adapted from John Berlau's new book, *Eco-Freaks: Environmentalism Is Hazardous to Your Health*, published in late 2006 by Nelson Current. Excerpts from the book are reprinted in the body of the article with the permission of the publisher.)

**Please remember Capital
Research Center in your
will and estate planning. Thank
you for your support.**
Terrence Scanlon, President



**ORGANIZATION
WATCH**

Capital Research Center's
next online radio show airs
February 13, 3:05 p.m.
(Eastern time)
at <http://www.righttalk.com>
(replays follow at 5 minutes past the hour
for the following 23 hours)

BrieflyNoted

We told you so. A series of mishaps at **BP**—including a Texas refinery explosion that killed 15 workers, oil pipeline spills in Alaska, and alleged U.S. market manipulation—has led BP president **John Browne** to resign (effective July 2007). Lord Browne led the rebranding of the company, launching its controversial “Beyond Petroleum” campaign to fool the public into believing BP was an alternative-energy company instead of an oil company. It has invested \$8 billion in alternative fuels development while cutting costs at refineries. On January 16 an independent panel found the cuts undermined BP’s maintenance programs. **Capital Research Center** President **Terrence Scanlon** chastised BP in a Washington Times op-ed last year for contributing to environmental advocacy groups instead of maintaining its Alaska pipelines.

House Speaker **Nancy Pelosi** is shaking up Congress with her plan to create a special committee on global warming. The move seems certain to anger House Energy Committee czar, **John Dingell**, Detroit’s defender of the internal combustion engine.

The **National Council of Churches** is becoming beholden to left-wing secular groups that have “very little demonstrated interest in religion beyond recruiting faith communities to support their favored social and political causes,” said the **Institute on Religion and Democracy**. NCC donors in 2004 and 2005 included the **Sierra Club**, **Ford Foundation**, **United Nations Foundation**, and **Connect US Network**, a spinoff of **George Soros’s Open Society Institute**, the Washington Times reported January 11.

Former GOP Senator **Rick Santorum** has become a senior fellow at the **Ethics and Public Policy Center** in Washington, D.C. Santorum will head a program on “America’s Enemies,” focusing on identifying threats to America by anti-Western forces.

To fight terrorism, the **IRS** is allowing federal agencies to tap its databases, which include tax returns for nonprofits and charities, the Los Angeles Times reported. The “Reveal” data-mining program uses powerful software that enables investigators to analyze massive quantities of data quickly and identify patterns of activity that are difficult to spot when focusing on individual returns.

Yum Brands, which owns **Kentucky Fried Chicken**, offered \$1 million for a site in Norfolk, Virginia, not knowing the identity of its owner, the **People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) Foundation**. PETA said it would give the company the property for free if KFC adopted new chicken treatment guidelines. Yum refused, the New York Times reported. “We don’t do business with corporate terrorists and, therefore, we no longer have any interest in this property,” a KFC spokeswoman said.

Dell Computers plans a “Plant a Tree for Me” program that asks customers to give \$2 for each notebook computer they purchase and \$6 for each desktop computer. The money would go to the **Conservation Fund** and the **Carbonfund**, which promote the reduction or offsetting of carbon emissions.

Eyebrows were raised when Representative **Alan Mollohan** was named the new chairman of the House appropriations panel on the Justice Department’s budget. Critics note the West Virginia Democrat is under DOJ investigation regarding \$200 million in federal money he directed to nonprofits in his congressional district. Some of the organizations were headed by his campaign donors. Mollohan quit a House ethics panel last year and has recused himself from working on DOJ’s budget in his new assignment.

Al Gore’s eco-horror movie, *An Inconvenient Truth*, hasn’t been well received in the nation’s classrooms. Even though the film’s producer, liberal Hollywood activist **Laurie David**, offered 50,000 free copies to the **National Science Teachers Association**, the group refused to distribute it to teachers. NSTA said David had demanded it endorse the film, which it refused to do. One Washington state school board put conditions on showing the movie in its classrooms, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer reported January 11. Teachers who show the movie have to ensure that a “credible, legitimate opposing view will be presented,” and obtain the approval of senior local education officials, according to the new school board policy.

Fourteen members of the **Carter Center’s** advisory board quit to protest former President **Jimmy Carter’s** new Israel-bashing book, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid*. Citing Carter’s “strident and uncompromising position” on the Israel-Palestine conflict, the board members wrote in a letter to Carter, “It seems that you have turned to a world of advocacy, including even malicious advocacy,” the Wall Street Journal reported. **Steve Berman**, a board member who quit, said “the book was not steeped in fact.”

A federal grand jury in New York has indicted **Benon Sevan**, former head of the U.N.’s \$64 billion oil-for-food program, accusing him of accepting \$160,000 in bribes. Also indicted was **Fred Nadler**, a brother-in-law of former U.N. Secretary General **Boutros Boutros-Ghali**. Both men are reportedly living abroad, and the **Bush** administration intends to seek their extradition. The U.N. was criticized last year after announcing that it would not release a financial disclosure form filed by then-Secretary General **Kofi Annan** following reports that his son and other U.N. officials were involved in the oil-for-food scandal.