THE CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY

910 17th Street, NW
7th Floor
Washington, DC 20006

NON-PROFIT
ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #70
WOODBRIDGE,
VA 22193

It's been a hectic few months, to say the least. On June 12, the Center posted a report on our Internet site called "War on Error: Live Pictures Taken by U.S. Spy Planes Were Freely Available on Internet." The report, by International Consortium of Investigative Journalists member Duncan Campbell, related that unmanned aerial drones flying over Bosnia and Kosovo were broadcasting live, real-time images of what they were seeing as unencrypted satellite signals. Our report, which noted that the satellite communication system made it easier for terrorists to tune in to live video of U.S. intelligence operations than to watch Disney cartoons or new-release movies, was picked up in Britain by the *Guardian* newspaper and the BBC, and on NBC here in the United States. War on Error generated more visits to our Internet site than any other single story (it didn't hurt that we also provided clips of the intercepted spy plane images that visitors could view).

On June 25, we released, in conjunction with the Center for Responsive Politics and the National Institute on Money in State Politics, the results of our State Secrets project, cataloging soft money contributions, transfers and expenditures of 235 state political party organizations.

War on Error generated more visits to our Internet site than any other single story

On July 3, the Center posted the first of 51 separate documents related to George W. Bush's turbulent tenure at Harken Energy on our Internet site, plus the complete text of the chapter profiling Bush from *The Buying of the President 2000*. The posted documents were avidly downloaded by members of the news media and the public.

On Sept. 26, we released a ranking of the disclosure laws for contributions to and expenditures by state political parties in the 50 states. We found that nearly half the states required inadequate disclosure of their political parties, making it almost impossible, in some cases, to track soft money in the states.

On Oct. 25, as a public service, we posted a database containing information culled from financial disclosure forms of candidates running for governor or attorney general in 37 states.

Oh, and on Oct. 28, we began rolling out a nearly two-year, book-length ICIJ investigation of war commerce, about which you'll be reading more soon. ■

THE PUBLIC i

AN INVESTIGATIVE REPORT OF THE CENTER FOR PUBLIC INTEGRITY

Vol. 8 • No. 3
October 2002

A MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Charles Lewis

On the morning of July 2, *New York Times* columnist Paul Krugman unexpectedly referenced our past research and perspective about President George W. Bush and Harken Energy, in the context of today's deepening crisis of confidence in American business.

The next morning, *Washington Post* White House correspondent Mike Allen wrote about an internal Securities and Exchange Commission memo from 1991 that chronicled how Bush had "repeatedly failed to file timely reports of his business interests and transactions . . . . "

He acknowledged that "The SEC memo was supplied by the Center for Public Integrity, a nonpartisan group specializing in government accountability. The group published information about Bush's transactions on its Web site during Bush's presidential campaign. . . . "

Beyond our past writing on *The Public i* and in *The Buying of the President 2000*, since July 3rd we have

continued on page 7

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

State Parties Collected Nearly $570 Million in Contributions, Soft Money Transfers in 2000

By John Dunbar, MaryJo Sylwester and Robert Moore

In the 2000 elections, Democratic and Republican state party committees raised $570 million, with 46 percent comprised of soft money transfers from national party organizations, according to an unprecedented study of party activity at the state level.

Center Executive Director Charles Lewis speaks at the press conference. Also seen are Samantha Sanchez of the National Institute on Money in State Politics and Larry Noble of the Center for Responsive Politics.

The transfers of unregulated soft money from federal party committees to their state counterparts confirm a commonly held perception that state parties are used to launder soft money and influence presidential and congressional elections in a way never envisioned nor intended by federal election law.

Of immediate concern to state parties is the fact that after the 2002 mid-term elections, those national soft money transfers will in effect be banned as a result of the passage of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act—more famil-

continued on page 3

National GOP Exchanged Soft Money for Hard in Florida

By John Dunbar

WASHINGTON—The National Republican Senatorial Committee sent more unregulated soft money to the Republican Party of Florida than to any other state party this election cycle, despite the fact there was no Senate race there this year.

The NRSC, which aids party candidates running for U.S. Senate, transferred a total of $3.2 million from its soft money account over five days to the soft money account of the Republican Party of Florida. Soon after each transfer, the Florida GOP transferred slightly lesser amounts of federally regulated hard money—$2.7 million in all—back to the NRSC in Washington. On three separate occasions, the funds moved on the same day, records show.

While Florida did not have a Senate race, the contest between Democrat Bill McBride and Gov. Jeb Bush, the Republican incumbent and brother of President George W. Bush, had national implications.

The transactions between the NRSC in Washington and the Republican Party of Florida are beneficial on both sides. Under Florida election law, direct contributions to candidates are limited, but there are no limits on soft money transfers to the state parties.

According to state records, the top recipient of the state GOP's money* is the MPGH Agency, a Falls Church, Va., political communications consulting firm that produced advertising for Jeb Bush. The firm received a little over $8 million through August, according to state campaign spending records.

Meanwhile, the NRSC was able to transfer the hard dollars from Florida to battleground states around the country. The stakes in this year's midterm election were particularly high—just one seat needed to change hands for Republicans to regain control of the Senate.

According to a Center for Public Integrity analysis, Florida's GOP received more money from the NRSC than any other state party in the first six months of 2002. The committee transferred $8,072,589 to all state GOP parties from January through June 30, the latest information available, with $3,165,750 going to Florida, or 39.2 percent of the total.

Every other state that received large transfers is host to a competitive U.S. Senate race. Second in transfers is Minnesota with $825,729 where Democratic Sen. Paul Wellstone is fighting a tough battle for re-election. Third is Oregon at $610,978, home to another tight race. Fourth is South Dakota, yet another battleground at $502,313 and rounding out the top five is Missouri at $436,947.

Critics of soft money say these types of transfers amount to a type of money laundering.

The timing leaves little doubt the transfers are related:

- On Jan. 17, 2001, the NRSC wrote two checks to the Florida state party—one for $276,000 and one for $1 million. One week later, the state party transferred $1.1 million back to Washington in hard money.
- On March 9, 2001, the NRSC transferred $406,000 to Florida. On the same day, a hard money transfer of $350,000 was sent back to Washington.
- On April 30, 2001, the NRSC transferred $240,000 in soft money to the Florida party, and $200,000 in hard money was sent back the same day.
- On June 27, 2001, the pattern changed. A total of $275,000 in hard dollars was sent north and two days later, on June 29, 2001, $343,750 in soft money was transferred to Florida.
- Finally, on Feb. 5, 2002, $900,000 in soft money went to Florida and $750,000 in hard money came back the same day.

Soft money is raised by national party committees in unlimited amounts, often from corporations and labor unions. The use of soft money is limited. It can't be spent to directly advocate the election of a candidate, but can be used to pay for so-called "issue advertising."

"Hard money is hard because it's hard to raise and it is more valuable," said Robert Biersack, who tracks soft money spending at the FEC. "In simple economic terms, if you are going to give up that hard money, you're going to get something in return."

Critics of soft money say these types of transfers amount to a type of money laundering. One former Federal Election Commission chairman deemed the practice a "money exchange." The fund shifts allow the national party committee to leverage unregulated soft money - which is easier to raise - to acquire much more valuable hard dollars, without violating election laws.

Robert Stern, president of the Center for Government Studies in California, called the example "one of the highest forms of money laundering." Stern's group is currently working on a study regarding disclosure of campaign finance information in state and federal campaigns. "This is not small potatoes," he said, referring to the large amounts that are going back and forth.

Following the Nov. 5 elections, the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, better known as McCain-Feingold or Shays-Meehan after its Senate and House sponsors, banned soft money contributions to the national parties.

While the Florida transfers are impressive in scale, the practice of trading hard dollars for soft is hardly a GOP-only activity, according to Towson Fraser, press secretary for the Republican Party of Florida.

"Transfers between national and state party committees are completely legal, we follow the law precisely, and the Democrats do it as much if not more than Republicans," Fraser told the Center.

For example, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee transferred $1.1 million to the Michigan Democratic State Central Committee through June 30, even though the Democratic incumbent, Sen. Carl Levin, is considered a shoo-in for reelection. FEC records show the party transferred $917,000 in hard dollars back to the DSCC in Washington.

"It's not like the Republicans have cornered this, Democrats do just as much as we do, but more" said Dan Allen, spokesman for the NRSC.

But at least Michigan actually *has* a Senate race this year, unlike Florida. Bob Poe, chairman of the Democratic Party of Florida said the practice is not terribly unusual, but called the Republican money exchange in Florida "blatant."

"They're able to make money on money," he said. "It's arbitrage."

The practice is not illegal because the two types of funding—hard and soft money—are segregated. State and national political parties have two main types of accounts. The hard money account is regulated by the FEC and is subject to strict federal campaign laws. The soft money account, also known as the "nonfederal" account, is subject to state laws. The NRSC sent money from its nonfederal account to Florida's nonfederal account, while Florida transferred money from its hard money account to the NRSC's hard money account.

"Why shouldn't this be illegal, and why isn't it illegal?" asked Stern. Biersack of the FEC said the only way it would be illegal is if a person made a soft money donation with the intent of it being used to trigger a hard money contribution. "If it's a contingency for the contribution in the first place, then yes, that would be illegal," he said.

While the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, which prohibits the six national party committees from raising soft money, will eliminate such transfers, there is nothing to prevent such exchanges between states, depending on state laws.

For example, Virginia, with virtually no campaign finance limits, could act as a de facto NRSC, and make the same kinds of currency exchanges with Florida and other states with lax campaign finance laws. The only difference is, such transactions will be much harder to track.

According to Florida Secretary of State records, the last NRSC transfer to the Republican Party of Florida was back on Feb. 3, more than eight months ago. But according to the state party's hard money filings with the FEC, it has continued helping senatorial candidates.

On Sept. 5, a hard money transfer of $475,000 was made to the South Dakota Republican Party. On Sept. 23, a hard money transfer of $105,000 was made to the New Mexico Republican Party. On Sept. 5, the day of the South Dakota transfer, the Republican National Committee transferred $975,000 to the Florida GOP's nonfederal account. ■

---

* *Excluding transfers to the state's federal campaign account.*

State Parties Used As a $263 Million Back Door for Soft Money

continued from page 1

iarly known as McCain-Feingold or Shays-Meehan, after its Senate and House sponsors. The act, which Congress passed and President George W. Bush signed earlier this year, bans soft money contributions at the federal level.

The year-long study of state parties' role in federal elections was conducted by the Center for Public Integrity, the Center for Responsive Politics and the National Institute on Money in State Politics.

The end result is a unique, detailed roadmap of the party money system at the state level in American politics. Records used to compile the report were collected from elections officials in every state as well the FEC.

For the study, the three groups collected campaign finance reports filed with state agencies for the 2000 election cycle by 225 Democratic and Republican committees. Some reports were electronic; more than half were available only on paper. All were standardized and entered into a database—the most comprehensive collection of state party contribution and expenditure information ever compiled.

Of the $307 million in contributions to state parties that were not federal transfers, the study shows contribution patterns that, in many ways, mirror soft money donations at the national level. State parties, like their national counterparts, collect millions from labor unions, corporations and rich individual donors, according to information gleaned from reports collected from elections offices across the country. But unlike the federal parties, a number of states limit or ban contributions from those sources.

continued on page 4

State Parties Used As a $263 Million Back Door for Soft Money

continued from page 3

Findings

Of the $570 million given to state parties in 2000, $263 million (46 percent) came from the soft money accounts of the national party committees, by far dwarfing any other category. Of those transfers, the largest amount went to state parties in critical swing states in the 2000 presidential election, like Florida, Michigan and Pennsylvania.

We collected national transfer information from the FEC due to unreliable reporting by the states. The states actually reported a much lower number, $247 million, according to our findings. For example, the Washington State Democratic Central Committee reported receiving just $705,040 in soft money from the national Democratic party committees. That figure was $6.6 million less than FEC records show. For other contribution information, the state-reported totals were used.

According to our analysis, the biggest non-federal contributions came from businesses, unions and other organizations ($120 million); followed by individual contributors ($86 million); non-national committees and candidates ($74 million) and "unknown" ($27 million).

Breaking it down still further, the top industry sector contributors were lawyers ($21 million); followed by real estate professionals ($11 million); public sector unions ($10 million); and securities and investment firms ($8 million).

Leading the list of donors is labor unions, with five of the top 10 spots. The National Education Association, through its political action committee and its affiliated teachers' unions, contributed $3.6 million for the top spot.

The study measured expenditures as well as contributions. Two states, Arkansas and North Dakota, do not require political parties to report expenditure information. Of the 48 states that did report, the tally was $552 million.

The top type of expenditure by far was transfers. State parties transfer funds from their non-federal, or soft money accounts, to their federal, hard-dollar accounts to cover expenses for federal activity, primarily issue advertising. The state parties reported transferring $204 million to their federal accounts. However, records from the FEC show this amount is millions of dollars less than what was actually transferred.

The quality of state records indicates that if, as some predict, soft money donors contribute to the state parties in the wake of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, tracking that money will be much more difficult.

Top Soft Money Donors in the 2000 Election

Contributions to federal and state party committees

American Fedn of State, County and Municipal Workers	$7,855,093
Service Employees International Union	6,643,815
AT&T	5,239,094
National Education Assn	4,543,791
Carpenters & Joiners Union	3,894,917
Intl Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	3,680,133
Philip Morris	3,565,342
Assn of Trial Lawyers of America	3,477,950
Microsoft Corp	3,186,328
Communications Workers of America	2,843,441
Steven T Kirsch*	2,769,000

** Full Disclosure: In March 2000, the Steven and Michele Kirsch Foundation gave $50,000 in general support to the Center for Public Integrity. At the time of that grant, Kirsch was not known as a major political donor.*

Squeezing the most from soft money

Soft money is generally defined as the unlimited contributions that national party committees raise from sources normally prohibited from donating to candidates by federal law. Although these contributions cannot be used to directly affect federal elections, various loopholes in the campaign finance laws have allowed the parties to get around those restrictions.

National and state party committees keep two general types of accounts—federal (hard money) and non-federal (soft money). Contributions to hard money accounts are regulated by the FEC and the amount that can be given by any single donor is limited. Contributions to soft money accounts are often unlimited and may be made by corporations and unions. Soft money is supposed to be used on state and local elections by funding so-called "party-building" initiatives like "get out the vote" drives. But since 1992, that money has been used more and more to fund controversial issue ads.

In the 2000 election, a half-billion dollars in soft money was raised by the Democratic National Committee, the Republican National Committee and the four party committees that raise money to win U.S. House and Senate races. More than half of that amount was then transferred to state parties which spent the money largely on issue advertising.

So why don't national parties buy the issue advertising themselves rather than transfer money all over the country and ask the states to do it? The short answer is, they do it to conserve their hard money.

Contrary to popular perception, there are restrictions on how soft money can be spent. The FEC requires state and federal parties to use a ratio of hard and soft money, even when funding issue advertising. If a national party committee were to buy an issue ad supporting a federal candidate, it would have to use a much higher percentage of hard money than if the state party bought the same ad.

"It was a key factor in the '96 election, which is the first time you saw it happening," said Trevor Potter, a former FEC chairman, general counsel to the McCain 2000 presidential campaign and a defender of the new campaign finance law. "There were articles then about whether this was legal—particularly when the ads were being prepared by national party people...There was focus then, but the FEC didn't go after it—didn't object to it. So I think everyone took it as part of the landscape."

Potter said this system of transfers is counter to what the rules intended. By using state parties as their proxies in buying issues ads, the national parties were able to conserve their all-important hard dollars.

"So if you could then do the activity out of the national party committee but pay for it out of the state—what is supposed to be a state and local candidate ratio—you clearly have gamed the system, successfully as it turns out."

Florida, the state that decided the presidential election in 2000, offers an excellent example of how the system works.

D.C. to Florida and back again

According to FEC records, in the 2000 presidential election, Florida state Republican and Democratic parties received $27 million in national soft money transfers from their national counterparts, more than any other state. Of the total, Democrats received $14.2 million, more than any other state committee.

Top Individual Donors to State Parties in the 2000 Election

Contributions to state party committees

Steven T. Kirsch	$2,150,000
S. Daniel Abraham	1,333,000
Bernard & Marsha Daines	1,178,000
Donald J. Carter	700,000
Stanley Fulton	565,000
James Leininger	525,000
Wayne Hogan	449,000
Vance K. Opperman	439,500
Jeffrey & Jeanne Levy-Hinte	435,000
Jay Vanadel	400,000

The Democratic party reported to the Florida Secretary of State that it paid some $15.7 million to three firms: Democratic Victory 2000 Inc. of Washington, D.C. ($5.8 million); Greer, Margolis, Mitchell, Burns & Associates, also of Washington ($5.3 million) and Morris & Carrick Inc. of New York City ($4.6 million).

Democratic Victory 2000 Inc. was incorporated in April 2000 by Carter Eskew, Robert Shrum, and Bill Knapp to craft issue ads for Democratic presidential nominee Al Gore. Among the most notable was a heavily aired ad that said Gore would fight the lobbyists in Washington and provide prescription drug coverage for senior citizens on Medicare.

Greer, Margolis, Mitchell, Burns & Associates is a firm with strong ties to the Democrats that specializes in issue-oriented advertising. The company had a high profile in the election of Bill Clinton in 1992 as well as in a number of other Democratic campaigns. Morris & Carrick is also a national media consulting firm with operations in New York and California; it too specializes in issue ads.

Normally, such expenditures are not reported to state election commissions. The FEC requires states to transfer soft money from their non-federal accounts to their federal accounts and then pay for the ads. So typically, the party will report only a transfer of funds to the state agency charged with overseeing campaign finance reporting requirements. But in Florida, the Democrats reported all expenditures, not just transfers.

In Florida, the transfers did not do the job for Gore, who lost in one of the most closely contested and controversial elections in U.S. history. But in Delaware, it was a different story.

Denise Rich and dollars for Delaware

For nearly a year leading up to the November 2000 elections, then-Delaware Gov. Thomas R. Carper, a Democrat, led incumbent U.S. Senator Bill Roth, a Republican, in polls for the race for Senate. His lead eroded in the summer of 2000, and by mid-summer, Carper was in a dead heat with Roth. Until that point, both candidates seemed to rely for the most part on hard money raised by their campaigns.

When the race tightened, the DNC and the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee began flooding the Delaware State Democratic Committee with money for party building, get out the vote drives and generic party ads. Democrats transferred a total of $4.9 million through the DNC and the DSCC to the state committee—an insignificant sum in the politics of states like neighboring New Jersey or Pennsylvania. But in Delaware, a state where

continued on page 6

State Parties Used As a $263 Million Back Door for Soft Money

continued from page 5

even the largest city does not have a commercial television station, $5 million is enough to turn an election.

Almost 70 percent of the DNC and DSCC money was raised and transferred to the Delaware Democratic committee in the final two months before the November election. And it came in from the most unusual of places.

One Democratic fundraiser—a joint fundraiser for Carper and another senatorial hopeful, Hillary Clinton—took place at the elegant Fifth Avenue apartment of Denise Rich, wife of then-fugitive financier Marc Rich. It was attended by then-President Bill Clinton.

" ... I really do believe that a lot of these decisions [about voting] are going to be made by people who never get a chance to come to dinners like this," Clinton told the crowd. "Even if they could afford to come, they wouldn't do it, because it's just not their thing. But they will vote, because they're patriotic citizens, they love our country; they want to make a good decision. But they've never had an encounter like this, and probably never will."

Clinton spoke for more than 20 minutes. It is unclear how much the fundraiser brought in for Hillary Clinton and Carper. But that night, the New Yorker, Rich, added a $15,000 check to the Delaware Democratic Committee.

Thanks in large part to the media blitz and voter mobilization paid for by soft money, Carper won the election.

But in presidential politics, the significance of soft money traveling to state parties is even greater.

The swing states

It seemed everyone with a television set tuned in to the election results on Nov. 7, 2000 to watch the bizarre tableau. National television network anchors called the race for Gore, then dramatically reversed themselves. Anchors used maps with red and blue to identify states that had been called for either Bush or Gore. Similar maps colored green might have illustrated how large the national contributions were to the states, as well.

A total of $263 million in soft money was transferred from the national parties to the state committees that election cycle. The money was fairly evenly distributed between the GOP and the Democratic Party. The DNC and the congressional campaign committees shifted $147 million to state Democratic parties. Republican committees in Washington sent $116 million to their counterparts in the states.

On election night, 2000, there were a handful of pivotal states where results were too close for the television networks to call. Among the most important states that night were Pennsylvania, Michigan, Missouri, as well as Florida. These were the so-called swing states.

Florida's share was high for another reason. In addition to the presidential race, the state was also host to a key U.S. Senate race and two competitive congressional races. The election lacked a high-profile state race like governor, but did host a couple of cabinet elections.

In all, the national parties shifted $95 million to those swing states—more than one-third of all transfers of soft money during the election cycle. Florida led the pack with $27 million, followed by Michigan ($24 million), Pennsylvania ($22 million), and Missouri ($22 million).

McCain-Feingold

When the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill, known formally as the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, goes into effect after the 2002 elections, it will eliminate the colossal loophole through which corporate, labor union and individual political donors poured a half-billion dollars in "soft money" into national party coffers in the 2000 election cycle.

The reform bill bans soft money at the national party level, limits controversial "issue ads" and raises hard money contribution limits to candidates. The bill also contains a provision that gives state party committees the opportunity to raise soft money in support of voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities that may also help federal candidates.

So where will all the money go? While many supporters of the act are convinced much of it will simply go away, cynics (or realists depending on one's point of view) are convinced donors will find new ways to give. And state parties may well be the option.

That is especially true for party committees in the 14 states that allow unlimited contributions from corporations, or in the 19 states that allow unlimited contributions from labor unions.

The jury is out on how states will cope with the loss of the $263 million in transfers from the federal parties.

"It's a total restructuring," said Bob Poe, chairman of the Florida Democratic Party. "And I don't know how we get it done by Nov. 6 in the middle of an election."

However, Poe said the law may actually create an opportunity for the states.

"I think the state parties may take a whole different role in the future." Why? "Well because ...whereas the national committee cannot accept any soft money—we can."

The year-long study was funded by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts. ■

A Message from the Executive Director

continued from page 1

been posting some of the hundreds of SEC documents about the Harken investigation on the Center's Web site, www.publicintegrity.org. And we have been interviewed by scores of U.S. and international media organizations, especially on the day of Bush's Wall Street speech on corporate responsibility. Knight-Ridder moved a profile of the Center nationwide and *Fast Company* magazine published a story about us.

What the President did as a businessman a decade ago is fair and relevant information for an informed citizenry in general—and especially with the stock market falling, dozens of companies committing fraud and speeches about corporate responsibility. With Mr. Bush, the Securities and Exchange Commission and Harken Energy mum on releasing any documents, we became the only source of internal Harken and SEC investigation documents, from a Freedom of Information Act request we filed in 1998.

Considering that the Center first disclosed Enron was Bush's top career patron back in January 2000, and that Attorney General John Ashcroft took campaign contributions from Enron executives which resulted in his immediate recusal from the criminal investigation, 2002 has been a wild and very busy year. With Center findings or perspective in roughly 1,000 news stories in the U.S. major media outlets alone, this is already the highest public profile year since the Center opened its first Washington office back in May 1990.

This summer was very special for another reason. We have had over 125 paid interns since 1990, and we said sad goodbyes to perhaps our most stellar group ever—Bernadette Cullen, Eric Marx, Gifty Boateng, Gina Bramucci, Julia Picard, Kathleen Liu, Kevin Bogardus, Miglena Mantcheva, Philip Caston, Shaun Young and Susan Schaab! Besides getting the opportunity to play on The Muckrakers softball team and the important, after-inning "seminars", they got to hear some outstanding speakers in an up close and personal way: Rich Bonin, *60 Minutes* producer; the Pulitzer Prize-winning team of Sarah Cohen, Sari Hurwitz and Scott Higham of the *Washington Post*; Judy Woodruff of CNN; Bill Kovach of the Center Advisory Board; Rep. John L. Lewis, who marched with Martin Luther King Jr., and was beaten or arrested 40 times during the civil rights struggle; ICIJ member Nate Thayer, who suffered through malaria, a land mine explosion and numerous death threats to interview Pol Pot in Cambodia; and Ted Koppel of ABC News *Nightline*.

What an amazing time to learn about democracy and seek truth, two blocks from the White House! In the shadow of the unspeakable tragedy of September 11, with the wisp of imminent war with Iraq, with more secrecy and less accountability about government policy decisions than anyone has seen in decades, during a time of the greatest distrust in Wall Street and American business perhaps since the 1930s, we all need straight information, the unfettered, un-spun truth, now more than ever.

National Journal once called us "a watchdog in the corridors of power." All I know is that one of our informal working mottos here at the Center for Public Integrity is, "Watch what they do, not what they say." The verbiage from politicos, regardless of party, has become increasingly unreliable, with each passing year. ■

THE PUBLIC i

Since opening its doors in downtown Washington in 1990, the Center has served as a mechanism through which important issues are investigated and analyzed by talented, responsible journalists, without the traditional time and space limitations.

The Center for Public Integrity
The Public i
910 17th Street, N.W.
Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 466-1300
Facsimile: (202) 466-1101

FOUNDER AND
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Charles Lewis

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Josie Goytisolo
Charles Lewis
Susan Loewenberg
Paula Madison
Charles Piller
Allen Pusey
Ben Sherwood
Marianne Szegedy-Maszak
Isabel Wilkerson

MANAGING EDITOR
Bill Allison

PRODUCTION EDITOR,
THE PUBLIC i
M. Asif Ismail

FOUNDING EDITOR,
THE PUBLIC i
Marianne Szegedy-Maszak

E-MAIL
Contact@publicintegrity.org

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR
letters@publicintegrity.org

WEB SITE
www.public-i.org

OTHER CENTER WEB SITES
www.publicintegrity.org
www.icij.org
www.animalunderworld.com
www.stateprojects.org