

**FOR SALE:
ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs in BRITAIN**



**A collaborative whitepaper by Energy and Environmental Legal Institute
with research from Taxpayers Alliance**

Executive Summary

Research directed by E&E Legal with support from the Taxpayers Alliance shines a light on how major environmental NGO lobbying campaigns are funded in the United Kingdom (U.K.) and United States (U.S.).

Key Findings:

- Our research suggests there is significant cross-over between U.S. & U.K. environmental NGO interests.
- NGOs are funded by a mix of U.K. taxpayer money – including significant grants from the European Commission - and private sources, including from American donors who are intent on changing public policy in the U.K.
- E&E Legal finds that much of this U.S. funding originates from a small number of wealthy and controversial American donors, including Fred Stanback.
- Mr. Stanback is an advocate of population control, anti-immigration laws, and other extreme views. This agenda was shared by other prominent NGO funders including David Packard.
- Fred Stanback, the Packard Foundation, and other entities, give hundreds of millions of dollars to environmental NGOs who lobby in the U.K.
- It is unclear whether NGOs are aware that they are being funded by extremist-linked financiers; or whether they have displayed wilful blindness.
- The U.K. Government and policy community is apparently unaware of the hidden interests and agenda in the U.S. that funds environmental NGOs in Britain.

Environmental NGOs are seen as protectors of the environment, and are treated as independent voices in the political and policy debate in the U.K. In recent years, their voices have become more powerful in debates on critical areas of public interest, such as energy.

Many environmental groups receive significant sums of taxpayer money including from both the U.K. and European Union (E.U.). Funding streams often run to several million pounds.

The parallels on both sides of the Atlantic are startling: American NGOs lobbying Brussels; European NGOs speaking at conferences in Washington D.C.; joint appearances at U.K. Parliamentary events. This report outlines the clear cooperation and interaction between the taxpayer-funded worlds of American and British NGOs.

The cooperation, though, is geared primarily in one direction: big American and international NGO lobbyists transplanting money and campaigning techniques from the U.S. into the U.K., to create ‘proxy’ debates on Green issues, most notably in recent years through –

- Opposing new U.K. energy sources such as the exploitation of shale gas, or the import of biomass for energy;

- Strong-arming U.K. politicians and regulators, even to the extent of breaking rules on election financing and advertising;
- Opposing infrastructure development, such as the building of nuclear power plants.
- Campaigning against individual chemicals or pesticides used by U.K. agriculture

It is worth remembering that such campaigns often imply significant negative impacts on U.K. jobs and investment in the industries they are targeting.

Who are the taxpayers' co-financiers in these efforts to change U.K. public policy and campaign against U.K. interests? Who lies behind the cuddly façade of the transatlantic NGO trade?

What we discovered is a network of ultra-rich American financiers, led by some extremely controversial figures who reportedly have ties to extremist ideology in the U.S. that advocates environmentalism as one strand of a 'preservation' ideology encompassing anti-immigration groups, and even fringe organisations advocating active population control.

The research poses many questions: do the environmental groups willingly take money from individuals linked to such extremist views? The funding in question runs to hundreds of millions of dollars: do NGOs look the other way when it comes to progressive principles, in order to fill their coffers? Or, are their governance structures so lax that they simply do not know – or do not want to know – where these large sums of money originate?

Why are the U.K. Government, E.U., and others, not aware that they are being lobbied by NGOs funded by secretive and controversial ultra-rich Americans? All of those legislative amendments, meetings, lobbying, events, suggestions and campaigns – all the times environmental groups were allowed to influence the agenda - were hiding something far more sinister. The U.K. and E.U. both provide co-financing to these NGOs: were they aware of who was driving the agenda from behind the scenes?

The U.K. and E.U. leadership, when it comes to evaluating the value of environmental NGOs as a reliable and trusted stakeholder, need to stop trusting blindly. Instead – they should follow the money.

Perhaps most importantly – now that the U.K. and E.U. are aware of the reality, will they continue to commit taxpayers' money to fund NGOs that allow themselves to be associated with such extremists?

Part One: Transatlantic NGOs

The transatlantic NGO community is big business. It is comprised of roughly two groups:

First, the major, international NGOs: the household names. These would include:

- Greenpeace
- Friends of the Earth
- WWF
- Client Earth

These NGOs often receive enormous grants from U.K. taxpayers, either through the U.K. government and its agencies, or through the European Union. Such grants and their negative impacts have been widely documented by the Taxpayers Alliance previously.

Second, the niche (often smaller) NGOs that tend to focus on a particular subject:

- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds – RSPB (Bird protection)
- Global Canopy Foundation (Tropical forests)
- Dogwood Alliance (U.S. forests)
- Marine Stewardship Council (Fisheries)
- Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (Wetlands)

Although less well-known, these NGOs would also dispense massive budgets that collectively would run into the tens of millions of dollars, including on lobbying to change laws and regulations in the U.K.

Both of these groups of environmental NGOs are seen as protectors of the environment, and are treated as independent voices in the political and policy debate in the U.K. They receive significant sums of taxpayer money – well into the tens of millions of pounds per year – and yet also are funded by hundreds of millions of dollars by unsavoury American interests with ties to controversial agendas on immigration and population control.

Part Two: Transatlantic Funding

Taxpayer funding is a consistent theme across both the larger and the more specialised international NGOs.

Taxpayers Alliance have documented¹ previously the enormous levels of taxpayers subsidy² in the U.K. and E.U. provided to NGOs, including those outlined in Part One.

However, the funding for lobbying activities in the U.K. also comes from across the Atlantic. Major U.S. and international NGOs are being bankrolled by a group of ultra-rich Americans, providing grant money through Foundations, which in some cases allows them to maintain secrecy and avoid public scrutiny.

These high net worth individuals are funding environmental groups to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars – cash which can be used to influence elections, policies, and public debate across the U.K.

A central figure is Fred Stanback, with a reported net worth in the hundreds of millions. According to media reports, Mr Stanback funnels his donations through the Foundation for the Carolinas (FFTC), a non-profit community foundation.

This appears to be a deliberate, and calculated, attempt to avoid detection of the large sums of money that Stanback is contributing to environmental groups. The FFTC is one of the largest community foundations in the U.S., and a primary method by which Stanback contributes to environmental groups. Since the FFTC administers donor-directed funds, it appears that Stanback now has control over the distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars from the FFTC. The secrecy and privacy rules of the FFTC can then be used by Fred Stanback to obscure his funding both of environmental groups, and of his other personal passions which, as outlined in Part Three, are distinctly controversial.³

Since 2014 FFTC has funded, among others –

- Southern Environmental Law Center - \$57,000,000⁴⁵
- Natural Resources Defense Council - \$25,000,000⁶⁷
- Friends of the Earth - \$6,000,000⁸
- Greenpeace - \$3,000,000⁹
- Dogwood Alliance - \$2,000,000¹⁰¹¹

¹ "New TPA Research: Taxpayer Funded Environmentalism." TaxPayers' Alliance. http://www.taxpayersalliance.com/new_tpa_research_taxpayer_funded_environmentalism.

² Mendick, Robert. "European Union funding £90m green lobbying con." The Telegraph. December 21, 2013.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/10532853/European-Union-funding-90m-green-lobbying-con.html>.

³ Michael Marsciano, "Foundation For The Carolinas chief defends donor rights and causes Response to Benjamin Chavis column" [The Charlotte Post](http://www.charlottepost.com), April 12, 2017.

⁴ Foundation for the Carolinas, [2015 IRS Form 990](https://www.foundationfortheCarolinas.org/2015-IRS-Form-990)

⁵ Foundation for the Carolinas, [2014 IRS Form 990](https://www.foundationfortheCarolinas.org/2014-IRS-Form-990)

⁶ Ibid

⁷ Ibid

⁸ Ibid

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Foundation for the Carolinas, [2015 IRS Form 990](https://www.foundationfortheCarolinas.org/2015-IRS-Form-990)

¹¹ Foundation for the Carolinas, [2014 IRS Form 990](https://www.foundationfortheCarolinas.org/2014-IRS-Form-990)

Alongside Mr. Stanback's efforts, David Packard, the founder of Hewlett-Packard, a well-known conservationist, philanthropist, and the eponymous founder of the Packard Foundation also contributed heavily to transatlantic advocacy efforts. The foundation, which has borne his name long after his death, also provides major donations to international and American NGOs that actively lobby in the U.K. Our research shows that Mr. Packard also directed his Foundation to make population control efforts the foundation's highest priority as global birth rates rose and led to, in Mr. Packard's mind, "utter chaos for humanity."¹²

Our research has shown that since 2014 the Packard Foundation has funded -

- Nature Conservancy - \$5,700,000¹³
- Marine Stewardship Council - \$1,000,000¹⁴
- Greenpeace - \$935,000¹⁵
- Natural Resources Defense Council - \$900,000¹⁶
- Birdlife International - \$700,000¹⁷
- FERN - \$200,000¹⁸
- Partnership for Policy Integrity - \$120,000¹⁹

Our research has shown that neither Greenpeace nor Friends of the Earth, nor Dogwood Alliance identifies funders on its publicly available lobbying registration form for the E.U. When lobbying elected members to change U.K. or E.U. policy it is clear that those officials & regulators would not know who was funding or directing the campaigns of these NGOs.²⁰

We believe that NGO funding from Fred Stanback, including through the FFTC, and NGO funding from the Packard Foundation goes back more than a decade for the NGOs that have mounted campaigns in the U.K. throughout that time:

- Friends of the Earth 2007-2013
- Birdlife 2006-2015
- Greenpeace 2007-2014
- Dogwood Alliance 2003-2014

¹² Anders, George. "Packard Children Focus Giving On World-Population Control." The Wall Street Journal. March 06, 1998. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB889135960465877000>.

¹³The David and Lucile Packard Foundation Form 990 – PF <https://www.packard.org/about-the-foundation/how-we-operate/investments-finance/form-990-pf/>

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Total Contributions In 2014: \$935,000

The Packard Foundation Made A \$35,000 Contribution To Greenpeace Australia Pacific Ltd. (The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, [2014 IRS Form 990](#))

The Packard Foundation Made A \$350,000 Contribution To Greenpeace Fund Inc. (The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, [2014 IRS Form 990](#))

The Packard Foundation Made A \$400,000 Contribution To Greenpeace Japan NF Building. (The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, [2014 IRS Form 990](#))

The Packard Foundation Made A \$150,000 Contribution To Greenpeace South East Asia. (The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, [2014 IRS Form 990](#))

¹⁶ The David and Lucile Packard Foundation Form 990 – PF <https://www.packard.org/about-the-foundation/how-we-operate/investments-finance/form-990-pf/>

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ EU Transparency Register: <http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/consultation/displaylobbyist.do?id=218230019195-25>

Part Three: A Hidden Agenda

Fred Stanback is a leading donor to environmental-focused issues and organisations and an heir to the Stanback headache-powder fortune.²¹ An alumnus of Duke University, Stanback sits on boards of major environmental groups and has funded environmental programmes at the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill and Catawba College, as well as an internship programme at Duke University that bears his name.²²

John Tanton is the American founder of several anti-immigration groups that advocate population control like Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), Zero Population Growth (ZPG – now Population Connection) and Center for Immigration Studies (CIS).

As stated in a memorandum published by John Tanton, Fred Stanback purchased a number of copies of *The Camp of the Saints* for \$5,000 from the American Immigration Control Foundation to be distributed to others.²³ The book has been described by the anti-racist campaign group Southern Poverty Law Center as a “favourite racist fantasy²⁴” of the Anti-Immigrant Movement in the United States.²⁵ Through Stanback’s Duke University internship programme, interns are strategically placed at both environmental and anti-immigrant organisations throughout the United States, including at the environmental organisations Greenpeace,²⁶ Dogwood Alliance,²⁷ and the Environmental Working Group²⁸; and at anti-immigration organisations Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), NumbersUSA, and Progressives for Immigration Reform (PFIR). Additionally John Tanton wrote that Stanback also vocalized his concerns that “Catholic Interests” were the primary motivation behind the *Wall Street Journal*’s opposition to immigration control.²⁹

According to memoranda and letters written by John Tanton, by the mid-1990s, Stanback had already donated more than \$500,000 to FAIR.³⁰

The Partnership for Policy Integrity (PFPI) has received grants both from Fred Stanback and, in 2014 and 2015, from The David and Lucile Packard Foundation.³¹ In 2014 the Civil Society Institute received a \$100,000 grant to characterize, quantify, and mitigate damage from forest loss and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.³² In 2015, PFPI received a grant for \$240,000 for similar activism against deforestation. As with other organisations with which Fred Stanback is only tangentially affiliated, his funding does play an active role in determining the results of studies, research, and policy positions.³³

²¹ Joseph Tanfani, “Sessions’ allies on opposition to immigration have their roots in population control efforts,” [Los Angeles Times](#), 1/10/17

²² Lisa Sorg, “Duke Removes Four Anti-Immigration Groups From Fred Stanback Internship Program,” [Indy Week](#), 4/10/13

²³ [Memo By John Tanton On Fred Stanback](#), 11/2/95

²⁴ “Racist Book, Camp of the Saints, Gains in Popularity.” Southern Poverty Law Center. <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2001/racist-book-camp-saints-gains-popularity>.

²⁵ [Memo By John Tanton On Fred Stanback](#), 11/2/95

²⁶ “Forests Campaign Intern - Greenpeace (Stanback).” Greenpeace Forests Campaign Intern. <https://nicholas.duke.edu/sites/default/files/Greenpeace-forests.pdf>.

²⁷ “Welcome Our Newest Board Member Rachel.” Dogwood Alliance. April 17, 2015. <https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/2015/04/welcome-our-newest-board-member-rachel/>.

²⁸ “Stanback Partners.” Stanback Partners | Nicholas School. <https://nicholas.duke.edu/career/for-students/stanback/partners>.

²⁹ [Memo By John Tanton On Fred Stanback](#), 11/2/95

³⁰ [Memo By John Tanton On Fred Stanback](#), 11/2/95

³¹ The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2015

³² Partnership For Policy Integrity, IRS Form 990 2014.

³³ The David And Lucile Packard Foundation, IRS Form 990, 2015

The financial connections between these extremist-linked groups and major funders like Fred Stanback indicate more than a probability that these environmental NGOs willingly received funding from the same source that funds population control and anti-immigrant groups “hate groups” on a large scale and apparently without anyone in the environmental world publicly questioning the moral or financial integrity of using the money.

It is clear from this research that Fred Stanback is a sophisticated donor who has methodically funded population control, anti-immigration and environmental groups for decades to advance what some would classify as his radical ideology. Evidence suggests he has developed a network of believers, operatives and leaders who passionately advance his radical population control agenda.

Mr. Stanback’s network of environmental and population control NGOs and lobby groups rivals the reach and money of the more famous Koch brothers’ network. Like the Kochs, Mr Stanback has conducted the initial donations and founding of the network in almost total secrecy, without significant public scrutiny.

We believe Mr. Stanback has closely and deliberately associated himself with some of the most notorious anti-immigrant and population control groups and leaders in the U.S. and around the world, from Garrett Hardin – an American ecologist and philosopher who advocated for population controls, to John Tanton – a zero population growth advocate and first chairman of FAIR, to Alan Weeden – founder of the Weeden Foundation which cautions against immigration as a threat to population control,³⁴ as well as some of the top leaders of the environmental movement like the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC)’s Derb Carter, and John Adams, the founder of the Natural Resources Defense Action Fund (NRDC).³⁵

Stanback has provided direct financial support for anti-immigrant and population control groups, as well as funneling additional millions through the FFTC. As previously highlighted, he has also provided staff support to these groups through internships he finances at Duke University’s Nicholas School of the Environment.

As our research demonstrates, the scale of Stanback’s involvement and influence in environmental circles is best illustrated by the sheer size of his funding. Stanback’s 2014 donation to FFTC of over \$397 million in “Non-Cash” contributions would (if it had been public) rank as the third-largest charitable donation anywhere that year, according to MarketWatch’s list of the 10 Largest Charitable Donations.³⁶ It appears the reason that he does not feature on the public rankings is because Stanback operates through the FFTC donor directed fund, in secret, distributing widely his funding of both environmental and population-control groups as a means of conducting international

³⁴ "Fundors of the Anti-immigrant Movement." Anti-Defamation League. <https://www.adl.org/news/article/funders-of-the-anti-immigrant-movement>.

³⁵ Adams, John H. *A Force for Nature: The Story of NRDC and Its Fight to Save Our Planet*. San Francisco, CA: Chronicle Books, 2010.

³⁶ Quentin Fottrell, "10 Biggest Charitable Donations Of 2014," MarketWatch, 12/20/14; Foundation For The Carolinas, 2014 IRS Form 990, Submitted 5/19/16

advocacy for extreme positions in an under-the-radar manner, away from public scrutiny.³⁷

Now, as environmental NGOs continue to spend millions on lobbying in the U.K., Britain has become a sort of proxy-war for Fred Stanback and others to fight public policy battles on American political controversies, including shale gas exploration, biomass energy generation, and nuclear energy development.

A key question is whether the leadership of these NGOs knew that at the same time they were requesting U.K. taxpayer funding, they were also being bankrolled with millions of dollars for U.K. lobbying actions that ultimately stemmed from the bank accounts of Mr. Stanback and his allies.

³⁷ Michael Marsciano, "Foundation For The Carolinas chief defends donor rights and causes Response to Benjamin Chavis column" *Post.*, April 12, 2017.

Taxpayers' Alliance: Taxpayer-Funded Environmental Lobbying

EU Funded Lobbying

This section of the report reveals the extent of European Union funding of environmental lobbyists over the past decade.

Evidence collected³⁸³⁹⁴⁰ supports the following key findings:

- A total of €86.5 million has been given to a range of environmental groups by the European Commission over the past 10 years.
- 34 groups have been given more than €1 million.
- The European Environmental Bureau (EEB) was the group that received the most funding from the European Commission, €8.3 million.
- Friends of the Earth has received the second most: €7.6 million
- Birdlife International has received the third most funding: €3.8 million

Many of the environmental groups are heavily reliant on EU funding:

- The European Commission provided 57 per cent of Friends of the Earth Europe's funding in 2015.⁴¹
- The European Commission provided 49 per cent of Pesticide Action Network Europe's funding in 2015.⁴²

NGOs Influencing U.K. Policymaking

Many of the organisations exposed in the report have had significant influence on U.K. public policy and deploy the resources they receive from European taxpayers to campaign against their interests.

1. Undermining the U.K.'s energy independence
Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB) & Friends of the Earth

Royal Society for Protection of Birds⁴³ (a partner organisation of Birdlife) and Friends of the Earth have conducted campaigns in the U.K. over several years in an attempt to prevent the exploration of lower-cost, home-grown gas and to prevent a nascent U.K. shale gas industry from developing:

RSPB, Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace have:

³⁸ New TPA Research: Taxpayer Funded Environmentalism." TaxPayers' Alliance. http://www.taxpayersalliance.com/new_tpa_research_taxpayer_funded_environmentalism.

³⁹ EU Taxpayer Funded Environmentalism. The TaxPayers Alliance. 5 July 2013. <https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/taxpayersalliance/pages/395/attachments/original/1417700871/tfe2013.pdf?1417700871>

⁴⁰ Mendick, Robert. "European Union funding £90m green lobbying con." The Telegraph. December 21, 2013. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/10532853/European-Union-funding-90m-green-lobbying-con.html>.

⁴¹ Transparency Register - Alphabetic list of registered organisations. <http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/consultation/displaylobbyist.do?id=9825553393-31&isListLobbyistView=true>.

⁴² Transparency Register - Alphabetic list of registered organisations. <http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/consultation/displaylobbyist.do?id=15913213485-46>

⁴³ Positions on Climate Change, Wind Farms, Biofuels & Wild Birds - RSPB." The RSPB. <https://ww2.rspb.org.uk/our-work/our-positions-and-casework/our-positions>.

- Lobbied successfully to prevent exploration for shale gas taking place in Wiltshire⁴⁴
- Worked with other NGOs, to lobby the U.K. Government⁴⁵
- Published misleading advertising to influence consumer and public opinion, and spread falsehoods about shale gas exploration⁴⁶
- Influenced the pre-election position of the U.K.'s Labour Party⁴⁷

2. Breaking U.K. Election Rules *Greenpeace & Friends of the Earth*

In conjunction with Greenpeace (which has not received funding from the European Commission), Friends of the Earth conducted major anti-shale gas campaigns spending over £100,000 supporting Parliamentary candidates.⁴⁸ Friends of the Earth were heavily fined by the Electoral Commission who found that:

“Friends of the Earth Ltd incurred at least £24,000 on spending in England. The spending was incurred on the joint activity with Greenpeace Ltd and separately on a “manifesto scorecard” published on its website. Friends of the Earth Ltd was fined £1000 and has paid the fine.”⁴⁹

To put this in context, the lobbying amounts spent by Greenpeace are several multiples of the limit imposed on MPs and candidates themselves in the final stages of the U.K. election campaign. This was an extremely well-funded and deliberate attempt to promote electoral candidates favourable to the views of Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth.⁵⁰

3. Shutting down U.K. energy sources *Friends of the Earth & Dogwood Alliance*

Dogwood Alliance, a U.S.-funded and U.S.-based environmental campaign group focused on shutting down all exports of timber products from the U.S., has worked with Friends of the Earth on a major campaign to shut down biomass plants and other related energy businesses in the U.K.^{51,52}

Dogwood Alliance has:

⁴⁴ Earth, Friends Of the. "South Western Energy pulls out of Wiltshire and Forest of Dean." Friends of the Earth. September 28, 2016. <https://www.foe.co.uk/news/south-western-energy-pulls-out-wiltshire-forest-dean>.

⁴⁵ "Shale Gas and Climate Change." The RSPB. <https://www.rspb.org.uk/our-work/our-positions-and-campaigns/positions/climatechange/action/ukenergy/fit-to-frack.aspx>.
⁴⁶ Sean Poulter for the Daily Mail. "Greenpeace fracking advert that claimed drilling for shale gas won't cut energy bills is banned by watchdog." Daily Mail Online. May 05, 2015. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3069500/Greenpeace-fracking-advert-claimed-drilling-shale-gas-won-t-cut-energy-bills-banned-watchdog.html>.

⁴⁷ "Labour vows fracking ban if it wins general election." BBC News. September 26, 2016. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-37470549>.

⁴⁸ Electoral Commission | Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth fined for breaking campaigning rules. <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/journalist/electoral-commission-media-centre/news-releases-donations/greenpeace-and-friends-of-the-earth-fined-for-breaking-campaigning-rules>.

⁴⁹ "Electoral Commission | Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth fined for breaking campaigning rules." <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/journalist/electoral-commission-media-centre/news-releases-donations/greenpeace-and-friends-of-the-earth-fined-for-breaking-campaigning-rules>.

⁵⁰ "Electoral Commission | Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth fined for breaking campaigning rules." <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a/journalist/electoral-commission-media-centre/news-releases-donations/greenpeace-and-friends-of-the-earth-fined-for-breaking-campaigning-rules>.

⁵¹ "Our Forests Aren't Fuel Update From Europe: Brussels and the UK." Dogwood Alliance. February 10, 2015. <https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/2015/02/our-forests-arent-fuel-update-from-europe-brussels-and-the-uk/>.

⁵² EUbioenergyteam. "Industry and NGOs in historic alliance over biomass concerns." EUbioenergy. June 26, 2017. <http://www.eubioenergy.com/2017/02/03/industry-and-ngos-in-historic-alliance-over-biomass-concerns/>.

- Worked closely with larger, international NGOs such as Birdlife International and Greenpeace⁵³. Birdlife Europe is scheduled to receive up to €765,998 from the European Commission in 2016 and 2017.⁵⁴
- Taken credit for an impactful lobbying campaign to influence changes to E.U. law⁵⁵ that would directly harm U.K. businesses and jobs⁵⁶
- Worked with ClientEarth, another NGO that also receives financing from U.S. billionaires, to bring legal action against the U.K. Government and others⁵⁷

As well as policy, the lobbying money funding Dogwood Alliance and others has bought an impressive PR operation, influencing U.K. media across the spectrum to publish negative stories on biomass energy and U.K. energy generation^{58,59,60,61}.

4. Preventing infrastructure development *Royal Society for the Protection of Birds & Greenpeace*

The U.K.'s desperate need for new energy infrastructure has been opposed by the international and local environmental NGOs, including those in receipt of vast sums of taxpayer funding. The end result of their campaign will likely be higher energy bills for those same taxpayers that have funded the NGO activities.

RSPB and Client Earth have:

- Launched media campaigns against planned new nuclear power stations^{62,63}
- Launched legal cases to obstruct new power stations^{64,65}
- Lobbied the U.K. Government to prevent expansion of existing infrastructure⁶⁶

The RSPB [received £27.5 million](#) in grants from U.K. taxpayers in 2015 and 2016.⁶⁷

5. Ripping off taxpayers *Pesticide Action Network*

⁵³ Electoral Commission | Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth fined for breaking campaigning rules." <https://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/i-am-a-journalist/electoral-commission-media-centre/news-releases-donations/greenpeace-and-friends-of-the-earth-fined-for-breaking-campaigning-rules>.

⁵⁴ Environment - LIFE: Funding: NGOs. <http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/funding/ngos/>.

⁵⁵ "Environmental groups launch social media blast at EC members to influence post-2020 Renewable Energy Directive." Bioenergy News. October 31, 2017.

http://www.bioenergy-news.com/display_news/11271/Environmental_groups_launch_social_media_blast_at_EC_members_to_influence_post2020_Renewable_Energy_Directive/#WBTDt-Wat3s.twitter

⁵⁶ "Danna Smith: #SOSForests presentation to EU." YouTube. November 12, 2015. https://youtu.be/NZiTE_5PO3w?t=9m40s.

⁵⁷ "Over £1bn in public funds to finance Drax's not-so-clean power conversion." ClientEarth. March 07, 2017. <https://www.clientearth.org/1bn-public-funds-finance-draxs-not-clean-power-conversion/>.

⁵⁸ Harvey, Fiona. "New regulations create fresh row over biomass power." The Guardian. August 22, 2013.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2013/aug/22/regulations-fresh-row-biomass-power>.

⁵⁹ Vaughan, Adam. "European commission approves Drax biomass subsidy." The Guardian. December 19, 2016.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/dec/19/power-station-shares-jump-ec-approves-wood-burning-subsidies-coal-switch>.

⁶⁰ "Over £1bn in public funds to finance Drax's not-so-clean power conversion." ClientEarth. March 07, 2017. <https://www.clientearth.org/1bn-public-funds-finance-draxs-not-clean-power-conversion/>.

⁶¹ "Campaigners take legal action over EU biomass review." Reuters. January 31, 2013. <http://uk.reuters.com/article/us-biomass-eu-idUKBRE9oU01320130131>.

⁶² "Hinkley: The Nuclear Power Station That Will Haunt Britain For Decades." Greenpeace UK. June 23, 2017. <http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/blog/nuclear/hinkley-nuclear-power-station-will-haunt-britain-decades-20160727>.

⁶³ "New petition: Stop Hinkley nuclear plant and spend the money on renewable instead." Greenpeace UK. June 09, 2017. <http://www.greenpeace.org.uk/blog/nuclear/new-petition-stop-hinkley-nuclear-plant-and-spend-money-renewable-instead-20160307>.

⁶⁴ Reuters. "Greenpeace and utilities launch suit against Hinkley nuclear plant." The Guardian. July 02, 2015.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/jul/02/greenpeace-utilities-launch-suit-against-hinkley-nuclear-plant>.

⁶⁵ "Hinkley Point pause a huge opportunity." ClientEarth. August 01, 2016. <https://www.clientearth.org/hinkley-point-pause-huge-opportunity/>.

⁶⁶ "All about our work at the RSPB." The RSPB. <https://www.rspb.org.uk/our-work/our-positions-and-campaigns/campaigning-for-nature/casework/details.aspx?id=tcn%3A9-402014>.

⁶⁷ "Trustees' Report and Accounts." The RSPB. <http://www.rspb.org.uk/about-the-rspb/about-us/how-we-are-run/reportaccounts.aspx>.

The Pesticide Action Network has received more than €710,000 from the European Commission over the past decade.⁶⁸⁶⁹ They are currently campaigning to ban the use of Glyphosphate, a widely used weed killer. They claim Glyphosphate is a “potentially cancer-inducing chemical.”⁷⁰ This is despite the European Chemicals Agency finding⁷¹ that:

“The available scientific evidence did not meet the criteria in the CLP Regulation to classify glyphosate for specific target organ toxicity, or as a carcinogen, as a mutagen or for reproductive toxicity.”

A ban would cost council tax payers £228 million a year,⁷² the equivalent of 11,438 adult social care workers and force farmers to adopt more mechanical and labour-intensive means to control weeds⁷³

⁶⁸EU Taxpayer Funded Environmentalism. The TaxPayers Alliance. 5 July 2013.

<https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/taxpayersalliance/pages/395/attachments/original/1417700871/tfe2013.pdf?1417700871>

⁶⁹EU Taxpayer Funded Environmentalism. The TaxPayers Alliance. 5 July 2013.

<https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/taxpayersalliance/pages/395/attachments/original/1417700871/tfe2013.pdf?1417700871>

⁷⁰“Glyphosate.” Pesticide Action Network UK. <http://www.pan-uk.org/glyphosate/>.

⁷¹“Glyphosate not classified as a carcinogen by ECHA” ECHA. <https://echa.europa.eu/-/glyphosate-not-classified-as-a-carcinogen-by-echa>.

⁷²“Ban on Common Weed Killer Could Create £228 million Council Tax Bombshell,” <http://www.amenityforum.co.uk/downloads/Press%20Releases/PressRelease080517.pdf>

⁷³“Ban on Common Weed Killer Could Create £228 million Council Tax Bombshell,” <http://www.amenityforum.co.uk/downloads/Press%20Releases/PressRelease080517.pdf>

Part Four: Direct Lobbying of Government to Pursue Partisan Agenda

In addition to changing U.K. laws through targeted campaigns, the major NGOs lobby Government through a programme of meetings with Government Ministers and Members of Parliament, paying for travel and hospitality, and hosting events with U.K. policymakers, who were seemingly unaware – through no fault of their own - of the primary funding sources behind the NGOs.

Just one NGO, Greenpeace, has conducted multiple lobbying meetings with different U.K. Government Ministers involved in environment & energy policy during a time when Mr. Stanback and the Packard Foundation were contributing funding:

- Greg Barker⁷⁴
- Ed Davey⁷⁵⁷⁶
- Amber Rudd⁷⁷⁷⁸
- Nick Hurd⁷⁹⁸⁰

It seems extremely unlikely that the Ministers were aware of U.S. funding and interests that lie behind the NGOs who requested lobbying meetings. Similar lack of transparency would have affected NGO lobbying of European Union policymakers.

Over the same time period, NGOs representing Greenpeace and other U.S.-funded groups conducted multiple lobbying meetings with Members of the European Parliament, including:

- Julie Girling MEP⁸¹
- Daniel Dalton MEP⁸²
- Jacqueline Foster MEP⁸³
- Ashley Fox MEP⁸⁴
- Anthea McIntyre MEP⁸⁵

NGOs have also paid for overseas trips for MPs and others⁸⁶

⁷⁴ "Greg Barker's meetings with external organisations: April to June 2014." Greg Barker's meetings with external organisations: April to June 2014 - GOV.UK.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/421496/greg_barker_meetings_with_external_organisations_apr_june_2014.csv/preview.

⁷⁵ "Edward Davey's meetings with external organisations: July to September 2014." Edward Davey's meetings with external organisations: July to September 2014 - GOV.UK.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/468551/Edward_Davey_-_meetings_with_external_organisations_-_July_-_Sept_2014.pdf

⁷⁶ "Edward Davey's meetings with external organisations: January to March 2015." Edward Davey's meetings with external organisations: January to March 2015 - GOV.UK.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/468536/Edward_Davey_-_meetings_with_external_organisations_-_Jan_-_Mar_2015.pdf

⁷⁷ "Amber Rudd's meetings with external organisations: October to December 2014." Amber Rudd's meetings with external organisations: October to December 2014 - GOV.UK.

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/468523/Amber_Rudd_-_Meetings_with_external_organisations_-_Oct_-_Dec_2014.pdf

⁷⁸ "DECC Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel July – September 2015" DECC Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel July – September 2015 - GOV.UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/decc-ministerial-gifts-hospitality-meetings-and-travel-jul-sep-2015>

⁷⁹ "BEIS Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel July – September 2016" BEIS Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel July – September 2016 - GOV.UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/beis-ministerial-gifts-hospitality-travel-and-meetings-july-to-september-2016>

⁸⁰ "BEIS Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel October – December 2016" BEIS Ministerial Gifts Hospitality Meetings and Travel October – December 2016 - GOV.UK.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/beis-ministerial-gifts-hospitality-travel-and-meetings-october-to-december-2016>

⁸¹ Conservative MEP Lobbying Contact Report 1st January - 30th June 2016 <http://conservativeeurope.com/Right%20to%20know/Members%20Lobbying%20Reports%20Jan-June%202016%20as%20at%2014%2010%202016.pdf>

⁸² Conservative MEP Lobbying Contact Reports 1st July – 31st December 2016 <http://conservativeeurope.com/Members%20Lobbying%20Reports%20July-Dec%202016%20finalfinal.pdf>

⁸³ Conservative MEP Lobbying Contact Report 1st January - 30th June 2016

<http://conservativeeurope.com/Right%20to%20know/Members%20Lobbying%20Reports%20Jan-June%202016%20as%20at%2014%2010%202016.pdf>

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Conservative MEP Lobbying Contact Report 1st July - 31st September 2014 <http://conservativeeurope.com/Right%20to%20know/Lobbying%20contacts%20July-Dec%202014%20complete.pdf>

⁸⁶ Parliament of the United Kingdom, Disclosure of Expenditures, Payments, and Fees <https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm/cmregmem/140616/140616.pdf>

All Ministers, MEPs and others would probably have taken at face value the environmental claims and agendas advanced by the NGOs – and were, through no fault of their own, unaware of the controversial American financiers who help to fund such lobbying efforts.

A lack of transparency from many of the NGOs means that these are merely the policy changes and influence that we know about. It is possible that this is the tip of an unknown iceberg involving lobbying on myriad other areas where data is unavailable. In theory, this could include –

- Changing U.K. local planning and/or zoning laws;
- Influence on statutory instruments and other related government business;
- Lobbying E.U. Commission officials to change policies impacting the U.K.;

However, even setting aside such likelihoods – the limited data that we have illustrates the clear impact that can be made by NGOs with a determined agenda in the U.K., and an overflowing wallet funded by interests in the U.S.

Conclusion: Questions to be answered

U.S. IRS tax documents clearly demonstrate that, the Stanback network of population control and anti-immigration activists – primarily through FFTC, and the Packard Foundation separately - have funded environmental NGOs through several hundred million dollars of grants that have materially influenced U.K. government policy and the everyday lives of U.K. taxpayers.

Our evidence suggests that Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, RSPB, Dogwood Alliance, and others have –

- Influenced U.K. and E.U. Government energy policy
- Broken U.K. election rules in an attempt to influence election outcomes
- Published false advertising to mislead consumers
- Lobbied the E.U. to undermine U.K. energy development
- Supporting the closing down of U.K. power stations
- Prevented cheap shale gas from benefitting U.K. consumers
- Opposed measures that could make the U.K. energy independent

The central criticism of the NGO campaigning in the U.K. is not that they are undertaking lobbying; it is that they are using E.U. and U.K. taxpayer funding allied to hidden millions from American financiers that often is not disclosed publicly.

First, the research from Taxpayers Alliance shows that the NGOs are funded by taxes – money provided to the NGOs to undertake lobbying, without the consent of those funding the activities. The lack of transparency and accountability – in addition to the fact that the NGO campaigns are actively lobbying *against* the best interests of many taxpayers, is a scandal. Many taxpayers would wind up with significantly higher energy bills, for example, if RSPB, Friends of the Earth, and others, were to succeed in closing down nuclear facilities, power plants, or shale gas exploration.

Second, it appears the NGOs are being funded by hidden American interests, whose motivation seems to be to use the U.K. as a proxy market to fight for controversial policy goals that Fred Stanback and others have advocated for in the U.S.

This has had significant effects in the U.K. In addition to the specific instances cited by Taxpayers Alliance, other NGOs and environmental lobbyists funded by Stanback or Packard have also conducted public policy campaigns in the U.K.

- Advertising in the U.K. conducted by Greenpeace was banned by the U.K.'s Advertising Standards Authority (A.S.A), after a tribunal ruled that the anti-shale gas claims made did not stand up to scientific scrutiny and were not

representative of the facts. The A.S.A. “concluded that the advert was misleading” and Greenpeace was ordered to refrain from repeating those claims.⁸⁷

- As well as policy and lobbying efforts, the American millions funding the anti-shale gas campaign has bought substantial PR and media efforts, to prevent shale gas development in the U.K. and to undermine the U.K.’s attempts at energy independence.⁸⁸⁸⁹⁹⁰
- Worked with the Chatham House⁹¹ think-tank, also funded by donations⁹² from the same group of individuals, to lobby for changes to U.K. policy⁹³
- Lobbying for changes to the E.U.’s Renewable Energy Directive as recently as June 2017 to change E.U. laws⁹⁴ to ban biomass in the U.K.

The infiltration of the respected Chatham House think-tank is particularly notable. Chatham House regularly features on lists of the world’s top think-tanks. That funding and personnel linked to the Packard Foundation and other NGOs were able to use the Chatham House brand to advance their partisan agenda illustrates both the scale and sophistication of the funding and strategy employed by these NGOs. Again, it is unlikely that Chatham House was aware, until now, of the controversial individuals or agendas linked to the funding.

This is happening without the knowledge of U.K. regulators and politicians; without any significant scrutiny from U.K. or U.S. media or transparency groups; without any public understanding that taxpayer money is co-financing campaigns driven by extremist U.S. interests; without the knowledge of millions of Britons who innocently support such NGOs and charities; and possibly without the knowledge of some employees and executives of these NGOs themselves.

⁸⁷ Advertising Standards Authority Committees of Advertising Practice. "Greenpeace Ltd." Greenpeace Ltd - ASA | CAP. <https://www.asa.org.uk/rulings/greenpeace-ltd-a15-291715.html>.

⁸⁸ Financial Times. <https://www.ft.com/content/09dea1e6-8af4-11e6-8cb7-e7ada1d123b1>.

⁸⁹ Wilkinson, Michael. "Greenpeace opens fracking site in Parliament Square as Cuadrilla inquiry begins." The Telegraph. February 09, 2016. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/energy/fracking/12147831/Greenpeace-opens-fracking-site-in-Parliament-Square.html>.

⁹⁰ Weaver, Matthew. "Minister says he will have final say on Lancashire fracking plan." The Guardian. November 27, 2015. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/nov/27/lancashire-fracking-shale-gas-drilling-cuadrilla-greg-clark>.

⁹¹ "Cross-party Parliamentary Briefing on Biomass." Facebook. <https://www.facebook.com/events/202326046887537/>.

⁹² "Energy, Environment and Resources Department Funding." Chatham House. <https://www.chathamhouse.org/about/structure/eeer-department/funding>.

⁹³ "Pivotal Report Details That EU Bioenergy Policy is Making Climate Impacts Worse." Dogwood Alliance. March 28, 2017. <https://www.dogwoodalliance.org/2017/02/pivotal-report-details-that-eu-bioenergy-policy-is-making-climate-impacts-worse/>.

⁹⁴ http://www.birdlife.org/sites/default/files/attachments/PolicyBriefing_Forest_Biomass_for_Energy.pdf