

America At War: The Enemy Within

Radical Left Uses Anti-War Movement to Wage War on America

By John J. Tierney

Summary: With the swift air and ground war against Iraq now history, the U.S.-led war against international terrorism moves forward with renewed momentum. But the Iraqi campaign also has spurred on the anti-war movement, which began taking shape after 9/11. We should expect anti-war protests to accelerate rather than diminish in the months ahead. Here are the principal radical groups organizing protests against U.S. security policy.

Unlike hostile regimes, professional anti-war protesters do not lie low after the American military successfully demonstrates how to use force to depose a tyrant. If anything, the tanks, artillery and airpower directed against Saddam Hussein have only enflamed protesters' outrage and encouraged more activism. A statement issued for an April 12, 2003 demonstration by ANSWER, the largest umbrella protest group, is defiant on this point:

It would be the most tragic and wasteful outcome if this movement - less than a year old - decided that its efforts had failed because Bush and the Pentagon proceeded with their slaughter in Iraq. The war on Iraq does not prove the failure of the anti-war movement. If anything, the war on Iraq proves only that the economic, political and military authority in the United States is morally bankrupt. It is nurtured by a system that has become addicted to militarism and war.



The principal organizers of the anti-war movement are products of Marxist and other radical left organizations.

As clashes between U.S. soldiers and Iraqi citizens are sure to be a feature of news coverage during the coming months, we can expect that the issue of the American "occupation" of Iraq will be the new rallying cry of radical protest groups.

Protest is an integral part of the anti-war movement's campaign against American foreign and defense policy—and, indeed, against American society in general. When U.S. military power scores victories against terrorists and sustains the Bush Administration's foreign policy, protest groups suffer a tactical defeat. Yet even though protesters have not derailed the war against Saddam, the determination and staying power of the anti-war movement should not be underestimated. Organizers of the current anti-war movement are veterans of past protests. Despite many lost battles, they are stubborn and resilient. To

them, political struggle is perpetual and systemic.

The U.S. has been down this road before. The sights and sounds of anti-war protest—police barricades, bullhorns blasting, graffiti and slogans—are reminiscent of the 1960s protests against the Vietnam War. Within months of the 1968 Tet Offen-

June 2003

CONTENTS

America At War:
The Enemy Within
page 1

Briefly Noted: page 6

Organization Trends

sive, amidst a relentless chorus of nationwide protest, President Lyndon Johnson—who had won the greatest plurality in U.S. election history just four years earlier—announced he would not seek re-election. The Vietnam War went on for seven more years, but the center of political gravity—American government willpower and citizen support for its exercise—was severely crippled.

Will the aftereffects of the Iraq war and the ongoing war against terrorism generate another “Vietnam syndrome”? It’s unlikely, but it would be reckless to dismiss the ability of professional anti-war groups to stoke dissent, promote turmoil, and engage in activities that undermine the legitimate use of U.S. power.

The Major Anti-War Groups: Radical Left Leadership

Professional anti-war groups wage war on America even as they profess a humanitarian concern about collateral damage that any large-scale military action is bound to produce. Typically, their tactics are overt,

loud, disruptive, emotional, anti-intellectual and—above all—ideological. They stage mass rallies to win maximum publicity and they make their points using slogans, graffiti, chants, songs and profanity. Examine their tactics and you will learn their real intentions.

One other way to determine the aims of protest groups is to follow their money. It takes money to master the logistics, administration and paraphernalia of mass demonstrations. Find the donors to groups opposing the war against Saddam and fighting U.S. anti-terrorism policies and you may learn the real ambition of the protest. Some donors, like the Ford and MacArthur foundations, are mainstream liberals. But others, such as the Bill of Rights Foundation, have explicit radical left political agendas.

Whatever the funding source, one thing anti-war groups have in common is radical leaders. The training ground of anti-war activists includes the Workers World Party, Communist Party USA, National Lawyers Guild, All-African Peoples Revolutionary Party and other Marxist and hard left organizations. It should raise a red flag anytime former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark is listed as a speaker at a demonstration or a member of a group’s board of advisers. Clark has the shameful distinction of participating in a mock war crimes trial in Pyongyang, North Korea that denounced U.S. foreign policy towards that regime. He also joined the International Committee to Defend Slobodan Milosevic. Unfortunately, Clark has been an all-too-frequent participant at rallies opposing U.S. policy towards Iraq. In opposing the war, the movement’s leaders are really attacking American political values and institutions.

Not In Our Name

Not In Our Name is one of the newest of several hard core political groups that have seized upon the war against terrorism and U.S. action in Iraq in order to mobilize protests against the Bush Administration. The group was created in March 2002 in a meeting between an assortment of left-wing veterans, including partisans from the Revolutionary Communist Party, the

All-African Peoples Revolutionary Party, Refuse and Resist, the International League of People’s Struggle, and the National Lawyers Guild, the 1930s-era Communist front group whose members claim to act as the “people’s lawyer.” Not In Our Name was set up to act as an umbrella organization that would attract liberal and left-leaning celebrities, artists and intellectuals—recognizable figures who would lend authority to the group’s activities.

Not In Our Name has achieved exactly what it wants: publicity about protest against the war on terror. The group published two full-page ads in the January 27, 2003 *New York Times*, which accuse the Bush Administration of promoting “a spirit of revenge” after 9/11 that has plunged the country into “war abroad and repression at home.” The statement is signed by hundreds of celebrities, including Al Sharpton, Jesse Jackson, actors Edward Asner and Martin Sheen, folksinger Pete Seeger, and novelist Kurt Vonnegut.

The organization uses two devices to involve participants. Celebrities can sign the “Statement of Conscience,” while other folks must make do with the “Project,” which organizes street demonstrations. The “Statement” is primarily a forum for political theater organized by Clark Kissinger, a self-proclaimed “revolutionary Maoist.” Kissinger worked with the Black Panther Party in the 1960s, founded the U.S.-China People’s Friendship Association in 1971, and supported the Iranian revolution in 1979. (He resigned from the U.S.-China Friendship Association after the death of Mao Tse-Tung to protest China’s repudiation of the Cultural Revolution.) Kissinger’s aim is to exploit what Lenin called the “useful idiots.” He makes sure that Not In Our Name wins the support of anyone who opposes the war, but he keeps the organization free to pursue its own extremist political agenda: “We wanted people to sign the statement,” he has said, “without having their names used to endorse other actions.”

Not In Our Name says over 4,000 people contributed over \$300,000 to publicize its Statement of Conscience. The group also receives financial support from

Editor: John Carlisle

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:

jcarlisle@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.

nonprofits not previously interested in U.S. foreign policy. According to press reports, the Bill of Rights Foundation is a funder. It is mainly known for providing support for the legal defense of Mumia Abu-Jamal, a radical with ties to Fidel Castro and Mideast terrorism who has been on death row for two decades for murdering a Philadelphia policeman in 1982. In 2001, the foundation, which is actually a 501(c)(3) nonprofit and not a private foundation, had expenses of over \$102,000, and \$95,737 went to Jamal's legal defense fund.

Not In Our Name is also funded by the Interreligious Foundation for Community Organization (IFCO), a group founded in 1967 to "advance the struggles of oppressed people for justice and self-determination." At a recent solidarity conference in Havana, IFCO's executive director, Rev. Lucius Walker, proclaimed, "Long live the creative example of the Cuban Revolution. Long live the wisdom and heartfelt concern for the poor of the world by Fidel Castro." IFCO also sponsors Refuse and Resist, an organization founded in 1987 in response to Reagan era reforms. Its organizers, which included Clark Kissinger, "Chicago Seven" defendant Abbie Hoffman and his attorney, William Kunstler, pledged to "renounce all allegiance to this hateful Resurgent America program."

The mix of anti-American politics and anti-war protest is a trademark of illegitimate protest, and it is all tax-deductible. We don't know how much money the Bill of Rights Foundation and IFCO have given Not In Our Name because federal laws do not require tax-exempt nonprofits to reveal pass-through gifts to other nonprofits. According to Bill of Rights Foundation president Judith Levin, funding sources are nobody's business; all proceeds go to the same cause: revolution against society. Says Levin: "The connection is the violation of civil rights of people in this country."

ANSWER

Act Now to Stop War and End Racism (acronym: ANSWER) was the first and largest group organized after 9/11 to oppose Bush Administration anti-terrorism

policies. A 501(c)(3) nonprofit, ANSWER was the primary sponsor of mass marches against the war in Iraq held in Washington, D.C. on April 12, 2003.

The Washington protest was coordinated with anti-war actions in the capital cities of more than 60 nations. ANSWER and its affiliate, ANSWER International, helped organize a coalition support network of hundreds of U.S. and overseas groups. More than 25,000 protestors converged at Freedom Plaza, just blocks from the U.S. Capitol, to loudly denounce the war. (Large numbers came from Wisconsin, New York, Michigan, California and Northern Virginia.) Later, they marched past several corporate offices, targeting companies that allegedly stood to profit from the war. For instance, they went to the offices of the Halliburton corporation, the energy firm once headed by Vice President Cheney, shouting "Halliburton War Criminals!" Other throngs of ANSWER protestors stood outside the Justice Department building shouting "Get the hell out of Iraq!" In addition to profanity-laden chants, marchers carried signs with such statements as "Money for Jobs, Not for Empire." Scuffles with police broke out, but there were few arrests.

Other anti-war groups aided the ANSWER protest by inviting their members to join the Washington crowd. They included Not in Our Name, the National Lawyers Guild and Black Voices for Peace.

ANSWER has a startling background. The organization propping it up is a Cold War communist relic called the Workers World Party (WWP). WWP split from the Socialist Workers Party in 1959 over the Soviet invasion of Hungary three years earlier. The Socialist Workers opposed the invasion, as did other communist fronts, but the WWP remained faithful to the Soviet cause. WWP also supported the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Viet Cong and North Vietnam, and the communist governments of Cuba and North Korea.

ANSWER's links to the WWP are hardly hidden and lie just beneath the surface. It is a reincarnation of the old

Communist "Popular Front," which played a prominent role in the peace and unilateral disarmament movements in the 1930s and later during the Cold War, and whose own roots are in the Communist International.

ANSWER's Steering Committee is comprised of the most radical Marxist organizations in the U.S. The most influential is the International Action Center (IAC), a WWP front formed in 1991 by former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, a leading ANSWER operative. Other key WWP operatives hold critical positions in Clark's IAC, including Sarah Flounders (coordinator), Brian Becker (national co-director), Sarah Sloan (youth coordinator), and Gloria La Riva (a correspondent for *Workers World*, WWP's weekly newspaper). IAC and ANSWER share office space in New York City (39 W. 14th Street), and both groups shared a website for the April 12th, 2003 war protest demonstrations.

Beside IAC, ANSWER's Steering Committee includes other radical groups with no previous interest in Iraq or, for that matter, the peace movement. For example, the Korean Truth Commission (KTC) is a long-time staunch supporter of North Korea. It is little more than a North Korean front organization that over the years has sent eight separate delegations (including IAC members Ramsey Clark, Sarah Flounders and Brian Becker) to Pyongyang to uncover "evidence" of U.S. "war crimes." The visits culminated in an International War Crimes Trial of the United States in Pyongyang. Clark was "Prosecutor," Flounders was "Tribunal co-chair," and Becker "Tribunal sponsor."

Pastors for Peace (PFP), a pro-Castro organization, is also on the ANSWER Steering Committee. PFP is partially funded by the Arca Foundation, a private foundation (2001 assets \$68 million, grants \$3 million) that has given it more than \$100,000 during the 1990s. Arca was founded in 1952 by North Carolina tobacco heiress Nancy Reynolds Bagley; its president is Washington, D.C. socialite-activist Smith Bagley, who hosted young Elian Gonzalez at his Georgetown home following Elian's forced seizure by federal agents. Using Arca funds, PFP has managed to ship "hu-

Organization Trends

manitarian" aid to Cuba which winds up in government hands.

Other ANSWER Steering Committee members are the Muslim Student Alliance and the Free Palestine Alliance. Links between ANSWER and radical Islam abound, but one will suffice. In April 2002 ANSWER sponsored a Free Palestine Rally, in which marchers carried signs reading, "Chosen People: It's Payback Time."

The Mystery of ANSWER's Funding

ANSWER's funding is unknown because IRS rules protect tax-exempt organizations from making public disclosure of their donors. Herbert Romerstein, one of America's leading counter-intelligence experts, estimates that major peace demonstrations cost at least \$200,000, an amount far in excess of what a typical grassroots peace group can afford without sizeable donations from outside sources. Romerstein told *Insight* magazine (March 4-17, 2003) that "there's no such thing as a spontaneous demonstration," and that organizers such as the Workers World Party, with only a few hundred people, could not possibly raise that amount of money on their own. "No very radical group in the U.S. has been able to exist for very long," he concluded, "without direct foreign support."

United For Peace and Justice

While Not In Our Name and ANSWER coordinate the major anti-war protests, many lesser protests in small cities and college towns are handled by United for Peace and Justice. Marches and sit-ins, boycotts and petitions, candlelight vigils and visits to the local officeholders are among the tactics available to protesters. It takes skilled organizers to decide which tactics work best.

Leslie Cagan, a veteran Communist Party USA (CPUSA) organizer, founded United for Peace and Justice (UPJ) on October 25, 2002. Her Communist party roots can be traced to the 1970's, when she received "agitation and propaganda" training in Cuba. In the intervening years, Cagan became a professional organizer for Soviet-front groups and causes worldwide.

They ranged from mass protests against U.S. arms build-ups ("Mobilization for Survival") to support for Marxist-Leninist terrorist groups in the Third World. Cagan's colleague in UPJ is Michael Myerson, whose "agitation and propaganda" origins go back to the early 1960's, when he was first identified as a member of the national council of the CPUSA.

UPJ helped coordinate protests in New York after 9/11 and helped organize the massive February 15-16, 2003 demonstrations in the U.S. and around the world. Its main contribution was to organize the demonstration in New York City. Although UPJ claims to have attracted 500,000 protesters, most outside estimates peg the number at about 100,000. Staged near the United Nations behind steel barricades and thousands of police—a federal judge denied a UPJ request to march in front of the UN building—the demonstrators shouted slogans like "No Blood for Oil" and "Stop Mad Cowboy Disease" as they awaited a host of noted anti-war personalities. Protesters listened to such speakers as Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa, actress/activist Susan Sarandon, actor Danny Glover, Martin Luther King III, NAACP chairman Julian Bond, and radical activist Angela Davis. Cagan confidently – and wrongly as it turns out – predicted that "there will not be a war against Iraq. We will not let that happen." Also in attendance was Rep. Nydia Velasquez (D-NY) who said "This is not the kind of war I want to fight." Velasquez called the real fight the one against the "real axis of evil: homelessness, poverty and racism." Another speaker was Ghanim Khalil, an Arab-American serving in the military who vowed not to report for duty.

Democratic presidential candidate Al Sharpton told the crowd that President Bush was "pursuing a manifest destiny plan that will not secure America, but put the whole world at risk." Sharpton said the real patriots were the protesters demanding peace.

In addition, singers Pete Seeger and Richie Havens serenaded the demonstrators.

UPJ claims to be an antiwar coalition of 200 groups with a budget of several hundred thousand dollars. It will hold its first National Strategy Conference in Chicago on June 6-8, 2003. Its financial supporters included anonymous foundation donors who gave from \$5,000 to \$10,000 to fund the February protests.

Institute for Policy Studies

The principal left-wing "think tank" set up to oppose U.S. foreign and military policies is the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS). Labeled "Soviet fifth columnists" by David Horowitz, once a New Left colleague of theirs, IPS was a visible and active supporter of North Vietnam thirty years ago. Today it promotes the idea that the Bush Administration is determined to impose American economic, political and cultural "supremacy" over the world. Founded in 1963, IPS has been active against U.S. anti-terrorism policies since 9/11 (For more background on IPS, see "Return of the Radical Left?," *Organization Trends*, December 2001).

IPS receives much of its annual budget (\$2.2 million for 2003) from the Turner (\$65,000 - 2000), Ford (\$50,000 - 2002), MacArthur (\$50,000 - 2000) and Charles Stewart Mott foundations (\$50,000 - 2001). Other IPS funding comes from the HKH Foundation (\$40,000 - 2000), Nathan Cummings Foundation (\$35,000 - 2000), the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation (\$10,000 - 2001) and the Town Creek Foundation (\$25,000 - 2000).

Liberal Anti-War Protest Groups

Unlike the radical Left, liberal religious groups, affluent environmental organizations and other groups representing elite special interests hesitated to join the antiwar movement. But, belatedly, they organized their own groups to protest the Administration's Iraq policy.

The most prominent liberal antiwar protest organization is the **Win Without War** (WWW) coalition. Organized in December 2002, it is comprised of 38 member-groups, including the NAACP, Sierra Club, Greenpeace, National Council of Churches, and Jesse Jackson's Rainbow/PUSH coalition. It is backed by \$1.5 million from the

Tides Foundation. The group's national director is former Maine Democratic congressman Tom Andrews.

WWW was a Johnny-Come-Lately to anti-war protest, reflecting liberal confusion over what position to take toward Saddam Hussein. But because it enjoys the support of major Washington liberal advocacy groups, WWW spokesmen like Andrews receive invitations to appear on public affairs television talk shows like Tim Russert's "Meet the Press." Currently, WWW urges the UN, not the U.S. military, to be in charge of humanitarian relief and reconstruction in Iraq.

True Majority promotes e-mail-oriented public relations activities and it sponsored highly expensive anti-war ads in the *New York Times* (\$40,000) and *Wall Street Journal* (\$210,000 for ads in the national and New York metro sections). It ran three ads in the *New York Times* in October and December 2002, and on February 12, 2003 just prior to UPJ's demonstration. The December ad featured a photo of President Bush with the caption, "Jesus changed your heart. Now let him change your mind." The Turner Foundation and the San Francisco-based Ploughshares Fund (assets \$14 million, grants \$3 million) have helped True Majority underwrite its \$1.5 million operating budget.

True Majority was founded last year by Ben Cohen, co-founder of Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream. It is a "project" of Priorities, Inc., a 501(c)(3) group which is itself composed of four ad hoc groups: Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities (whose members include Cohen, Ted Turner, real estate mogul Peter Malkin and others); Military Advisory Committee (which includes retired admiral Jack Shanahan and former Reagan assistant secretary of defense Lawrence Korb); and Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities and Entertainers for Sensible Priorities (names too numerous and too obvious to mention).

Code Pink is a new feminist group organized to oppose the war in Iraq. Its members have received much media attention by dressing in the color pink as they peacefully demonstrate against the

Administration's policy. Organized in November 2002, the group has raised almost \$80,000 through sales of pink t-shirts, shawls and umbrellas on its website.

Code Pink apparently doesn't like to identify its real leaders. To learn more about its organizers, inquirers to the Code Pink website are referred to e-mail contacts Jodie Evans, a board member of Bad Babes and their Buddies; Starhawk, a co-founder of the neo-pagan movement; and Medea Benjamin, a co-founder of the group Global Exchange. Global Exchange played a lead role in the violent demonstrations against the World Trade Organization in Seattle in December 1999. Perhaps Code Pink is not as peaceful and playful as it purports to be.

Why Did the Protests Fail?

If President Bush and his top advisors are correct in their view that the war against terrorism will be long and protracted, then it should also be clear that protest and dissension will be just as protracted. The short-term victory over Saddam Hussein may, in the long run, simply fuel the fires of anger and frustration against the U.S. both here and overseas. We need to understand that war protest is a *political* phenomenon against *political* policies. It will not disappear after victories on distant battlefields. In this sense, the nature of the political enemy at home is almost exclusively ideological and, thus, permanent and resolute. The defeat of Saddam Hussein's fascist government does not mean the "real" war is over; it has only begun. Fortunately, the anti-war movement has been notably unsuccessful to date.

The failure of domestic protest groups to turn public opinion against the Bush Administration has at least two explanations. First, the modern American military demonstrated its magnificent strategic capacity and its companion technology. During the Vietnam War, it should be recalled, radical anti-war protests began to influence public opinion only after the hope of military victory was largely abandoned and there were thousands of casualties. If the Administration avoids major setbacks in the war against terrorism, we

should not expect protest movements to have much influence on the public or on public policy. But if setbacks occur or terrorists attack us again, then we should expect a heightened level and intensity of protest activity.

A second reason why the protest movement failed lies within the protest movement itself. The anti-war organizations leading the protests are run by hard-core ideologues. Most of their organizing occurred during the Cold War and much of their organizing genius is traceable to the American Communist Party. In this respect, they are their own worst enemies.

Writing in *Liberty* magazine (May 2003), Stephen Cox makes this trenchant observation: "More clearly than ever before, I believe, the great liability of the anti-war movement is ... the anti-war movement. It is a movement that programmatically refuses to separate itself from radical left sentiment."

If hard core protest organizers are ever able to expand beyond their self-imposed left-wing corner and seek a measure of political legitimacy, they may well make more inroads against the war. Writing in *The American Conservative* (March 10, 2003), British socialist Neil Clark offered just that argument when he suggested the creation of an international left-right coalition against U.S. policies: "Until the Left is ready in its hordes to link up electorally with the old antiwar Right, the brutal truth is that we have no chance of defeating the Bush/Blair axis."

Will such alliances emerge? That depends on the future success of the war on terror. Under the best scenario the Bush Administration should produce a string of brilliant successes. However, nothing is guaranteed in the business of war. A rising crescendo of anti-war activism will engulf U.S. cities if things go wrong. But this time, at least, we will know who the protesters are, where they come from – and the true purpose of their political agenda.

John J. Tierney is Faculty Chairman at the Institute of World Politics, a Washington, DC-based research foundation.

Briefly Noted

Senate Judiciary Committee chairman Orrin Hatch says liberal activists have made abortion rights the most important factor in determining whether Bush judicial nominees are confirmed. Many Democratic senators deny having an abortion litmus test, but Senator Edward Kennedy (D-Mass) says he opposes the nomination of Texas Supreme Court justice Priscilla Owen to the 5th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals because he has "serious doubt about her ability to safeguard the constitutional right to privacy and reproductive freedom." Democratic senators filibuster nominees they deem unfit on abortion rights, such as Owen and Miguel Estrada. A four-page memo from **People for the American Way** president Ralph Neas argues that a filibuster is "the one remaining check and balance in our federal system." Kate Michelman, president of **NARAL—Pro-Choice America**, says her group "will use every available resource to protect our rights and stop Owen." The NARAL web site will rate senators based on their vote on Owen. **Planned Parenthood** is lobbying senators and distributes position parents on nominees at Senate Judiciary Committee hearings.

Children's Defense Fund (CDF) purchased a full-page ad in the May 13 *New York Times* to warn readers that President Bush's proposed tax cut "Leaves no millionaire behind...just millions of children." The ad says 40 percent of eligible preschoolers won't get into the Head Start program, "making it harder for hungry children to get nutritious meals at school," that 570,000 children will be dropped from afterschool programs, and that Medicaid will be cut so severely that 9 million children will be denied "the quality health care they need." An e-mail from CDF, which has a 501(c)(4) lobby affiliate, urges Americans to call their congressman to vote NO on the Bush plan.

On April 30, the **Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA)** announced that Patricia Ireland, former president of the **National Organization for Women (NOW)**, will become its new chief executive officer. Ireland was NOW president from 1991 to 2001. Besides advocating abortion rights, she opposed Clarence Thomas's Supreme Court nomination and lobbied for gender quotas in hiring. In a 1991 interview, Ireland admitted to a relationship with a female companion while married to her former husband. In a May 5 *Boston Globe* op-ed Cathy Young writes, "A married man who unrepentantly admitted to having a mistress would not have much of a future in public life. So much for complaints that women are still judged more harshly than men for their sexual behavior."

The National Rifle Association (NRA) and several liberal groups, including the **AFL-CIO**, filed lawsuits last year to overturn the campaign finance law's restrictions on interest group political ads. On May 2 they had reason to celebrate. A federal court struck down a broad ban on election-time political ads. It ruled unconstitutional a provision barring interest groups from running ads mentioning federal candidates in the month before a primary and within two months of a general election. While the court upheld fallback rules that bar groups from airing ads that promote, support, attack or oppose a candidate at any time, the restriction is unclear. The law doesn't say what it means to promote, support, attack or oppose a candidate.

Under pressure from **People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)**, Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) has pledged to improve the living conditions of the 350 million chickens it eventually serves customers each year. KFC promises to provide chickens with "mental and physical stimulation" and increase the space allotted each bird by 30 percent.