NOVEMBER 2020

EDITED BY
JON RODEBACK

MAPPING SOROS'S "PHILANTHROPY" AT HOME AND ABROAD

CAPITAL RESEARCH CENTER
AMERICA'S INVESTIGATIVE THINK TANK

Mapping Soros's "Philanthropy" at Home and Abroad

Edited by

Jon Rodeback

Capital Research Center

November 2020

Executive Summary

Billionaire financier and philanthropist George Soros, "the man who broke the Bank of England,"[1] has a philosophy about how society should work, adapted from philosopher Karl Popper's theory of the "open society." Accordingly, he founded dozens of foundations to push the world in that direction, led by his flagship nonprofit Open Society Foundations (OSF). He is open about his objectives.[2] As of 2017, Soros had donated more than $32 billion to his foundations to realize his "open society" vision and his foundations give away almost $1 billion dollars annually to make "open society" a global reality.[3]

The Open Society network of foundations and nonprofits[4] has a physical presence in dozens of countries around the world, supporting largely left-wing causes. The network has incurred the displeasure of several governments, including those of the Russian Federation—which could arguably be more of a credit than a black mark—and Hungary, Soros's birth country.

Billions of dollars flowing through such a tangled web of organizations have inevitably generated widespread speculation, more than a few conspiracy theories, and sometimes outright fear. The Open Society network's ironic lack of transparency only feeds the speculation and concerns.

Untangling this "riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma" would be the work of a lifetime, if not many lifetimes. Money and influence flows through the network to its allies in countries around the world, but the exact amounts, destinations, and purposes are largely hidden.

Researchers at Capital Research Center have pulled on several threads of this mystery, including massive funding of district attorney candidates in local U.S. elections, meddling in European parliamentary elections, and supporting of caravans of migrants attempting to cross the U.S. southern border.

Local Elections

Since 2015, Soros has spent more than $17 million on district attorney and other local races in swing states such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Arizona and in large, predominantly left-of-center states such as California and New York. These huge contributions make it difficult for the other candidates to compete. District attorney elections are usually on a small scale and the campaigns typically do not need to raise millions to run local ads and mobilize voters. When Soros's vast resources appear, constituents are swamped with propaganda, and the opposing non-

[1] Tom Bailey, "A Spotlight on the Man Who Broke the Bank of England," *World Finance*, March 10, 2016, https://www.worldfinance.com/banking/a-spotlight-on-the-man-who-broke-the-bank-of-england.
[2] Shane Devine, "A Peek into the Mind of George Soros," Capital Research Center, April 2, 2020, https://capitalresearch.org/article/george-soros-part-1/.
[3] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Foundations (OSF)," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-foundations/.
[4] InfluenceWatch, "Soros Network (Open Society Network)," https://www.influencewatch.org/organization/soros-network-open-society-network/.

liberal candidates are often victims of unfair character assassinations, such as defaming them as racists and white supremacists.[5]

His objective apparently includes ending "mass incarceration" in American prisons.[6] What started as contribution to the American Civil Liberties Union has evolved into a broader, more granular effort to change the U.S. law enforcement system from the ground up by electing like-minded local prosecutors.

Election Tampering in Europe

Leaked internal documents from OSF, headquartered in New York City, demonstrate clear intent from the top to deliberately alter election outcomes in other countries, particularly in the 2014 elections for the European Parliament and some national parliaments in Europe.

In the early 2010s, OSF became increasingly worried about the European Union and the trends in Europe that were creating an increasingly hostile environment for OSF. To counter and even reverse these trends, OSF adopted "a two-level strategy to reduce the number of opponents of the open society who get elected." Open Society Initiative for Europe (OSIFE) distributed $5.7 million to organizations to "to turn out the vote" in sympathetic constituencies. Open Society European Policy Institute (OSEPI) was assigned to "engage pan-European parties to influence their manifestos and campaigning tactics."[7] However, these efforts to achieve particular election outcomes appear to violate U.S. tax law on nonprofits.

Weaponizing Migration

A leaked internal OSF document[8] indicates that OSF's International Migration Initiative provided 40 grants totaling more than $8 million to 22 organizations during 2014–2016. Almost half ($3.7 million) went to organizations working on migrant and refugee issues in the "Asia/Middle East corridor" and the "Central America/Mexico corridor."

In North America, Soros and his foundations are apparently trying to erase U.S. national borders by facilitating refugee crises on the U.S. southern border—much like the European refugee crisis (2015–2017) put massive pressure on the European Union. OSF invested $136 million to influence societies, politics, and economics in Latin America from 2015 through 2018,[9] along

---

[5] Valerie Richardson, "Black Lives Matter Funder George Soros Helps Elect Liberal Prosecutors with $7m Payout," *Washington Times*, November 16, 2016, https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/16/george-soros-spends-millions-to-bury-republicans-e/.

[6] American Civil Liberties Union, "LU Awarded $50 Million by Open Society Foundations to End Mass Incarceration," November 7, 2014, https://www.aclu.org/print/node/48907.

[7] Open Society European Policy Institute (OSEPI), "Goals and Strategies for 2014-2017," Open Society Foundations, September 22, 2013, 8, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/OSEPI-strategy-2014-2017-EU-advocacy.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

[8] Anna Crowley and Kate Rosin, "International Migration Initiative: Migration Governance and Enforcement Portfolio Review," Open Society Foundations, May 12, 2016, https://archive.org/stream/321383374OpenSocietyFoundationsInternationalMigrationInitiativeMigrationGovernan/321383374-Open-Society-Foundations-International-Migration-Initiative-Migration-Governance-and-Enforcement-Portfolio-Review_djvu.txt.

[9] Open Society Foundations, "2018 Budget: Overview," https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/uploads/664f9d73-bbe3-4de1-a4c7-af205ab75477/open-society-foundations-2018-budget-overview-20181107.pdf.

with tens of millions of dollars for U.S. groups supporting illegal immigration.[10] The migrant caravans assembled in this context, and contrary to media narratives, the migrations were not spontaneous.

What We Don't Know

Much more about the Open Society network remains to be uncovered about how Soros is using his billions to influence events in these and other areas relevant to the citizens of the United States and many other countries.

[10] Judicial Watch, "The Financial and Staffing Nexus Between the Open Society Foundations and the United States Government," November 30, 2018, https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/soros-judicial-watch-special-report-open-society-foundations-2018/.

Introduction

Billionaire financier and philanthropist George Soros, "the man who broke the Bank of England,"[1] has a philosophy about how society should work, adapted from philosopher Karl Popper's theory of the "open society." Accordingly, he founded dozens of foundations to push the world in that direction, led by his flagship nonprofit Open Society Foundations (OSF). He is open about his objectives.[2] As of 2017, Soros had donated more than $32 billion to his foundations to realize his "open society" vision and his foundations give away almost $1 billion dollars annually to make "open society" a global reality.[3]

The Open Society network of foundations and nonprofits[4] has a physical presence in dozens of countries around the world, supporting largely left-wing causes. The network has incurred the displeasure of several governments, including those of the Russian Federation—which could arguably be more of a credit than a black mark to the network—and Hungary, Soros's birth country.

Inevitably, billions of dollars flowing through such a tangled web of organizations have generated widespread speculation, more than a few conspiracy theories, and sometimes outright fear. The Open Society network's ironic lack of transparency only feeds the speculation and concerns.

Untangling this "riddle, wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma" would be the work of a lifetime, if not many lifetimes. Money and influence flows through the network to its allies in countries around the world.

Researchers at Capital Research Center have pulled on several threads of this mystery. Based on our research using available sources—including leaked internal OSF documents—this is what we have discovered about Soros's/OSF's work in three significant areas:

- Funding of district attorney candidates in local U.S. elections,
- Meddling in European elections, and
- Support of caravans of migrants attempting to cross the U.S. southern border.

Much more about the Open Society network remains to be uncovered in these areas and many others relevant to the citizens of the United States and many other countries.

---

[1] Tom Bailey, "A Spotlight on the Man Who Broke the Bank of England," *World Finance*, March 10, 2016, https://www.worldfinance.com/banking/a-spotlight-on-the-man-who-broke-the-bank-of-england.
[2] Shane Devine, "A Peek into the Mind of George Soros," Capital Research Center, April 2, 2020, https://capitalresearch.org/article/george-soros-part-1/.
[3] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Foundations (OSF)," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-foundations/.
[4] InfluenceWatch, "Soros Network (Open Society Network)," https://www.influencewatch.org/organization/soros-network-open-society-network/.

Transforming the U.S. Justice System by Funding District Attorney Elections

Shane Devine

Financier and left-wing philanthropist George Soros has contributed large sums of money to left-wing candidates running for district attorney all around the country to change the law enforcement system at the county or district level.[1]

Millions for Local Elections

Since 2015, he has spent more than $17 million on district attorney and other local races in swing states such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Arizona, but also in large, predominantly left-of-center states such as California and New York. In 2016, Soros dropped $2,000,000 into a single sheriff race in Maricopa County, Arizona, helping progressive candidate Paul Penzone win the election with ease.[2] He has given millions of dollars to candidates in several other counties as well.[3] (For a more complete list of Soros donations to local elections, see the Appendix.)

These huge contributions make it difficult for the other candidates to compete, since district attorney elections are on such a small scale and the campaigns typically do not need to raise millions to run their local ads and mobilize voters. When Soros's vast resources appear, constituents are swamped with propaganda, and the opposing non-liberal candidates are often victims of unfair character assassinations, such as defaming them as racists and white supremacists.[4]

This effort has a clear motive, spelled out in a 2014 press release from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)[5] after Soros's Open Society Foundations contributed $50 million toward its Campaign to End Mass Incarceration, which is a part of their wider Smart Justice campaign.[6]

In a November 2014 press release, the ACLU claimed that America's criminal justice policies have led to the imprisonment of over 2.2 million people since the 1980s and 1990s. The ACLU stated its intention to reform criminal justice policies at the state level in order to cut this number in half by 2020. (In October 2020, the U.S. Department of Justice reported that the total U.S.

---

[1] https://definitions.uslegal.com/d/district-attorney/.
[2] https://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/george-soros-joe-arpaio-arizona-230724.
[3] https://m.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/16/george-soros-spends-millions-to-bury-republicans-e/; https://www.politico.com/states/florida/story/2019/05/28/with-challengers-in-the-wings-florida-prosecutor-who-stood-against-death-penalty-wont-seek-reelection-1030026; https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/9/george-soros-spends-115-million-defeat-pete-weir-s/; https://freebeacon.com/issues/george-soros-floods-local-da-races-1-7m-philadelphia/; and https://freebeacon.com/politics/soros-backed-prosecutor-candidates-sweep-virginia-races/.
[4] https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/16/george-soros-spends-millions-to-bury-republicans-e/.
[5] https://www.aclu.org/print/node/48907; and https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/american-civil-liberties-union-aclu/.
[6] https://www.aclu.org/issues/smart-justice.

prison population had declined steadily from a peak of 1,615,500 in 2009 to 1,430,800 at the end of 2019—a drop of 11 percent.)

It seems that Soros decided his massive donation to the ACLU was not enough and started funding county prosecutor races by himself.

The Soros Effect

Critics of Soros's efforts have raised the concern that such blind partisan funding can weaken the vetting process regarding the candidates' characters. These fears were confirmed when Robert Shuler Smith—a district attorney for Hinds County, Mississippi, whom Soros had backed—was tried in criminal court for two counts of suspected conspiracy to hinder prosecution and one count of suspected robbery, among other charges.[7]

As one reporter put it,

> This isn't about either of [the candidates] personally. This is about a man [Soros] who has no connection to my corner of the world attempting to impose his agenda on a crucial local race without any real understanding of how that will impact the people who have to live with the fallout.[8]

At the time when Soros was attempting to undercut her campaign, conservative candidate for district attorney of Philadelphia Beth Grossman said,

> [T]he role of the DA's office is not to conduct a grand social experiment, it is to enforce the laws of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania justly and fairly, and to protect the constitutional rights of everybody: victims, witnesses, as well as those accused of crime.[9]

She subsequently lost to her opponent Larry Krasner, who has been the subject of controversy since taking office. Under Krasner, homicides in Philadelphia have risen by 12 percent.[10]

Tilting the Scales of Justice

Soros is not the only billionaire who contributes to elections, for left-of-center or conservative candidates. Far from it. However, a billionaire putting so much money into elections on such local levels may be unprecedented. The Capital Research Center could not find any other instances in recent electoral history of prominent donors funding dozens of district attorney races in this manner, except for Soros's own sons.

---

[7] https://m.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/nov/16/george-soros-spends-millions-to-bury-republicans-e/; and https://www.clarionledger.com/story/news/local/2018/09/12/hinds-da-robert-shuler-smith-contradicts-two-witnesses-stand/1273563002/.

[8] https://www.inquirer.com/opinion/george-soros-delaware-county-district-attorney-stollsteimer-krasner-20191101.html.

[9] https://freebeacon.com/issues/george-soros-floods-local-da-races-1-7m-philadelphia/.

[10] https://www.npr.org/2019/08/17/752051788/u-s-attorney-slams-philadelphia-da-over-culture-of-disrespect-for-law-enforcemen.

After Manhattan District Attorney Cy Vance declined to prosecute Harvey Weinstein and it was discovered that Weinstein's legal team had funded Vance's campaign,[11] state legislators discussed whether there should be restrictions on funding in these races.[12] But almost no one besides the reporters covering their local elections has discussed Soros's forays into reshaping America's law enforcement system, county by county.

Appendix: Soros Local Election Donations[13]

Candidate	Election Year	Office	Location	Donation	Result
Kim Foxx	2016	state attorney	Cook County, IL (Chicago)	$2,000,000	won
Aramis Ayala	2016	state attorney	Orlando, FL	$1,400,000	won[14]
Jake Lilly	2016	district attorney	Jefferson and Gilpin County (Denver, CO)	$1,150,000	lost
Jose Garza	2020	district attorney	Travis County (Austin, TX)	$650,000	won primary
Joe Kimok	2020	state attorney	Broward County, FL	$750,000	lost primary
Kim Ogg	2016	district attorney	Harris County (Houston, TX)	$583,000	won
Parisa Dehghani-Tafti	2019	commonwealth's attorney	Arlington County, VA	$583,000	won
Paul Penzone	2016	sheriff	Maricopa County, Arizona	$2,000,000	won
Larry Krasner	2017	district attorney	Philadelphia	$1,700,000	won[15]
Jody Owen	2019	district attorney	Hinds County, MS (Jackson)	$500,000	won
James E. Stewart	2015	district attorney	Caddo Parish, LA (Shreveport)	$406,000	won
Steve T. Descano	2019	commonwealth's attorney	Fairfax County, VA	$392,000	won
Diana Becton	2018	district attorney	Contra Costa County, CA	$275,000	won[16]
Darius Pattillo	2020	district attorney	Harris County, GA	$147,000	won primary[17]

[11] https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/why-didnt-manhattan-da-cyrus-vance-prosecute-the-trumps-or-harvey-weinstein.
[12] https://www.gothamgazette.com/state/8278-legislators-pursue-campaign-finance-reform-for-district-attorneys.
[13] https://thefederalist.com/2020/09/19/why-arent-we-allowed-to-talk-about-george-soross-plan-to-remake-america/; and https://www.inquirer.com/philly/news/politics/soros-cash-affects-da-races-nationwide-20170528.html.
[14] https://www.inquirer.com/philly/news/politics/soros-cash-affects-da-races-nationwide-20170528.html.
[15] https://americanmind.org/post/the-soros-cover-up/.
[16] https://sandiegofreepress.org/2018/03/these-3-women-could-change-the-california-justice-system-for-good/.
[17] https://www.news-daily.com/news/henry-county-district-attorney-candidate-matt-mccord-drops-out-of-race-pattillo-presumptive-winner/article_08d17724-f9aa-561d-b011-51e745d62b74.html.

Candidate	Election Year	Office	Location	Donation	Result
Kim Gardner	2016	circuit attorney	St. Louis	$116,000	won; re-election bid in 2020[18]
Raul Torrez	2016	district attorney	Benalillo County (Albuquerque, NM)	$107,000	won[19]
Scott Colom	2015	district attorney	Lowndes County, MS	$89,000	won[20]
George Gascón	2020	district attorney	Los Angeles	$1,000,000	General election candidate[21]
Chesa Boudin	2019	district attorney	San Francisco	unclear	won[22]
Kimberly Gardner	2016	circuit attorney	St. Louis	$67,000	won
Shani Curry Mitchell	2019	district attorney	Monroe County, NY (Rochester)	$800,000+	lost[23]
David Clegg	2019	district attorney	Ulster County, NY	$240,000	won[24]
Pamela Price	2018	district attorney	Alameda County, CA	$134,745	lost
Noah Phillips	2018	district attorney	Sacramento County, CA	$184,000	lost[25]
Geneviéve Jones-Wright	2018	district attorney	San Diego County, CA	$402,000	lost primary
Paul Penzone	2016	sheriff	Maricopa County, AZ	$2,000,000	won
Morris Overstreet	2016	district attorney	Harris County, TX (Houston)	$100,000	lost primary[26]
Monique Worrell	2020	state's attorney	Orlando, FL	$1,000,000	won primary[27]

[18] https://www.stltoday.com/news/local/govt-and-politics/st-louis-circuit-attorney-candidate-defends-accepting-super-pac-campaign/article_11036aaf-4b1b-58cd-871f-4084f1ec1485.html.
[19] https://berncoda.com/meet-the-da/.
[20] https://www.msda16.org/scott-colom.
[21] https://californiaglobe.com/section-2/soros-funded-da-candidate-george-gascon-wants-to-transform-la-disastrously-as-he-did-san-francisco/.
[22] https://californiaglobe.com/section-2/soros-funded-da-candidate-george-gascon-wants-to-transform-la-disastrously-as-he-did-san-francisco/.
[23] https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/04/nyregion/soros-election-da.html; and https://www.rochesterfirst.com/local-politics/sandra-doorley-beats-shani-curry-mitchell-for-monroe-county-district-attorney/.
[24] https://www.dailyfreeman.com/news/elections/election-soros-funded-pac-has-spent-more-than-k-to/article_9e36df76-fb4d-11e9-bb70-4bd5e1e08e76.html
[25] https://www.eastbayexpress.com/SevenDays/archives/2018/05/07/billionaire-george-soros-pours-money-into-alameda-county-district-attorneys-race.
[26] https://www.houstonchronicle.com/politics/houston/article/Soros-weighs-in-on-Dem-DA-race-6857389.php.
[27] https://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/os-ne-monique-worrell-george-soros-state-attorney-20200816-xgstfmgnlnbzrek5bbja4ykm6u-story.html; and https://dos.elections.myflorida.com/committees/ComDetail.asp?account=78871.

Soros Meddling in European Elections

Jon Rodeback

Summary: *"Open Society has a long history of involvement in elections, some of it rather controversial." Leaked documents and other evidence indicate that the Open Society Foundations' involvement in the 2014 European Parliament elections likely violated IRS prohibitions on partisan election work by U.S. nonprofits. Yet the bigger issue may be what else Open Society Foundations is hiding.*

"Open Society has a long history of involvement in elections, some of it rather controversial," reads an internal Open Society Foundations (OSF) memo dated April 11, 2013.

If anything, the memo greatly understates how much OSF and its affiliated organizations have intervened in elections around the world since the 1990s. In developing countries, OSF expenditures in the millions—if not tens of millions—of dollars give OSF and its grantees disproportionate influence for good and ill. Even in the United States, Soros's millions have exerted a disproportionate influence to reshape dozens of local elections.[1]

Over the years, much of the OSF involvement in elections overseas—especially election monitoring—was arguably laudable, and some is in debatable gray areas. Yet a significant portion appears to blatantly violate U.S. tax law, if not other laws as well.

Leaked internal documents from OSF, headquartered in New York City, demonstrate clear intent from the top to deliberately alter election outcomes in other countries, particularly the 2014 elections for the European Parliament and some national parliaments in Europe. While OSF headquarters did not directly run these influencing efforts, its European subsidiaries did, under OSF's instruction and guidance. This appears to blatantly violate OSF's status as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit foundation, which prohibits directly or indirectly intervening in any election for public office anywhere in the world.

Open Society Foundations

Billionaire financier and philanthropist George Soros founded Open Society Foundations (then named Open Society Institute) in 1993 as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit under U.S. law. It has since become the flagship of the Soros Network, a fleet of nonprofits through which Soros promotes his philosophy of "open society" around the world. As "the main hub of Soros-funded a network of more than 20 national and regional foundations," OSF is "one of the largest political

[1] Shane Devine, "Soros Aims to Transform the Justice System by Funding DA Races," Capital Research Center, December 17, 2019, https://capitalresearch.org/article/soros-aims-to-transform-the-justice-system-by-funding-da-races/.

philanthropies in the world."[2] As of 2017, Soros had donated more than $32 billion[3] to his foundations, and his foundations give away almost $1 billion dollars annually to make "open society" a global reality.[4]

Major pillars of the Soros nonprofit network include:

- Foundation to Promote Open Society (FPOS), "the primary grantmaker in the Soros network."[5]
- Open Society Policy Center (OSPC), a 501(c)(4) nonprofit that serves as the main lobbying arm of the Soros network.[6]
- Fund for Policy Reform, a 501(c)(4) nonprofit that gives "grants to organizations focused on drug policy, criminal justice, and election administration policy."[7]
- Central European University Budapest Foundation, a 501(c)(3) nonprofit used to fund Soros's Central European University.

Soros's Philosophy and Giving. Soros's philosophy is informed by 20th-century philosopher Karl Popper's theories in which, as one observer summarized, "'open societies' . . . operate based on critical thinking, constantly seeking to make things more democratic and pluralistic, ensuring that the rule of law is ever equal and expanding to protect marginalized groups."[8]

This thinking animates his giving and his foundations, his giving to his foundations, and the foundations' efforts to change the world. He first tried to change apartheid in South Africa and failed:

> Then I turned my attention to Central Europe [then suffering under communist regimes]. Here I was much more successful. I started supporting the Charter 77 movement in Czechoslovakia in 1980 and Solidarity in Poland in 1981. I established separate foundations in my native country, Hungary, in 1984, in China in 1986, in the Soviet Union in 1987, and in Poland in 1988. My engagement accelerated with the collapse of the Soviet system.[9]

---

[2] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Foundations (OSF)," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-foundations/.
[3] Open Society Foundations, "George Soros," https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/george-soros.
[4] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Foundations (OSF)."
[5] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Foundations (OSF)."
[6] InfluenceWatch, "Open Society Policy Center," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-policy-center/.
[7] InfluenceWatch, "Soros Network (Open Society Network)," https://www.influencewatch.org/organization/soros-network-open-society-network/.
[8] Shane Devine, "A Peek into the Mind of George Soros," Capital Research Center, April 2, 2020, https://capitalresearch.org/article/george-soros-part-1/.
[9] George Soros, "The Capitalist Threat," *Atlantic*, February 1997, https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1997/02/the-capitalist-threat/376773/.

After the fall of Communism, he formed OSF and has turned to monitoring free elections, promoting "open borders" and unrestricted immigration, supporting marginalized populations such as LGBT and Roma (Gypsies), and advocating radical criminal justice reform.

OSF has a global reach and ambition, as illustrated by a February 2012 list of "Activities by Region,"[10] which indicated OSF activities in multiple countries in Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, Southeastern Europe, and the Former Soviet Union. For the Middle East and North Africa, it lists only Turkey and a "Middle East/North African Initiatives (MENA)." In North America, only the United States is listed, with the catch-all subheading "US Programs."

Lack of Transparency. Contrary to its "emphasis on transparency and 'open societies,'" OSF is consistently rated as nontransparent. For example, in 2016, Transparify rated OSF as "highly opaque," with zero stars out of five—the lowest ranking of any rated U.S. nonprofit. (Ironically, the report was "made possible through the support of the Think Tank Fund of the Open Society Foundations.")[11]

Prohibition on Political Campaigning by 501(c)(3) Organizations

The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) states:

> Under the Internal Revenue Code, all section 501(c)(3) organizations are absolutely prohibited from directly or indirectly participating in, or intervening in, any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for elective public office.

However, voter education activities conducted in a nonpartisan manner are permitted, as is encouraging participation in elections if such activities are conducted in a nonpartisan manner. That said, the IRS warns:

> Voter education or registration activities with evidence of bias that (a) would favor one candidate over another; (b) oppose a candidate in some manner; or (c) have the effect of favoring a candidate or group of candidates, will constitute prohibited participation or intervention.

Source: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, "The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations," July 28, 2020, https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations.

This lack of transparency makes serious research into OSF activities difficult—akin to discerning the internal workings of the Soviet Union during the Cold War. And the sheer scope of OSF activities makes any comprehensive, thorough analysis of OSF activities extremely difficult. As a result, much of the available information about OSF is anecdotal, the result of occasional government investigations, or revealed through leaks of OSF documents.

Election Involvement and Backlash

[10] Open Society Foundations, "Activities by Region," February 14, 2012, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/Activities-by-Region-OSF.png. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.
[11] Transparify, "How Transparent Are Think Tanks About Who Funds Them 2016?," June 29, 2016, 1 and 16, https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.transparify.org%2Fs%2FTransparify-2016-Think-Tanks-Report.pdf.

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, OSF was actively involved in elections in Central and Eastern Europe, former Soviet republics, and Latin America. An internal OSF memo obliquely states, "Open Society was present for many of the major transformations of the era, including the so-called 'color revolutions' in Georgia [in 2003], Ukraine [in 2004] and Kyrgyzstan [in 2005]."[12] The involvement often took the form of support for domestic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that monitor local elections.[13]

Since the early 2000s, OSF has pulled back from direct engagement in Latin America, while becoming more active in Africa, supporting election monitoring and related activities.[14] During the 2000s, Soros's giving in the United States expanded, including $27 million to defeat George Bush in the 2004 election.[15] For 2017, the OSF's U.S. programs had a budget of $100 million.

Banned in Russia. OSF efforts were generally well received in most Central and Eastern European countries, but not in neighboring Russia, where the government has repeatedly condemned them. For example, in 2015, President Vladimir Putin said:

> In the modern world, extremism is used as a geopolitical tool for redistribution of spheres of interest. We can see the tragic consequences of the wave of the so-called color revolutions, the shock experienced by people in the countries that went through the irresponsible experiments of hidden, or sometimes brute and direct interference with their lives.[16]

In fact, from Putin's perspective, the color revolutions in Europe had eroded the security buffer between Russia and NATO and threatened to spread to Russia itself. In November 2015, the authoritarian Putin regime predictably—except that it took so long—classified Open Society Foundations as an "undesirable" organization and banned it from operating in the country.[17]

Driven out of Hungary. OSF activities, particularly in support of illegal immigrants, also became quite controversial in Hungary, Soros's birth country. After "campaign[ing] under a

---

[12] Morton Halperin, Jerry Fowler, and Jonas Rolett, "Open Society Foundations' Election Related Activities," memorandum, Open Society Foundations, April 11, 2013, 5, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/Open-Society-Foundations'-Election-Related-Activities-1.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

[13] Such organizations include Građani Organizirano Nadgledaju Glasanje (Citizens Supervising Voting in an Organized Manner) in Croatia and Graǵanska Asocijacija MOST (Citizen Association MOST) in Macedonia. Morton Halperin, Jerry Fowler, and Jonas Rolett, "Open Society Foundations' Election Related Activities," Open Society Foundations, [Washington, DC office], April 11, 2013, 5, https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/Open-Society-Foundations'-Election-Related-Activities-1.pdf.

[14] Halperin et al., "Open Society Foundations' Election Related Activities," 6.

[15] Ivan Levingston, "George Soros Returns to Politics with $25 Million Splash: Report," CNBC, July 27, 2016, https://www.cnbc.com/2016/07/27/george-soros-returns-to-politics-with-25-million-splash-report.html. Julian Borger, "Financier Soros Puts Millions into Ousting Bush," *Guardian*, November 11, 2003, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/nov/12/uselections2004.usa.

[16] RT, "Putin Vows to Prevent 'Color Revolutions' for Russia and Its Eurasian Allies," April 12, 2017, https://www.rt.com/russia/384451-putin-vows-to-prevent-color/.

[17] Open Society Foundation, "Russia Cracks Down on Open Society," November 30, 2015, https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/newsroom/russia-cracks-down-open-society; and Jennifer Ablan, "Russia Bans George Soros Foundation as State Security 'Threat,'" Reuters, November 30, 2015, https://www.reuters.com/article/russia-soros/russia-bans-george-soros-foundation-as-state-security-threat-idUSL1N13P22Y20151130#slpVaobQZ0A8YikE.97.

'Stop Soros' banner," Prime Minister Victor Orbán won re-election in a landslide in April 2018, with his party alliance winning 133 of 199 seats in the Hungarian parliament. The parliament wasted no time in passing a collection of "Stop Soros" laws that restricted foreign funding of NGOs and aid to illegal aliens.

OSF countered by moving its operations to Berlin after condemning the "increasingly repressive political and legal environment" in Hungary.[18] Central European University responded by moving most of its operations from its main campus in Budapest to Vienna.[19]

The Europe Problem

In the early 2010s, OSF became increasingly worried about the European Union and the trends in Europe that were creating an increasingly hostile environment for OSF. OSF was greatly concerned about growing "xenophobia" and anti-EU sentiments among Europeans. In 2013, an internal OSF strategy document opined, "The EU has lost self-confidence and influence, and the European consensus on pluralism and inclusion is breaking down."[20] OSF felt this breakdown was directly impeding its mission.

Protecting OSF Turf. The OSF was particularly concerned this would undermine OSF's cozy relationship with EU institutions: "Vocally xenophobic candidates are already pushing mainstream parties to attack policies and institutions that OSF has worked for years to build up."[21]

Yet this cozy relationship has continued beyond the 2014 elections with OSF boasting of an unheard of 42 meetings in one year with the European Commission[22]—the rough equivalent of a private foundation meeting 42 times with the Cabinet of the U.S. president. Revealing the scope of the relationship, an internal OSF document listed 226 "reliable allies" in just the European Parliament in 2017,[23] not to mention allies in the sprawling EU bureaucracy.

---

[18] BBC News, "George Soros: Foundation Quits Hungary over 'Repressive' Policies," May 15, 2018, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-44082976; Marton Dunai, "Soros Foundation to Shut Its Office in 'Repressive' Hungary," Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/journalists/marton-dunai; and Vanessa Romo, "Hungary Passes 'Stop Soros' Laws, Bans Aid to Undocumented Immigrants," NPR, June 20, 2018, https://www.npr.org/2018/06/20/622045753/hungary-passes-stop-soros-laws-bans-aid-to-undocumented-immigrants.

[19] Shaun Walker, "'Dark Day for Freedom': Soros-Affiliated University Quits Hungary," *Guardian*, December 3, 2018, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/dec/03/dark-day-freedom-george-soros-affiliated-central-european-university-quits-hungary.

[20] Open Society European Policy Institute (OSEPI), "Goals and Strategies for 2014-2017," Open Society Foundations, September 22, 2013, 1, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/OSEPI-strategy-2014-2017-EU-advocacy.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

[21] Robyn Waserman, "Elections: Contributions to Work—From OSF Proposed Strategies 2014–2017," Open Society Foundation, July 2018, 3, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/Elections-Contributions-to-Work-From-OSF-Proposed-Strategies-2014-2017.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

[22] Nigel Farage, "The Biggest International Political Collusion in History," European Parliament, November 14, 2017, https://youtu.be/PZLr0TtPjUc.

[23] Kumquat Consult, *Reliable Allies in the European Parliament (2014–2019)*, October 2014, https://legacy.gscdn.nl/archives/images/soroskooptbrussel.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

Given the parliament's new powers under the Lisbon Treaty (which took effect on December 1, 2009), the 2014 elections became a high priority, particularly in terms of preventing the election of members of the European Parliament (MEPs) who would oppose OSF priorities:

> The 2014 European Parliament elections will be a big political moment which will raise the alarm about illiberal trends in European politics. Public anger and protest voting could result in a major increase in the number of xenophobic and anti-EU candidates who get elected.[24]

To counter and even reverse these trends, OSF focused on the 2014 elections for the European Parliament as a decisive means through which OSF could influence the EU. One OSF report stated, "The European Parliamentary elections in May 2014 present a crucial opportunity for citizens and civil society actors to help influence and shape the agenda of the European Union in the EU's legislative period 2015–2019."[25]

Justified Concerns. Eurobarameter surveys tend to confirm that OSF concerns about the EU were warranted. Trust in EU institutions—specifically, the European Parliament, European Commission, and European Central Bank—peaked in spring 2007 (56 percent, 52 percent, and 53 percent, respectively) and steadily declined through spring 2014 (37 percent, 32 percent, and 31 percent). By spring 2015, a majority of respondents in the U.K., Italy, Cyprus, and Slovenia believed that their country would be better off outside the EU. All of these indicate deteriorating support for the EU, with support across the entire EU dropping 3 percentage points from autumn 2012 (58 percent) to autumn 2015.[26]

If there were any doubts that the EU was facing an existential crisis, BREXIT erased them. The June 2016 referendum in which 52 percent of U.K. voters chose to leave the EU sent shockwaves through Europe and around the world. The U.K. had never quite fit in the EU, even after France stopped vetoing the U.K.'s accession to the EU's predecessor. It took nearly four years, but despite all manner of political scheming by pro-EU forces, the U.K. formally left the EU on January 31, 2020.

Open Society Blinders. OSF concerns about Europe are a peculiar creation of the open society mindset, which frames opposition to porous national borders and floods of international refugees as xenophobia and racism. Internal OSF documents consistently reflect this mindset. Similarly, opposition to the EU is cast as indefensible backward thinking, excluding even the possibility of reasoned skepticism. In this way of thinking, the objective of advancing "open society" overrides people's legitimate concerns about cultural identity, economic costs, and law and order in favor of the OSF agenda of open borders, radical criminal reform, and promotion of minority rights.

---

[24] Waserman, "Elections," 3.
[25] Open Society Initiative for Europe (OSIFE), "List of European Elections 2014 Projects," Open Society Foundations, October 17, 2014, 1, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/OSIFE-List-of-European-elections-2014-Projects.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.
[26] European Commission, Standard Eurobarameter 79–84, Spring 2013–Autumn 2015, 104, https://ec.europa.eu/commfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/index#p=1&instruments=STANDARD. Trust briefly rebounded about 5 percentage points in autumn 2014 and spring 2015, but returned to the 30s by autumn 2014.

Targeting the 2014 European Parliamentary Elections

OSF adopted "a two-level strategy to reduce the number of opponents of the open society who get elected."[27] Two OSF organizations in Europe were tasked with the mission: Open Society Initiative for Europe (OSIFE) would "work on local campaigns to turn out the vote," and Open Society European Policy Institute (OSEPI) would "engage pan-European parties to influence their manifestos and campaigning tactics."[28]

OSIFE. For its part, OSIFE reaffirmed that a "crucial test will take place in May 2014 when all EU citizens vote for the European Parliament" and "that landmark election will be the cornerstone and key priority for OSIFE's strategy."[29]

In the larger context of trying to tilt the 2014 elections, OSIFE described its objectives as:

1. Preventing racist candidates from getting (re)elected
2. Countering racism in election campaigns and in the European Parliament
3. Getting EU citizens who live in other EU countries to vote in their countries of residence[30]

In less partisan and more objective terms, OSIFE's goals included "preventing" candidates with whom OSF disagreed "from getting (re)elected" and "countering" views OSF disliked "in election campaigns and in the European Parliament."[31]

OSIFE's primary tool for achieving these objectives appears to have been grant making, with 92 grants ranging from $8,790 to $340,000, totaling more than $5.7 million. The grants included "open call grants, targeted mobilization efforts, up-scaling grants and grants related to post-election actions."[32] The OSIFE grants also overlapped with OSEPI's objective of engaging pan-European parties. In fact, the list included not just all OSIFE grants, but also related projects from the Soros network's Hungary project, Italy project, and the less subtly named Open Society Fund to Counter Xenophobia. The list also included "election grants" from the At Home in Europe and European Civil Liberties projects, an "election-related legacy grant" from the Open Society Youth Initiative, and a "co-funded project" of OSIFE with OSF's so-called Information Program.[33]

Even more illuminating are the grant descriptions. Most of the grants focused on three areas: targeted voter mobilization, lobbying/influencing political campaigns, and media operations.[34] Other grants did not obviously intend to directly influence election outcomes but in some cases became tools to that end.

[27] OSEPI, "Goals and Strategies for 2014–2017," 8.
[28] OSEPI, "Goals and Strategies for 2014–2017," 8.
[29] Waserman, "Elections," 9.
[30] Waserman, "Elections," 10.
[31] Waserman, "Elections," 10.
[32] OSIFE, "List of European Elections 2014 Projects," 1.
[33] OSIFE, "List of European Elections 2014 Projects," 1.
[34] OSIFE, "List of European Elections 2014 Projects."

For example, OSIFE gave a grant to Kieskompas, a Dutch voting advice website, to develop EUVOX 2014, a free voting advice application that appeared nonpartisan on its face. This application was designed to give the voter "a nuanced portrayal of his or her distance from all parties in the political spectrum," not offer "one-sided voting advice." However, even assuming the app was truly nonpartisan, younger voters are far more likely than older voters to turn to an app for voting advice—a point reinforced by a second grant to Kieskompas to fund a Facebook marketing campaign to encourage "young people" to use the app.

After reviewing 92 grants, we find most programs that received grants were attempting to target specific populations, especially "young people" (18–35-year-olds), migrants, and LGBT. In what appears to be a typical function of age, "young people" in Europe and elsewhere tend to skew left of the general population and would therefore tend to be more supportive of "open society" positions. LGBT communities exhibit similar tendencies, and migrants would be expected to support more open borders. In other words, every OSIFE voter-turnout grant appears intended to increase voter turnout of populations that would be more supportive of open society positions.

On the other side of the coin are the lobbying of political campaigns and media operations, some of which may be called "fake news" in today's parlance. Both prongs intended to alter the public conversation by "naming and shaming" what OSF deems xenophobic and nationalist rhetoric and "hate speech" in general.

While Europe certainly has its share of neo-Nazis, fascists, communists, and others who hate freedom, the OSF uses rather expansive "definitions" of nationalism, xenophobia, and hate speech. Based on OSF public literature and internal documents, the OSF lexicon broadly classifies opposition to porous national borders and floods of foreign refugees as xenophobia, nationalism, and racism. Opposition to EU's ongoing erosion of national sovereignty receives similar treatment, painting patriotic pride in one's nation and euroscepticism with the same brush as neo-Nazi skinheads. "Hate speech" is a particularly slippery term in Europe given the lack of First Amendment equivalents.[35] And these OSF-funded campaigns and media operations take place against the historical horrors of the Holocaust and Nazi occupation of most of continental Europe, which supercharge any charges of nationalism, Nazism, Fascism. Accordingly, a naming and shaming (i.e., propaganda) campaign against European political parties and candidates who disagree with OSF positions could be expected to stifle debate and potentially suppress voter turnout of their supporters.

Because most EU countries elect their parliaments using some form of proportional representation, even "a small increase in turnout can reduce dramatically the representation that extremist parties win."[36] Of course, the opposite applies as well: A small increase in votes in the "open society" direction could elect more MEP's that support open society objectives.

---

[35] See Noah Feldman, "Free Speech in Europe Isn't What Americans Think," Bloomberg, March 19, 2017, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2017-03-19/free-speech-in-europe-isn-t-what-americans-think; and Mike Gonzalez, "Europe's War on Free Speech," Heritage Foundation, February 9, 2918, https://www.heritage.org/europe/commentary/europes-war-free-speech.

[36] Waserman, "Elections," 4.

OSIFE Grants for the 2014 European Elections. The number of grants is impressive. The list below is only a selection of the grants,[37] grouped by program focus, with a brief description for each grant and its target countries.

Targeted Voter Mobilization

- **Europe on Track** (EU-wide): mobilize university students.
- **LGBT Mob-Watch Italy-Europe 2014** (Italy): mobilize LGBT voters.
- **Bite The Ballot** (U.K.): register "young people" voters.
- ***Combattre l'islamophobie politique*** (fighting political islamophobia) (France): mobilize Muslim voters.
- **Disclosing Hate Speech and Discrimination** (Croatia): mobilize ambivalent voters against "xenophobic, racist, and other radical political options."
- **Vote-Up!** (France): mobilize youth voters.
- ***Ligue des jeunes électeurs*** (league of young voters) (France): mobilize "young people" vote.
- **Operation Vote** (Italy): mobilize EU expats in Italy to vote in Italian elections.
- ***Höj Rösten*** (raise your voice) (Sweden): mobilize anti-xenophobic, anti-nationalist vote.
- **Mobilizing the Vote Through Social Media in 2014** (France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, U.K.): mobilize voters through social media.
- **Vote for the Voiceless: Amplifying the Voices of the Powerless** (EU-wide): mobilize "young people" voters.
- **Romanians Vote for Europe** (EU-wide): mobilize Roma voters.
- **The Raval Project** (Spain): mobilize migrant voters.
- **It's About You** (Hungary): mobilize LGBT voters.
- **Facebook Marketing Campaign for EUVOX 2014** (10 Central European countries): mobilize "young people" voters.
- **I Do Care** (Lituania): mobilize "young people" voters.
- **Our Elections—Our Europe** (Greece, Hungary, Italy, U.K.): mobilize "young people" voters.
- **Piloting Immigrant Citizenship Campaigns Across Europe** (11 countries): mobilize immigrant voters.
- **My Vote Matters** (U.K.): mobilize migrant-worker voters.
- **Vote Europe!** (U.K.): mobilize Hungarian expat voters in the U.K.
- **Voter mobilization and information campaign** (EU-wide): mobilize Czech voters across EU, especially among "young people."
- **Youth Voice at European Elections** (Slovenia): mobilize "young people" voters.

Media Operations

- **Open EU 2014** (EU-wide): publish articles against "hate speech" and "intolerant rhetoric" in local media outlets.

[37] OSIFE, "List of European Elections 2014 Projects."

- **Radical Democracy for Europe** (EU-wide): involve media-makers (e.g., video and animation artists) in election debate.

Lobbying/Influencing Political Campaigns

- **Towards a European Parliament Committed to Transparency and Accountability** (EU-wide): Promote a campaign pledge against "excessive lobbying influence."
- ***Per i diritti, contro la xenophobia*** (campaign for rights, against xenophobia) (Italy): lobby candidates about the rights of Roma, Sinti, migrants, and detained persons.
- **Naming and Shaming Populism in EP Election Campaign** (Belgium, Germany, France, Netherlands): fact-checking, hate-speech monitoring, and public debates to shape political campaigns.
- **Platform for Voice** (Greece, Netherlands, U.K.): monitor and micro-target candidates and parties who use xenophobic speech.

Taken individually or a few at a time, these programs are unthreatening, sometimes even laudable. Taken together they constitute a massive, covert effort to tilt the makeup of the European Parliament in a very specific direction.

OSEPI. OSEPI explicitly planned for the joint effort with OSIFE to "reduce the number of opponents of the open society who get elected" in Europe in 2014.[38] In other words, the OSEPI and OSIFE planned on "directly . . . intervening . . . in opposition to . . . candidate[s] for elective public office"—which is "absolutely prohibited" under the Internal Revenue Code.[39]

For its part OSEPI would tackle "pan-European parties" to "influence their manifestos and campaigning tactics," employing its so-called Foresight Program to "engage politicians and campaign managers of mainstream parties," "highlight dangers in key constituencies," "develop social media tools to support election campaigning" and push those tools out to OSF's grantees, and "show politicians and officials how to frame open society concerns in ways that majority populations can identify with."[40]

How this worked in practice is much less clear given the limited documents available. OSEPI certainly influenced the list of OSIFE grants, and many of the grants would appear—at least indirectly—to facilitate influencing pan-European political parties. The 2017 list of 226 "reliable allies" suggests its efforts bore fruit. Yet this sort of person-to-person influencing is more difficult to observe and document than flows of money.

Outstanding Questions

The evidence—what we have been able to gather—is persuasive that the OSF and its European entities planned and executed an operation to tilt the 2014 European Parliament election in favor of its objectives. The operation was apparently initiated and directed (on the strategic level) from

[38] OSIFE, "List of European Elections 2014 Projects," 8; also cited in Waserman, "Elections," 4.
[39] U.S. Internal Revenue Service, "The Restriction of Political Campaign Intervention by Section 501(c)(3) Tax-Exempt Organizations," July 28, 2020, https://www.irs.gov/charities-non-profits/charitable-organizations/the-restriction-of-political-campaign-intervention-by-section-501c3-tax-exempt-organizations.
[40] Waserman, "Elections," 4.

OSF headquarters in New York City, which likely makes it subject to U.S. law even though the operation was carried out through OSF subsidiaries in Europe, especially if OSF funneled 501(c)(3) money to its subsidiaries to interfere in the elections. In particular, OSEPI and OSIFE's self-described "two-level strategy to reduce the number of opponents"[41] seems to clearly fall outside the legal confines of nonpartisan election activities under U.S. law and likely the laws of the relevant European countries.

In short, OSF's projects for the 2014 European elections—as a group and many as individual projects—appear to have violated U.S. tax law on nonprofits.

OSF's lack of transparency breeds suspicion, and the internal documents appear to confirm those suspicions. As usual, answering some questions leads to more questions:

- **To what extent did 501(c)(3) money funneled through the OSF to its subsidiaries violate U.S. law by funding their interventions in the 2014 European Parliament elections?**
- **Did the OSF and its subsidiaries continue to interfere in subsequent elections in Europe, including the European Parliament elections in 2019?** Anecdotal evidence suggests that OSF has continued to heavily influence European and national elections and votes. For example, Nigel Farage MEP (UK Independence Party) suggests that OSF was behind a parliamentary investigation into alleged Russian influence behind the BREXIT vote.[42]
- **Did OSF break the election laws of the EU or of the targeted European countries?** In most EU member states, candidates and political parties can receive both public funding and donations from private parties, although most member state prohibit corporate and foreign donors and the restrictions vary widely from state to state.[43]
- **Did the OSF leverage U.S. government funding to magnify its election interference?** Where possible, OSF uses its grants to leverage and attract funding from other sources, especially the U.S. Agency for International Development.[44] Was any U.S. government funding diverted to supporting OSF's election interference?
- **How effective was the 2014 operation in preventing the election of "xenophobic" MEPs and assisting the election of OSF allies?** OSF's confidential list of 226 "reliable allies" out of 751 seats in the European Parliament in 2017 suggests some success—or at least that the operation was not a bust. But assessing how effective OSF was in altering

[41] OSEPI, "Goals and Strategies for 2014–2017," 8.
[42] Farage, "The Biggest International Political Collusion in History."
[43] For an overview of election finance laws in the European Unions, see Amsterdam School of Communication Research, "Party Financing and Referendum Campaigns in EU Member States," European Parliament, 2015, https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2015/519217/IPOL_STU(2015)519217_EN.pdf.
[44] Judicial Watch, "The Financial and Staffing Nexus Between the Open Society Foundations and the United States Government," November 30, 2018, https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/soros-judicial-watch-special-report-open-society-foundations-2018/.

the outcomes of the elections would require looking at elections in multiple member states.

Prying loose truthful and complete answers to these questions would likely require the full force of the U.S. government (or other governments), in part because the U.S. government is uniquely positioned to pressure the OSF to cooperate and answer questions. And the U.S. government would do well by its allies and friends to investigate OSF's likely illegal interference in European elections.

OSF activities also beg the question of whether Congress should require greater transparency of U.S. nonprofits operating overseas.

The author is grateful to Chris Hull for research support and to CRC intern John Byrne for his assistance in compiling data for this chapter.

Appendix A: Methodology and Sources

A full review of Open Society interventions in elections is beyond the scope of this short report for two reasons: (1) An examination of the sheer number of interventions in any depth would require a book if not a multivolume book, and (2) in many cases the needed information is not publicly available.

Much of the key information on which this report is based came from internal OSF documents that were leaked on DCLeaks.com, which was ostensibly a front for GRU (Main Intelligence Directorate) of the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces. Despite the unsavory provenance of the OSF documents and other leaked documents, to our knowledge OSF has not disputed the authenticity of these or other documents leaked on the site. Each document cited in this report appears internally consistent and consistent with other leaked documents and public OSF documents that were reviewed.

In the specific case of leaked emails attributed to former Secretary of State Colin Powell that were posted on DCLeaks.com—which are unrelated to OSF—Secretary Powell has confirmed their authenticity.[45]

Curiously, whoever has since taken over the website to archive it as "part of the historical record" has chosen to point the banner's "Learn more" link to the Moscow Project, "an initiative of the Center for American Progress Action Fund." The Center for American Progress Action Fund was established by John Podesta, George Soros, and Morton Halperin (from the Open Society Institute).[46] Less curiously, many of the leaked OSF documents are no longer available on DCLeaks.com as of July 2020. Questions submitted to the email address provided on the website have received no response to date.

[45] Tom Winter, Andrea Mitchell, and Cassandra Vinograd, "Colin Powell Slammed Trump as 'National Disgrace,' Called Clinton 'Greedy,' in Hacked Emails," NBC News, September 14, 2016, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/colin-powell-calls-trump-national-disgrace-hacked-emails-n648011.

[46] InfluenceWatch, "Center for American Progress Action Fund (CAP Action)," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/center-for-american-progress-cap-action/.

Appendix B: OSF Grants for the European Elections 2014 Projects[47]

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
Europe on Track	EU-wide	Mobilize university student voters	15,598
LGBT Mob-Watch Italy-Europe 2014	Italy	Mobilize LGBT Italian voters	99,690
Bite The Ballot	U.K.	Register "young people" voters	138,634
Combattre l'islamophobie politique (fighting political islamophobia)	France	Mobilize Muslim voters	49,882
Disclosing Hate Speech and Discrimination	Croatia	Mobilize ambivalent voters against "xenophobic, racist, and other radical political options"	46,840
Vote-Up!	France	Mobilize youth voters	19,400
Operation Vote	Italy	Mobilize EU expats in Italy to vote in Italian elections	46,090
Höj Rösten (raise your voice)	Sweden	Mobilize anti-xenophobic, anti-nationalist voters	25,000
Vote for the Voiceless: Amplifying the Voices of the Powerless	EU-Wide	Mobilize "young people" voters	49,500
Romanians Vote for Europe	EU-Wide	Mobilize Roma voters	41,250
The Raval Project	Spain	Mobilize migrant voters	24,973
It's About You	Hungary	Mobilize LGBT voters	39,580
Facebook Marketing Campaign for EUVOX 2014	10 Central European countries	Mobilize "young people" voters	22,225
I Do Care	Lithuania	Mobilize "young people" voters	9,723
Our Elections—Our Europe	Greece, Hungary, Italy, U.K.	Mobilize "young people" voters	49,663
Piloting Immigrant Citizenship Campaigns Across Europe	11 EU countries	Mobilize immigrant voters	80,073
Ligue des jeunes électeurs (league of young voters)	France	Mobilize "young people" voters	39,726
My Vote Matters	U.K.	Mobilize migrant-worker voters	12,917
Vote Europe!	U.K.	Mobilize Hungarian expat voters in U.K.	24,800
Voter mobilization and information campaign	EU-Wide	Mobilize Czech voters across EU, especially among "young people"	30,000
Youth Voice at European Elections	Slovenia	Mobilize "young people" voters	9,840

[47] Open Society Initiative for Europe (OSIFE), "List of European Elections 2014 Projects," Open Society Foundations, October 17, 2014, archived at https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/OSIFE-List-of-European-elections-2014-Projects.pdf. Downloaded from DCLeaks.com.

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
Open EU 2014	EU-Wide	Publish articles against "hate speech" and "intolerant rhetoric" in local outlets	130,992
Radical Democracy for Europe	EU-Wide	Involve media-makers (e.g., video and animation artists) in election debate	261,619
Towards a European Parliament Committed to Transparency and Accountability	EU-Wide	Promote a campaign pledge against "excessive lobbying influence"	150,000
Per i diritti, contro la xenophobia (campaign for rights, against xenophobia)	Italy	Lobby candidates about the rights of Roma, Sinti, migrants, and detained persons	49,782
Naming and Shaming Populism in EP Election Campaign	Belgium, Germany, France, Netherlands	Fact-checking, hate-speech monitoring, and public debates to shape political campaigns	49,930
Platform for Voice	Greece, Netherlands, U.K.	Monitor and micro-target candidates and parties who use xenophobic speech	49,930
Analyzing and reporting the 2014 European elections and countering extremist and populist political voices in Hungary	Hungary	Reports political party activity throughout the election	35,000
Vote for Your Rights	Greece	Lobby and advocate for LGBTQ inclusivity representation	26,000
Pas de quartiers pour les clichés !	France	Reports news coverage of all applicable elections	49,467
Women's Shadow Cabinet in Hungary	Hungary	Mobilize women involvement in politics and the election	49,515
Combattre l'islamophobie politique (fighting political islamophobia)	France	Mobilize people voters	49,882
EP elections 2014—disclosing hate speech and discrimination	Hungary	Blaming and shaming campaigns	46,840
Campaign "Höj Rösten" - raise your voice	Sweden	Mobilize voters	25,000
Mobilizing the vote through social media in 2014	France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Netherlands, Ukraine	Mobilize voters	129,484
Open EU 2014—extension	EU-wide	Reporting news coverage of elections	29,353
Europeans Abroad Vote 2014 (#EAV2014)	Global	Increase voter participation	20,000
LYV - Comparison of Manifestos Online Tool	EU-wide	Make election manifestos accessible to young voters	27,770
Changing the Rules of Finance in Europe is Essential for Democracy	Belgium, Denmark, France, and Netherlands	"Ensure that media coverage of the EU elections reflects their priority of 'making finance serve society'"	175,576

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
European Elections 2014: Countering the Rise of Hate-Speech	Romania	Testing the effects of the presence of hate speech on the elections	91,500
Romanians vote for Europe	EU-wide	Motivate and educate voters	41,250
Political Agenda Setting: Reclaiming Democracy	Hungary	Send out positive messages of open society values, while also encouraging undecided voters to get out and take part in the elections	49,843
Placing anti-racism and antidiscrimination on the pre and post electoral agenda	Greece	Sensitize public opinion on racism and identify them in election agendas	33,200
″It's about you″—LGBT people and their rights in the 2014 elections in Hungary	Hungary	Monitoring and responding to hate-speech incidents during the election campaign	39,580
Check the facts—Mind the Gap	Austria	Activities encompass a collection and analysis of hate speech in Austrian election campaigns, workshops to develop communication materials using humor and satire, and the production and dissemination of a video clip entitled “We check the facts!”	49,500
EUVOX 2014	EU-wide	Communicate positions of candidates in the election	117,280
Facebook Marketing Campaign for EUVOX 2014	Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Croatia, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania	Extend work of EUVOX 2014	22,225
Dealing with Skepticism: Understanding pro- and anti-EU attitudes of voters	EU-wide	Research voter engagement	15,000
Vote! Vote! Vote!	EU-wide	Increase voter participation	48,558
WomenZone EU	U.K.	Support women voter engagement	15,040
Vote Abroad: Mobilizing Bulgarian Citizens for the European Elections 2014	EU-wide	Mobilizing Voters	34,901
Aspire	U.K.	Mobilize voters	49,810
Defining the stakes of the EP elections	EU-wide	Expose the activities of the far-right political forces	95,228

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
Empowering voters through VoteMatch Europe and Information Meetings	Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Italy, Latvia, Netherlands, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain and U.K.	Mobilize voters	217,249
iChange Europe	Denmark and surrounding countries	Communication platform for voter groups	24,800
List of shame—The voice of the democratic people	Hungary	Advertise xenophobic political actors-including those in the election	44,664
List of shame—The voice of the democratic people II (2014)	Hungary	Advertise xenophobic political actors-including those in the election	18,400
Workshop for media experts on the link between news coverage and populist, xenophobic and Eurosceptical movements	Spain	Report election news	27,049
Making every voice count: Elections in the Netherlands 2014	Netherlands	Increase participation of underrepresented groups in pollical processes	100,000
Your Vote, Your Choice: voter mobilization campaign before EU elections in Poland, U.K. and Ireland	Ireland, Poland, U.K.	Voter mobilization	10,000
Pinocchio's Election Campaign 2014	EU-wide	Fact-check election information	10,000
Public Loss, Private Gain	Netherlands, Italy	Policy advocacy	150,000
Bringing Accountability to the European Vote in Latvia: Voters Memory Project	Latvia	Election information communication campaign	65,000
Bringing Accountability to the European Vote in Latvia: Scale Up of Voters Memory Project	Latvia	Boost the campaign	13,320
European Parliament Integrity Watch—European Elections 2014	Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Croatia, Italy, Slovenia, Slovakia	Access integrity of elected	122,000
Let's demand equality! Local community mobilization for a racism-free European Parliament	EU-wide	Aims to counter the election MEPs from populist and far-right parties in Europe	100,000

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
Reaching out to voters ahead of the 2014 European Parliament elections (phase 2)	EU-wide	Develop a voting advice application for all 28 EU countries, but rather than looking at election promises expressed	148,500
MovEurope2014!	Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France, Hungary, Croatia, Italy, Netherlands, Slovakia	Implement the project MovEurope2014!, which aims at raising awareness among (young) citizens on the upcoming EU elections	49,270
League of Young Voters II	EU-wide	Encourage young people to actively engage in political processes, focusing on the 2014 European Parliamentary Elections	237,000
European Election Project: wepromise.eu	EU-wide	Bring digital civil rights issues onto the agenda of the 2014 European Parliament election campaigns of all political parties	17,000
Participatory elections	Romania	Enable greater public scrutiny of the elections and to develop sanctioning mechanisms of extremist political messages and debates	17,057
Advancing citizenship and participation to election in the PACA region, France	France	Voter mobilization	23,542
Unity is our only option	Sweden	Political activism regarding election	25,000
2014 Municipal Election Survey—Ile de France regio	France	Examine how they are represented and received at the next elections	8,790
Civil Journalism	Hungary	Report election news (journalism)	49,500
train your politician!	Hungary	Voter mobilization	180,000
Fiscal Impact Assessments of Political Parties Running at the 2014 Parliamentary Elections	Hungary	Assess campaign financials	23,000
Joint Civil Action for Fair Elections	Italy	"The project focuses on the European elections period and its immediate aftermath"	26,100
Politeia Romanì—Romanì Citizenship	Italy	Raise awareness and improve active Roma's participation to political life; strengthen participation in the upcoming European elections	25,000
Mobilizing MEPs in the European Parliament	EU-wide	Strengthen ENAR's communication and advocacy skills vis-à-vis the European Parliament, especially in view of the upcoming EP election in May 2014	49,900

Project	Countries	Project Description	Amount (U.S. Dollars)
Minority Women - Equal Votes - Equal Voices. Mentoring for Change in view of the 2014 European elections (follow-up)	EU-wide	Empower ethnic minority women and women of migrant background ahead of the May 2014 European election	98,465
HOPE Camp	U.K., France, Hungary Netherlands, Spain	Provide a community organizers training program for local antihate organizations, especially those wishing to engage in the 2014 European elections	93,740
Campaign to counter the growth of xenophobia and far-right groups in 2014 European and Municipal elections	France	Engage and counter racist/xenophobic elements of the election	66,050
Intervention program in the Catalan municipalities against the racist and xenophobic discourse in the upcoming elections	Spain	Reduce racist and xenophobic votes in the election	80,000

The Faces Behind the Migrant Caravans

Jon Rodeback

Summary: Three U.S.-based organizations—Pueblo Sin Fronteras, La Familia Latina Unida, and the Centro Sin Fronteras—appear to have played key roles in organizing and otherwise assisting the "caravans" of immigrants. Following the money trail appears to lead back to George Soros's well-funded Open Society Foundations, which are trying to advance his Open Society ideas throughout the world. Much is unknown and uncertain about their involvement, but it deserves thorough investigation.

U.S. Customs and Border Patrol agents took Jakelin Amei Rosmery Caal Maquin, a seven-year-old Guatemalan girl, and her father, Nery Gilberto Caal Cuz, into custody in "a remote stretch of the New Mexico desert" around 10 p.m. on December 6, 2018. They were in a group of 163 illegal immigrants who surrendered to U.S. agents that night.

Seven hours later she and her father boarded a bus to the nearest Border Patrol station. She soon began vomiting and had stopped breathing by the end of the 90-minute drive. Emergency medical technicians revived her, and she was flown to a hospital in El Paso, Texas, where she died the following day. The *Washington Post* reported that she died of dehydration and exhaustion.[1] An autopsy later determined that she died of a rapidly progressing infection that caused "multiple organ dysfunction and death."[2]

Her death was a tragedy—an avoidable tragedy.

Jakelin quickly became the face of the caravans as the media decried her death.

But who *should* have been the face of the caravans? How and why did Jakelin arrive in the New Mexico desert? It's a long way from Guatemala to New Mexico. Who encouraged it? Who financed the travel? Who facilitated it?

The Organizers

Beyond the politicians and activists flocking to the television cameras to express outrage at the tragedy, blame the opposition, and deflect personal and legal responsibility for the broken U.S. immigration system, the names of three organizations kept popping up as the story developed: Pueblo Sin Fronteras, La Familia Latina Unida, and the Centro Sin Fronteras.[3] (There are likely more organizations that have successfully stayed under the radar.)

---

[1] https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/7-year-old-migrant-girl-taken-into-border-patrol-custody-dies-of-dehydration-exhaustion/2018/12/13/8909e356-ff03-11e8-862a-b6a6f3ce8199_story.html.
[2] https://www.cnn.com/2019/03/29/us/guatemala-jakelin-caal-maquin-autopsy/index.html.
[3] https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/who-s-behind-migrant-caravan-drew-trump-s-ire-n862566; https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/pueblo-sin-fronteras/; https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/la-familia-latina-unida/; and https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/centro-sin-fronteras/.

While representatives of Pueblo Sin Fronteras initially denied involvement in the caravan. Denis Omar Contreras and Rodrigo Abeja, two activists from Pueblo Sin Fronteras were embedded in the caravan and appear to have played key roles in organizing and leading it.[4] NBC News reported in April 2018 that "volunteers from Pueblos Sin Fronteras and other groups accompany migrants in a caravan that travels in buses, on trains and on foot."[5]

Pueblo Sin Fronteras (People Without Borders) apparently started as a project of the now defunct 501(c)(4) La Familia Latina Unida.[6] It has a history of organizing groups of migrants to travel from Latin America to the United States and Mexico.[7] In 2018, it reportedly organized multiple caravans—including a "caravan" of more than 1,000 immigrants, which had at least 300 minors—to emigrate to the United States and Mexico, legally or illegally. In this effort, it worked closely with the CARA Family Detention Pro Bono Project.[8] Reportedly, much of CARA's funding comes from individual donations funneled through Freedom for Immigrants, a 501(c)(3) organization that operates in California.[9]

La Familia Latina Unida (The United Latin Family) was a Chicago-based advocacy group for illegal immigration formed in 2001. It was founded by Elvira Arellano,[10] co-chair of Centro Sin Fronteras, but has apparently since ceased operations.

The Centro Sin Fronteras (Center Without Borders), a 501(c)(3) activist group that advocates for illegal immigrants. It was founded in 1987 by Emma Lozano, a pastor at the Lincoln United Methodist Church.[11]

All three organizations used the Lincoln United Methodist Church in Chicago as a base of operations.

The CARA Family Detention Pro Bono Project was created in response to the Obama administration's 2014 decision to create detention facilities to house illegal immigrants and asylums seekers from Central America. It is a joint operation of the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, the American Immigration Council, the Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services, and the American Immigration Lawyers Association.

At least three of the four members of the CARA Family Detention Pro Bono Project receive "significant funding from (or otherwise have financial associations with) the Foundation to Promote Open Society," a component of Open Society Foundations.[12] The organizations have

---

[4] https://www.jornada.com.mx/ultimas/politica/2018/10/22/caravana-migrante-acuerda-continuar-su-viaje-por-mexico-9523.html; and http://www.theswcsun.com/border-angels-pueblo-sin-fronteras-link-to-help-asylum-seekers-find-safety-in-the-u-s/.
[5] https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/who-s-behind-migrant-caravan-drew-trump-s-ire-n862566.
[6] https://capitalresearch.org/article/the-open-border-activists-behind-the-illegal-immigrant-caravans/.
[7] https://www.protocolmagazine.org/post/2018/05/12/pueblo-sin-fronteras.
[8] https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/cara-family-detention-project/.
[9] https://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/en-espanol/sdhoy-pueblo-sin-fronteras-usa-caravanas-para-iluminar-la-dificil-situacion-de-los-migrantes-pero-ha-fraca-20181206-story.html.
[10] https://www.influencewatch.org/person/elvira-arellano/.
[11] https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/centro-sin-fronteras/.
[12] https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/cara-family-detention-project/.

also been funded by several major left-of-center foundations, including the MacArthur Foundation, Ford Foundation, and Carnegie Corporation of New York.

The Soros Nexus

Enter George Soros, the Hungarian-American billionaire with his own distinct view of how the world should operate. Growing up in Nazi-occupied Hungary and behind the Iron Curtain, he developed a hatred for totalitarian governments, bureaucracy, and government control in general. Along the way to earning his billions he developed his open society philosophy—which is far

George Soros's Thinking

Over the years, George Soros developed a theory of reflexivity that has guided his investments and his philanthropy. While studying at the London School of Economics, he was greatly influenced by philosopher Karl Potter's idea of the "open society." The following quotes and paraphrases highlight some aspects of Soros's philosophy:

> Soros's theory of reflexivity focuses on "the gap between perception and reality" and explains why markets can at times "tend toward excesses" rather than equilibrium.
>
> "Each form of social organization was found wanting in something that could be found only in its opposite: totalitarian society lacked freedom; Open Society lacked stability."
>
> Freedom and stability have an inverse relationship in politics: "Given our innate bias, a stable equilibrium between the two is just as unlikely to be attained as a stable equilibrium in a free market."
>
> "Permanent and perfect solutions are beyond our reach."
>
> "Temporary solutions are much better than none at all."
>
> International capitalism "favors the haves over the have nots."
>
> International capitalism will collapse because "in its present form [it] has proven itself inherently unstable because it lacks adequate regulation."
>
> Chinese "state capitalism" economic model is a novel and perhaps even desirable approach to economics.
>
> Soros argues, "the spread of market values into all areas of life is endangering our open and democratic society" and that "the main enemy of the open society," is no longer communism but rather capitalism.

Source: InfluenceWatch, "George Soros" https://www.influencewatch.org/person/george-soros/ and "Open Society Foundations," https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-foundations/.

too involved a topic for discussion here—and has donated most of his wealth (more than $32 billion)[13] to his Open Society Foundations (OSF) to advance his open society philosophy.

Soros is not the Bond villain that some critics see—he is too intelligent and too complex a character to fit into such a limited role. Nor is he the evil capitalist counterrevolutionary that Vladimir Putin has caricatured,[14] nor is he a friend of Western liberal democracy.

Soros and his foundations have clearly been disruptive influences on political systems. Soros is generally credited with playing a significant role in the "color revolutions" of 2004–2005 that toppled governments in the former Soviet republics of Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Ukraine[15] and threatened neighboring governments, not least the Putin regime in the Russian Federation. OSF activities have also incurred the wrath of the Hungarian government, which expelled them. More recently, the network of Open Society organizations has influenced elections throughout Europe.

Open borders (unrestricted immigration) is a key component of George Soros's open society philosophy and the Open Society network of nonprofit foundations.

In Europe, Soros and his foundations have effectively sought to erase national borders and identities and appear to have facilitated the European refugee crisis (2015–2017). He personally called on the European Union to deal with the crisis by opening its borders even more and going further into debt to finance a "Marshall Plan for Africa."[16]

Interestingly, a leaked internal OSF document[17] indicates that OSF's International Migration Initiative provided 40 grants totaling more than $8 million to 22 organizations during 2014–2016. Almost half ($3.7 million) went to organizations working on migrant and refugee issues in the "Asia/Middle East corridor" and the "Central America/Mexico corridor." (Note: This document and the leaked memorandum cited below were released through DC Leaks, which is accused of being a front for Russian military intelligence. Nevertheless, despite their dubious provenances, they appear genuine and reliable.)

Closer to his adopted home country, Soros's involvement in "opposing laws limiting legal and illegal immigration" began at least as early as 1996, when he provided $50 million to create the Emma Lazarus Fund.[18] The Lazarus Fund, later folded into his OSF network, directly and indirectly funded many other groups supporting illegal immigration into the U.S. and elsewhere ever since, according to Rachel Ehrenheld of the American Center for Democracy.[19]

---

[13] https://dailycaller.com/2017/10/17/soros-transfers-18-billion-to-his-open-society-foundations/; and https://www.influencewatch.org/non-profit/open-society-foundations/.
[14] https://www.cnbc.com/2018/07/16/i-hold-both-countries-responsible-here-is-the-full-transcript-of-tr.html.
[15] https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/10/10/whos-afraid-of-george-soros/.
[16] https://dailycaller.com/2018/05/30/george-soros-europe-refugee-crisis-keep-borders-open/.
[17] https://archive.org/stream/321383374OpenSocietyFoundationsInternationalMigrationInitiativeMigrationGovernan/321383374-Open-Society-Foundations-International-Migration-Initiative-Migration-Governance-and-Enforcement-Portfolio-Review_djvu.txt.
[18] https://www.nytimes.com/1996/10/01/us/philanthropist-pledges-help-to-immigrants.html.
[19] https://wtpotus.wordpress.com/2010/09/26/george-soros-agenda-for-drug-legalization-death-and-welfare/#more-5220; and http://acdemocracy.org/soross-victimhood/.

In recent years, OSF has given millions of dollars to other organizations that directly assisted the caravans with fundraising, legal assistance, and media support.[20] These organizations included the American Constitution Society, Centro para la Acción Legal en Derechos Humanos (Center for Legal Action in Human Rights), Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, Amnesty International, National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild, Center for Constitutional Rights, Human Rights First, and Church World Service.

U.S.-based OSF components have money to burn thanks to Soros. A leaked memorandum to the Open Society U.S. Programs Board dated August 29, 2013, proposed a programmatic budget of *$100 million* plus a reserve fund of $25 million.[21] It's good to be a billionaire's nonprofit.

While the linkages between OSF and Pueblo Sin Fronteras, La Familia Latina Unida, and Centro Sin Fronteras are still nebulous, using illegal immigrants as pawns to overwhelm national borders and agitate for open borders is of a piece with Soros's initiatives to create a global open society.

"Spontaneous" Migrations

Open Society Foundations are extremely active in Latin America, having spent more than $100 million in 2015–2017, with another $36 million budgeted for 2018, to influence societies, politics, and economics in the region.[22] OSF intervention in Latin America also coincided with the "pink tide," a wave of new left-wing governments throughout much of Latin America.

Guatemala, in particular, seems to have attracted OSF's attention, likely because it elected a conservative populist president in 2016. In fact, OSF dispersed millions in grants to Guatemala-based organizations that support various aspects of the Soros philosophy, including open borders.[23] Judicial Watch has identified at least 14 organizations active in Guatemala that received funding from both OSF and the U.S. government. This raises the question of whether OSF was using these organizations to redirect U.S. funding toward Soros's objectives.

It is in this environment that the 2018 caravans assembled. The 2018 caravans were the latest waves of an ongoing migration that nonprofits have been facilitating for at least 15 years. In 2018, political unrest in Honduras after the rigged presidential election contributed to larger numbers of Hondurans deciding to migrate.

Despite claims that the caravans were spontaneous migrations, the involvement of U.S. and Latin American activist organizations suggests otherwise. Referencing a caravan that started in San Pedro Sula in northern Honduras, Guatemalan officials were more blunt, stating that it was an "elaborately planned" migration that had been infiltrated by a number of aliens from Special Interest Countries (countries with ties to terrorism, such as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Angola),

---

[20] https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/soros-judicial-watch-special-report-open-society-foundations-2018/.
[21] https://capitalresearch.org/app/uploads/Open-Society-U.S.-Programs-Board-Meeting-September-3-4-2013.pdf.
[22] https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/uploads/664f9d73-bbe3-4de1-a4c7-af205ab75477/open-society-foundations-2018-budget-overview-20181107.pdf.
[23] https://www.judicialwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/JudicialWatchSpecialReportSorosGT17April2018.pdf.

MS-13 gang members, and other criminals. Guatemalan President Jimmy Morales and other officials explicitly blamed "Leftist organizations" for the caravans.[24] The extent to which the officials' own political interests colored their statements is unknown.

Indeed, media narratives of desperate migrants—including many women and children—spontaneously deciding to flee their homes appear naive. Granted, NBC News reported that members of one caravan in April 2018 were overwhelmingly Honduran and included 400 women and 300 minors.[25] Yet in October, Judicial Watch investigators came across "a rowdy group of about 600 men" marching north near Chiquimula, Guatemalan, seeking jobs in the United States[26]—not exactly poster children fleeing unrest at home.

More Questions

Again, the linkages from the caravans back to OSF and Soros are unproven, but there are credible grounds for suspicions, with the added concern that U.S. government funding was co-opted for OSF purposes. Especially during the Obama administration there was considerable overlap between OSF grants and U.S. government funding of Guatemalan organizations.

At the very least, Congress should audit government funding that went to organizations also funded by the Open Society Foundations to ensure that the U.S. funding was used as intended.

Similarly, the executive branch should investigate whether U.S.-based nonprofits conspired to break U.S. laws or the laws of any Latin American countries and prosecute any serious violations.

The author is grateful to Chris Hull, Hayden Ludwig, and the InfluenceWatch staff for their research that provided much of the foundation for this chapter.

[24] https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/soros-judicial-watch-special-report-open-society-foundations-2018/.
[25] https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/who-s-behind-migrant-caravan-drew-trump-s-ire-n862566.
[26] https://www.judicialwatch.org/documents/soros-judicial-watch-special-report-open-society-foundations-2018/.

About the Authors

Shane Devine is a Research Assistant at Capital Research Center.

Jon Rodeback is Managing Editor and Director of Content at the Capital Research Center.

About the Capital Research Center

The Capital Research Center (CRC) was founded as a watchdog on the nonprofit world. Now in our fourth decade as a think tank based in Washington, D.C., CRC investigates those trying to influence the public policy process—organizations, activists, funders, the media, and policymakers. As America's investigative think tank, we connect the dots to help the public understand how special interests are protected.

Today, we study unions, environmentalist groups, and a wide variety of nonprofit and activist organizations. We also keep an eye on crony capitalists who seek to profit by taking advantage of government regulations and by getting their hands on taxpayers' money. Our investigative researchers work to produce ironclad research developed into effective communications products deployed for maximum, real-world impact. CRC distributes our research across multiple content streams, including print (books, reports, and a regular magazine), online on our main website (CapitalResearch.org) and multiple microsites, traditional media outreach, educational videos and documentaries, and major social media channels.

We do have a specific point of view. We believe in free markets, Constitutional government, and individual liberty. But facts are facts, and our journalists and researchers go where the facts lead them. CRC is tax-exempt and fiercely independent. We perform no contract work, and we accept no government funds. Our work is supported entirely by individual donors, foundations, and corporations.

CAPITAL RESEARCH CENTER
AMERICA'S INVESTIGATIVE THINK TANK

1513 16th Street NW, Washington, DC 20036 | 202.483.6900 | capitalresearch.org