BARACK H. OBAMA

THE UNAUTHORIZED BIOGRAPHY

Webster Griffin Tarpley

ProgRESSive

2008

BARACK H. OBAMA: THE UNAUTHORIZED BIOGRAPHY

Copyright © Webster Griffin Tarpley, 2008
All Rights Reserved

Published by Progressive Press
P.O. Box 126, Joshua Tree, Calif. 92252,
www.ProgressivePress.com

Length: 264,000 words.

Typeset left-justified in 11 pt. Times New Roman, for optimum value and ease of reading.

Classification: Nonfiction, Politics, Biography
ISBN: 0-930852-91-5. EAN: 978-0-930852-91-7

DIGITAL
ADVANCE
REVIEW
EDITION
September 2008

Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Tarpley, Webster Griffin
Barack H. Obama: the unauthorized biography / Webster Griffin Tarpley
ISBN-13: 978-0-930852-91-7 (Digital), 978-0-930852-81-8 (Offset edition)
1. Obama, Barack. 2. Presidential candidates – United States.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION: OBAMA FROM THE FORD FOUNDATION TO THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION 4

CHAPTER I: OBAMA'S ROOTS IN POLYGAMY AND THE FORD FOUNDATION..... 12

CHAPTER II: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND RECRUITMENT BY ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI 37

CHAPTER III: FOUNDATION-FUNDED RACISM IN CHICAGO: JEREMIAH WRIGHT AND MICHELLE 91

CHAPTER IV: APPRENTICESHIP WITH FOUNDATION-FUNDED TERRORISTS: AYERS AND DOHRN 134

CHAPTER V: OBAMA'S HEART OF DARKNESS: REZKO, AUCHI, ALSAMMARAE, AND CHICAGO GRAFT 182

CHAPTER VI: GRABBING A SENATE SEAT WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM HIS TRILATERAL FRIENDS 215

CHAPTER VII: THE HOPE POPE AND HIS TRILATERAL MONEY MACHINE..... 265

CHAPTER VIII: "OUR SOULS ARE BROKEN" – "FEEL, DON'T THINK! BE VISCERAL!" – MICHELLE OBAMA, POSTMODERN FASCIST IDEOLOGUE 287

CHAPTER IX: OBAMA'S TRIUMPH OF THE WILL: THE 2008 PRIMARIES 309

CHAPTER X: OBAMA: A LOOMING WORLD TRAGEDY 369

CHAPTER XI: OBAMA AS SOCIAL FASCIST 393

APPENDICES 415

NOTES 426

INTRODUCTION: OBAMA FROM THE FORD FOUNDATION TO THE TRILATERAL COMMISSION

> You know, I've come to the conclusion that poverty is closer to the root of the problem than color. – Robert F. Kennedy, 1968

This book marks my first foray into the field of presidential candidate biography since the publication of my *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* (1992). I have been impelled to return to the business of presidential candidate biography by a profound sense of alarm and national emergency, because of the threat to the American people and to the future survival of the world posed by the Trilateral Commission puppet and Manchurian candidate, Barack Hussein Obama. During the early months of 2008, I issued a series of articles which analyzed the dynamics of Obama's postmodern coup d'état from the standpoint of comparing the Illinois Messiah's lemming legions and Kool-Aid cult fanatic following with the incipient and inchoate fascist movement which coalesced around the young Benito Mussolini between 1919 and 1922, in a period of crisis similar to the one we are traversing today. These articles were supplemented by a theoretical introduction restating the basic characteristics of a fascist mass movement, and also by an extended comparison between Obama's campaign platform and the record in office of Jimmy Carter, who is the most recent example of a puppet president controlled by the Trilateral-Rockefeller banking elite. I also benefited from valuable contributions from my friends Bruce Marshall and Jonathan Mowat.

The resulting book was entitled *Obama the Postmodern Coup: the Making of a Manchurian Candidate*, and was offered to the public for the first time on Monday, April 7, 2008, thanks to the superlative efforts of the eminent publisher John Leonard of Progressive Press in California. Our original intention had been to include a biography of the mystery candidate Barack Hussein Obama, but in the end we decided that it was better to issue a first volume well in advance of the April 22 Pennsylvania primary. Now, a few months later, we are delivering a second installment in the continuing process of exposing and unmasking the enigmatic Messiah Obama. We ask for the reader's indulgence for the fact that this book had to be assembled in haste, but we are confident that it contains the concepts necessary to understanding the threat posed by Obama, from the standpoint of elementary class consciousness.

THE ONLY STUDY BASED ON AN EXPLICIT CLASS ANALYSIS OF ELITISTS VS. WORKING PEOPLE

The 2008 campaign has been remarkable for having had the great merit of focusing attention on the issue of class, elitism, and oligarchy, with Obama furnishing the obvious villain on the elitist side. This book is a product of the anti-oligarchical or American school of historical writing. The analysis is conducted from the standpoint of the New Deal tradition. Class consciousness as used here means first of all the method exemplified by Plato in his *Republic*, above all awareness of the abuses of the one (tyranny), the few (oligarchy), and the many (mob rule or ochlocracy). Our world is generally a world of oligarchy, which is now threatening to pass through an interlude of mob rule and then into tyranny. This book is also based on the class analysis of Machiavelli's *Discourses*, which is infinitely superior to that of Marx. In Machiavelli's terms, the Obama campaign is a project of the nobility (*gentiluomini*) and the urban bankers (*ottimati* or *patrizi*, in Britain as well as the US) to mobilize the city mob, especially excitable youth (*plebe*) against the middle class (*popolo*), under extreme crisis conditions. This book is also founded on the experience of the

Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal as the most recent successful historical model in how to organize the American people to deal with a world economic depression.

A critical unauthorized biography of Senator Barack Hussein Obama is all the more urgent today because nothing competent in this line has been forthcoming so far. Back in 1991, when I began writing the unauthorized biography of George Bush the elder, I found that the biographical literature about the candidate was rather limited. There was a campaign biography from 1980, a campaign biography from 1988, and some biographical essays for 1992. These had all been generated from Bush family documents and printouts. There were also a limited number of critical studies, which were either very brief, incomplete, or useless for other reasons. Another biography of Bush the Elder which appeared after the election turned out to be just another cover-up. But all in all, the biographical literature was relatively limited, and there were no real autobiographies, memoirs or books written by the candidate.

With Obama, the picture is radically different. Obama is a word-monger. The candidate himself claims to be the author of not one but two books, although it is clear that he has had much help from the ghost-writing staff of the Trilateral-Bilderberg combine. The first is a long autobiographical memoir entitled *Dreams from My Father*, which Obama sent into the world back in 1995. This book documents Obama's obsession with the polygamous Kenyan father who showed no interest in him, with race and racism, and above all with himself. It is a document which already suggests that the author is not just a racist, but also a deeply troubled existentialist megalomaniac, since it is surely a rare man who writes his own autobiography before he has reached the age of 35, when he still has accomplished absolutely nothing. This is the book which we define as Obama's postmodern *Mein Kampf*. Obama is also the author of a more conventional catalog of campaign-oriented political positions *The Audacity of Hope*, with its title drawn from one of the ranting sermons of Obama's racist guru and hatemeister, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright.

1995: DREAMS FROM MY FATHER – OBAMA'S POSTMODERN MEIN KAMPF

The first time I heard Obama speak, the first words that passed through my mind were, "slippery as an eel." This is the main problem with the things that Obama himself has written, as well as with his campaign in general. Both books written by Obama make it their primary business to deceive the reader, for obvious purposes of political gain. *Dreams* is designed to mislead about the candidate himself, while *The Audacity of Hope* seeks to muddy the waters concerning his political ideas and policies. Far too often the audacity of hope that we are promised turns out to be nothing more than the mendacity of dope, on the part of a candidate whose mental impairment owing to narcotics abuse during his college years is certainly comparable to that of the notorious George W. Bush — as we can see in Obama's striking inability to speak coherently in the absence of the glass plates of a Teleprompter sitting in front of his nose.

The Audacity of Hope has been described by the reactionary Ann Coulter as Obama's dime-store *Mein Kampf*. This is accurate in at least one way, since both books deal with the quest for racial identity and the need to overcome the various barriers to the assertion of that identity. Well before Miss Coulter had come on the scene, I had published an article on the Internet referring to Obama's postmodern *Mein Kampf*, which represents a more exact description of Obama's actual ideology and world outlook, which is that of an existentialist reader of the Third World pro-terrorist ideologue, Frantz Fanon. Obama's book is also an attempt to capitalize on the popularity of Alex Haley's *Roots*. Obama's memoir may thus be described as *Roots* lite, but with the identity trip being carried out by a Fanon-style existentialist.

THE MENDACITY OF DOPE

But the books by Obama himself are only the beginning of the cloud of obfuscation and deception which envelops the Perfect Master. There are easily two dozen biographical studies of the Illinois Senator, and they are almost without exception characterized by fawning adulation, adolescent hero worship, and messianic hagiography. They add up to so many versions of the Life and Miracles of St. Barack the Good. I have found it easy to dispense with the vast majority of these meretricious and venal little books. One or two exceptions do stand out: there is, for example, Shelby Steele, a kind of black neocon, who makes many intelligent observations about Obama's character.

Then there are the hard-line neocon critics of Obama. Some of them have managed to perform an important public service by forcing the odious figures of the gangster Tony Rezko, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, the terrorist William Ayers, and the terrorist Bernardine Dohrn — all of whom belong to Obama's immediate social circle — into the public eye in the face of hysterical opposition by NBC, MSNBC, *The New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the other assorted media whores for Obama. But, for any task of analysis more complicated than the straight exposing and outing of Obama's rogues' gallery of personal friends and associates, the neocon methods break down and often lapse into absurdity. The biggest absurdities are that Obama is really a Moslem, or else that Obama is really a Marxist AND Communist.

We state emphatically here at the outset: Obama is a creature and puppet of finance capital and of the Wall Street bankers and investment bankers, as represented by the Trilateral Commission, Bilderberger Group, Council on Foreign Relations, Skull and Bones Society, Ford Foundation, and Chicago School of Friedmanite economics. The family business which Obama inherited from his mother (a Ford Foundation anthropologist and counterinsurgency operative who also worked for the World Bank and the US Agency for International Development) was to work for foundations. And this is what Obama has done in his life, working at various times for or with the Gamaliel Foundation, the Woods Fund, the Joyce Foundation, the Annenberg Foundation, and other foundations and entities which notoriously look to the Ford Foundation for guidance and leadership. Obama is best described as a foundation-bred counterinsurgent, that is to say an operative in the service of the US financier ruling class whose task it is to wreck and abort any positive outcomes that might be forthcoming from the political ferment which is shaking the globe, and above all from the deep political upsurge which is clearly at hand in this country.

Obama claims to be a uniter, but the simplest empirical survey will show that he is the most explosive divider seen in this country in decades, since he has succeeded in splitting both the Democratic Party and the US population in general according to the classic fault lines of white against black, black against Hispanic, black against Asian, black against Jewish, men against women, old against young, rich against poor. Having seen Obama accomplish all of this in less than a year and a half on the campaign trail, we can confidently predict that an Obama presidency would in all probability put the United States well on its way to civil war. Giving Obama and his financier controllers the White House would represent an act of national suicide for this country, with the most catastrophic implications for the world as a whole. This analysis is corroborated by the fact that Obama, alone among all the protagonists of the 2008 presidential contest, possesses either a postmodern fascist mass movement, or a very plausible facsimile thereof. These are the lemming legions who are not supporting a program of measures that the government might take, but who are hysterically loyal to and obsessed with Obama as a fantasy figure and charismatic savior – in other words, as an emerging fascist leader. As those who lived through Italy in 1922 and Germany in 1933 remind us in the writings they have left behind, there is simply no comparison between a normal, corrupt, bourgeois parliamentary regime and a fascist seizure of power. These

are qualitatively distinct, and set Obama apart from all of his competitors in a way that we can only ignore at our own very great peril.

The only way to conduct a satisfactory analysis of the Obama agitation is to use a class standpoint, rather than a racial criterion or an outlook based on gender. Obama is an operative for the finance oligarchs. The Democratic Party bureaucracy is supporting Obama and opposing Senator Clinton because this is the decree of Wall Street, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberger group, the Ford Foundation, Skull and Bones, the Chicago School, the Council on Foreign Relations, and other ruling class institutions. The Democratic Party bosses like Howard Dean and Donna Brazile are not supporting Obama because they care about what happens to black voters. The Democratic Party has proved repeatedly that it cares nothing whatever about the fate of black voters. At the same time, it is very naïve to assume that the explanation for the slander campaign of the controlled corporate media against Hillary Clinton is that the media whores for Obama are motivated by misogyny and hatred of women. That may be a factor in individual cases, but the main reason the controlled media are vilifying Senator Clinton is that they have been ordered by their Wall Street paymasters to do so. The main issues in this contest are class issues, and not racial or gender issues. Blue-collar working-class voters are not generally opposed to Obama because of race, but rather because they can sense in his elitism and condescension that he is a candidate loyal solely to the dictates of the financiers.

The phalanx of right-wing radio commentators who call themselves conservatives is attempting to portray Obama as an ultraliberal, "the most liberal senator in the Democratic Party," according to a study produced by *National Journal*. This is a very weak, tired, unconvincing way to deal with Obama, and it is ultimately a loser. This is not very scary, and to do justice to the horrifying reality of the Obama threat, it ought to be very scary indeed. To say that Obama is a liberal, as Rush Limbaugh incessantly does, is to say that he is just more of the same, from the same tired old playbook of Walter Mondale and Michael Dukakis. If Obama is just the latest liberal and there is nothing new under the sun, then ho-hum. This approach fatally underestimates how radically different and how extremely dangerous Obama really is. Sean Hannity does a little better with his mantra of "Stop the radical." But it soon turns out that this means radical liberal, which is also not going to launch a thousand ships against Obama.

The first instinct of most right-wingers is to look at Obama's middle name of Hussein, and perhaps at his Moslem father and step-father and at his time in school in Indonesia, and announce that Obama is a Moslem. But this will hardly do. Obama's father and step- father were united not by the Koran, but rather by their shared devotion to Johnny Walker, which increased as they got older. And if Obama himself were a secularized Moslem, so what? Voters have a right to know Obama's religious history in full detail, but there is no religious test for office. But Obama is something very sinister indeed. Obama himself is either an atheist, or much more likely a Satanist of the apostate Jeremiah Wright-James Cone-black liberation theology school, a Christian heresy which places racist hatred instead of charity at the center of its edifice of faith. Wright is ultimately the high priest of a death cult. Obama is, more precisely, an existentialist fascist made of equal parts 1969 Weatherman race war theory and Frantz Fanon's cult of violent Third World rebellion. This is what low-income blue collar voters in West Virginia have understood far better than all the effete snobs who profess postmodernism at Harvard.

The other approach is to paint Obama as a Marxist and communist, in the Cold War McCarthyite tradition. Here is an article by Dana Milbank, a decadent member of Skull and Bones who frequents the Keith Olberman *Grand Guignol* propaganda show on MSNBC-Obamavision, also known as the Brzezinski network. Milbank is a cynical cataloguer of the politically grotesque. The following is

Milbank's satire of a group of aging and rabid neocons who gathered recently in a Washington café to review the evidence that Obama was a communist, a Marxist, and a subversive. This group, assembled by America's Survival Inc., met in the basement of Ebenezer Coffee House at Second and F streets NE. Milbank writes:

> Here are some things we can look forward to learning about Barack Obama: that he was mentored in high school by a member of the Soviet-controlled Communist Party; that he launched his Illinois state Senate campaign in the home of a terrorist and a killer; that while serving as a state senator, he was a member of a socialist front group; that his affiliations are so dodgy that he would have trouble getting a government security clearance; that there is reason to doubt his "loyalty to the United States." "We believe that any public figure with links to foreign and hostile interests should be asked to explain those associations," the organizer, Cliff Kincaid, told about two dozen conservatives and a few reporters. "In the case of Obama, a relatively new figure on the national scene, we submit the facts suggest that he would have serious difficulty getting a security clearance in the United States government. An FBI background check was once used to examine one's character, loyalty to the United States, and associations." "He's a member of an organization [that is] openly a front for two socialist groups," reported another participant, Trevor Loudon. "Obama was raised and educated in a very Marxist-rich environment, which often would limit his worldview," reported a third, Max Friedman. But the star of the show was the ancient Herbert Romerstein, who once plied his trade for the Un-American Activities committee. "We decided to start going back and seeing what things influenced him even before he was born," Romerstein announced without a trace of irony, before tying Obama to the Communist Party of the 1930s in Hawaii and Soviet spies on the island. "This is the atmosphere that young Barack Obama grew up in." The smoking gun? Obama's "mentor" during his teens, according to Kincaid, was "a key member of a Soviet-controlled network that was sponsored by Moscow and active in Hawaii." "The Weather Underground terrorists," Romerstein added, "were instrumental in getting him into office in the first place." "It's clear that the communists and the socialists are backing him," Kincaid confirmed. It was beginning to sound like a UFO convention. But the panelists took it seriously, firing questions back at the audience. "Was Barack Obama working for Bill Ayers?" Kincaid wondered aloud. Romerstein demanded: "How come for 20 years he sat in the pews and listened to a raving anti-American racist? How did he bring his two young children to this church to hear Wright rave on?" The evidence was compelling enough for participant Friedman. For him, the Rosetta Stone was Obama's chief strategist, David Axelrod, who Friedman alleged was the protégé of a man with "a Communist Party-front record" in Chicago. "The more I look at this, I'm seeing there are a lot of red-diaper babies around here," he deduced. "By putting these pieces of the puzzle together, I'm beginning to see something much bigger." (Dana Milbank, "Obama as You've Never Known Him!" *Washington Post*, May 23, 2008.)

This treatment shows how easy it is for a lightweight elitist scribbler like Milbank to satirize these neocon critics of Milbank's Perfect Master. Even a superficial flack like Milbank has no trouble making these poor neocons look like relics from the hated and notorious House Un-American Activities Committee who are daring to pollute the sublime dream of today's golden youth.

Obama has only the vaguest echoes of his mother's vague devotion to old Karl Marx (the British agent whose case officer was David Urquhart of the British Foreign Office). Obama is most emphatically a product of the foundations and their cult of social manipulation and political subversion, but always in the service of a social order centered on Wall Street. Obama is himself an

operative of finance capital at the highest level. If his hardware comes from the Ford Foundation where his mother was employed, Obama's software comes from the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberger group, the Council on Foreign Relations, the RAND Corporation, Skull and Bones, the Chicago school of economics – in other words, the highest levels of the Anglo-American financier oligarchy. If Mussolini started off as an agent of the British and French embassies and of certain Venetian financiers, and Hitler began his career as an agent for German military intelligence, Obama's pedigree is the complex of institutions we have just stated. Obama is connected to Wall Street by a million adamantine threads. Obama's main controller, guru, adviser, and handler is none other than Zbigniew Brzezinski, the man who ran the catastrophic Trilateral administration of Jimmy Carter thirty years ago. Such is the reality of Obama as he emerges from these pages.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND IS INDISPENSABLE

In order to understand Obama and the congeries of foundation-funded racist and terrorist provocateurs and international gangsters who represent his immediate social circle, some significant historical background is indispensable. Obama's mother worked for the Ford Foundation, and Obama has worked for foundations like the Gamaliel, the Joyce, the Woods, and the Annenberg Chicago Challenge all his life. But what do foundations do? Emphatically, they do not practice good works of charity; they deal in cynical social and political manipulation in the service of the ruling class. So it is necessary to explain the strategic doctrine which has governed the activities of the US foundation community since the 1960s, especially in the framework of Reagan's Executive Order 12333, which privatized the US intelligence community into front companies, law firms, and especially foundations.

The public now knows that Obama attended Jeremiah Wright's church, where the incendiary doctrine of black liberation theology, a school atypical of the black church, is proclaimed. But where do Wright and his sidekicks Otis Moss III and Dwight Hopkins come from? Are they an authentic and spontaneous expression of the black church, or are they controlled assets deployed in a cynical divide-and-conquer strategy by foundations and divinity schools that represent the most parasitical interests in Wall Street? The historical approach is the only way to clarify these issues.

Obama claims to be an apostle of bipartisan cooperation and the transcendence of legislative wrangling and haggling. His background in this regard is real, but it is not what the public thinks. Obama is a product of the infamous Illinois bipartisan Combine, a joint venture by the Illinois Republican and Democratic Parties to savagely loot the people of that state. Obama's godfathers include not just corrupt machine pols like Mayor Daley and Governor Blagojevich, but also the Levantine gangsters and underworld figures Rezko, Auchi, and Alsammarae, all part of what the FBI has been probing under the heading of Operation Board Games. Obama's bosom buddy Rezko is now a convicted felon, having been found guilty on June 5, 2008 on 16 of 24 counts in Chicago federal court, including for scheming to get kickbacks out of money-management firms wanting state business, and a contractor who wanted to build a hospital in northern Illinois. Auchi and Alsammarae are also convicted felons. Obama's long history in graft and corruption make him the most corrupt and dirtiest presidential candidate in many decades.

Americans have now been told that the 1960s Weatherman terrorist bombers and provocateurs (and foundation operatives) Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn have sponsored Obama's career as a foundation asset and later as a holder of elective office. But what were the Weathermen? And, were Ayers and Dohrn honest revolutionaries who chose terrorism, or were they intelligence community operatives sent in to destroy the student movement and peace movement by taking over Students for

a Democratic Society (SDS) in the wake of the New York City teachers' strike, and then scuttling SDS from within, in a matter of months? Only historical background can clarify the question of how Obama's penchant for associating with known criminals makes him the most radical subversive ever to get this close to the presidency.

The public is being urged to regard Obama as a politician of phenomenal organizational ability because of his ability to game the absurd rules of the Democratic Party. But what if Obama had been a protected asset of Zbigniew Brzezinski and the Trilateral Commission since about 1981-1983, and a man whose entire career has been fostered and promoted by the Trilateral-Bilderberger Wall Street group? What if Obama's campaign ran on Rockefeller-Soros Trilateral cash, with the backing of the matchless Trilateral network of media whores and agents of influence? Here again, adequate historical background is necessary.

The last time that the Trilateral Commission fielded a relatively unknown puppet with the goal of seizing power through an insurgency based on surprise, the result was the catastrophic presidency of Jimmy Carter, who turned foreign affairs over to Brzezinski, while placing economic policy in the hands of Trilateral agent Paul Adolph Volcker, who destroyed what was left of the US industrial economy. Today Obama is attempting to profile himself as something of an economic populist. Only an appeal to history can show how today's Trilateral puppet Obama will go beyond yesterday's Trilateral puppet Carter, this time imposing austerity in the name of third world solidarity, sacrifice in the name of global warming, and perhaps even reparations for racism. As with Carter, the beneficiaries will be the Rockefeller-Soros Wall Street interests.

Obama promises hope and change, but his campaign bears uncanny similarities to the early days of Italian fascism in 1919-1922. Only historical background can show the many parallels between Obama and the young Mussolini.

This book is not an invitation to contemplation. It is a call to mobilize. At this writing, we are at the half-way point in a postmodern fascist coup in the United States. There is still time to prevent this coup from succeeding.

In January 1933, just before Hitler seized power, people in Germany were as careworn and overwhelmed and overstressed as many Americans feel today. A combination of bankers and corporate chiefs had decided they needed more than a dictator; they needed a dictator with his own private army of street fighters, the storm troopers. The Social Democrats (the SPD) were a huge mass party backed up by trade unions, sports clubs, women's groups, and their own self-defense corps, but they dithered and dawdled and talked about a general strike, and never did anything. The communists (the KPD) were also a large mass party, with a big organization of unemployed workers, and their own self-defense corps of armed veterans. But the communists were convinced that they had been living under fascism for a long time, and that the Social Democrats were really social fascists and therefore even worse than Hitler. So nobody called a general strike to stop Hitler when this would have been possible. Many of the SPD and KPD leaders who refused to mobilize against the National Socialist seizure of power soon had to flee the country when their parties were outlawed and their members expelled from the parliament by the Nazis. Many of those who stayed behind were either assassinated in the streets, or died in concentration camps. Perhaps we can learn something from this chilling example of the importance of mobilizing while mobilization is still possible.

If this book attracts some readers, the Obama campaign will inevitably attempt to vilify me as a racist. I therefore state formally that I am not a racist, but just the opposite. I am convinced that race is a mystification with no scientific basis whatsoever. Politics and government based on race are

sure to fail. My own standpoint is the universality of the human personality, with all persons being ontologically equal. I lived the first years of my life in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, a town which, thanks in part to a large population of abolitionists living there, had largely achieved racial integration in the decades following the Civil War. I lived on the same street where W.E.B. DuBois had grown up by the Housatonic River and close to the integrated school he attended c.1870.[1] I later lived in Flushing, New York, a part of north Queens which had been the site of the first formal demand for religious tolerance in North America – the Flushing Remonstrance of 1657. In the 1950s, this community was thoroughly integrated down to my Cub Scout troop, where the den mother was Mrs. Andrew Jenkins, a black lady and the mother of one of my friends. Flushing was so tolerant that, around the time of the New York World's Fair of 1964, it began to attract residents from the Far East, and now hosts a large Chinese community. So I reject any charge of racism. At the same time, I reject the absurd taboos which the bankrupt ideologues of foundation-style multiculturalism and political correctness are seeking to impose, since these are forms of insidious class prejudice against the working people of all races in this country. In many ways, this book continues the critique of foundation-based multiculturalism from a New Deal standpoint which was offered by the late Arthur M. Schlesinger in his *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. Those who actually read this book will be able to evaluate my argument that racism in the United States today is very largely the product of a deliberate and cynical divide-and-conquer policy carried forward above all by the foundations and by the oligarchs and elitists who control them – that is to say, by precisely those groups who have created Obama. We need a return to the New Deal and a Marshall Plan for the cities, not another fruitless discussion about race of the kind proposed by Obama. To finish off racism, we will need full employment, something which has hardly been seen in this country since 1945. Full employment is also the key to solving most of the problems associated with the flows of immigrants from Latin America and Asia, since a return to economic progress will immediately create a labor shortage that will put these issues in the proper perspective. To obtain an economic recovery for the benefit of all the people from the present Bush world economic depression, we will need updated versions of New Deal programs, and on the way to getting them we will need to break the power of the foundations, who will attempt to maintain the fragmentation and subjection of the US population by every means at their disposal. This book, it is hoped, will represent a step towards exposing the destructive elitist manipulation of society by the foundations and the sinister intentions of the leading foundation operative on the scene today, Obama.

CHAPTER I: OBAMA'S ROOTS IN POLYGAMY AND THE FORD FOUNDATION

How can I refuse the best education? – Barack Hussein Obama Senior

For many Americans, Barack Hussein Obama is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. Never in recent American history has a candidate so little known approached the presidency. The only recent comparison is offered by Jimmy Carter, and Carter — who had served as governor of Georgia for four years — was an open book in comparison to Obama. After Carter had entered the White House, voters were shocked to realize that they had elected a mystery man — they had bought a pig in a poke. George W. Bush was another little-known candidate: he too talked about being a uniter and not a divider, promised a foreign policy based on humility, and pledged to govern in the spirit of compassionate conservatism. Here too, the reality turned out to be much different.

Back in 1991, I realized that even though George H. W. Bush had been occupying the White House for a number of years, there was no critical and unauthorized biography of him. I therefore set out to write such a critical biography, which still stands today as the only non-apologetic study of his life. My present task is to offer readers a chance to get to know Obama before they make the irrevocable decision to grant him state power in the midst of one of the most severe crises this country has ever known.

As we have suggested elsewhere in this book, one way to parse the speeches and promises of presidential candidates is to examine their advisers, handlers, and controllers, since many of these will make their way into the cabinet and into the White House palace guard. Another important method is to examine the candidate's financial backers, and we will do so. A third approach is to bear in mind the famous dictum that biography is destiny — meaning that the life experience of any individual is bound to exert a profound influence on the way that person will tend to use the powers of a public office. It is mainly this third approach which we will implement in this section, seeking to assemble what is known about the life of Obama with a view to extracting clues about what kind of a president he might be.

The guiding principle of the present treatment is that when a politician is seeking to get his hands anywhere near the famous button which can be used to launch worldwide thermonuclear war, when that politician is in effect demanding life-and-death power over American voters and their families, then there are no limits to the public's right to know anything and everything about all facets of that politician's life, without exclusions of any sort. For a presidential candidate, there is and can be no private sphere. Everything is fair game. Researchers are not only allowed to delve into the candidate's background in every conceivable way — they are imperatively obligated to do so.

BARRY WHO?

Obama presents unprecedented difficulties for the presidential biographer. His clever handlers, controllers, and managers seem to have understood very well that a candidate with a resume, a voting record, and a history of past performance can very easily find that these things become liabilities when they are scrutinized by the opposition research of political adversaries, or simply by journalists in general. Any record at all is apt to become grist for the opponent's attack machine. Obama appears to have been advised by Senator Daschle that it is better not to stay in the Senate very long before running for president, since every vote that a Senator makes can represent a policy

commitment which is going to offend some group or stratum in the voting public. Ironically, it turns out that in politics, the best resume is often no resume at all. Obama represents this approach in an extreme form. Maureen Dowd of the *New York Times,* who with her usual cynicism has rushed to join media swoon for the Illinois Senator, has called Obama "the 46-year-old virgin." The columnist Spengler of the *Asia Times* observes that "We know less about Senator Obama than about any prospective president in American history. His uplifting rhetoric is empty, as Hillary Clinton helplessly protests. His career bears no trace of his own character, not an article for the *Harvard Law Review* he edited, or a single piece of legislation. He appears to be an empty vessel filled with the wishful thinking of those around him." (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008) Obama's half-sister, Maya Soetoro-Ng, a schoolteacher from Hawaii, says cryptically, "He's a very cool customer." The candidate himself admits: "I am an imperfect vessel for your hopes and dreams." (Todd Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

Indeed, Obama would appear to stand for nothing, with no principles, no commitments, no loyalties, and no real program. In spite of this, Obama did not spring fully armed from the head of Zbigniew Brzezinski, nor did he rise from the foam of the ocean. He does have a past, and it is to this past and its lessons that we now turn.

So little is known about the life of Obama that wild rumors have proliferated about who he really is. Is he a devout Moslem? Is he an Iranian agent? Is he a Marxist crypto-revolutionary? The conclusion of the present study is that he is none of these. Obama is certainly an ambitious and ruthless demagogue who can be counted on to be wholly unscrupulous in his pursuit and exercise of power. He is the creature of those intelligence circles which we may describe as the foundation-funded Left CIA. Obama is the wholly-controlled puppet of these circles. He has been chosen for his current task first of all because of his uncanny anthropologist's ability to size up and profile his interlocutors for the purpose of duping them all and manipulating them the more efficiently. He brings to his political campaign the detachment of an anthropologist doing field work: he treats American voters as mere ethnographic material, mere grist for his power machine. Obama is at heart a cosmopolitan, meaning that he would seek to float above the various constituent groups of the US population in the same way that the supernational and cosmopolitan Prince Metternich sought to float above the subject nationalities of the Austrian Empire until he was forced to flee to London in 1848. Obama's connection to the American people is as tenuous as that of such figures as the German Nesselrode, the Greek Kapodistrias, and the Sardinian Pozzo di Borgo, when they all found themselves working for the Foreign Ministry of the supernational Russian Empire. Obama is also reminiscent of those Coptic Christians like the Boutros-Ghali family whom the British habitually chose as top-level civil servants during their protectorate over Egypt. Imperial regimes have often chosen to govern large populations through ethnic minorities, and an Obama administration would give the United States a taste of this kind of rule for the first time.

THE MAKING OF A MANCHURIAN CANDIDATE

Underneath Obama's cool and aristocratic detachment, however, there lurks a deep resentment against the broad strata of the American people. It is not a hatred of Wall Street bankers, of CIA assassins, of war criminals, nor of mercenaries who kill people in countries far away. It must unavoidably be described as a hatred of the American people themselves, and it is therefore a sentiment which any responsible person must strongly condemn. Despite his evasive denials, Obama has a real elective cultural affinity for the "God damn America" outlook expressed by his pastor, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright. Based on the research embodied in this study, we can confidently predict that a future Obama administration would impose austerity, sacrifice, and

foreign wars on the American people with a wanton cruelty which has not been seen so far, not even under Bush the younger. It is because of their accumulated anti-American animus that Obama and his wife have been selected by the circles of the Trilateral Commission for their current attempts to carry out a postmodern coup d'état, leading in turn to what we must designate as postmodern fascism.

Obama is a disciple neither of Mohammed nor of Marx. He comes rather from the school of Frantz Fanon and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. His relation to Rousseau is especially close: both the Rousseau of the noble savage who is the patron saint of modern anthropology, and the Rousseau of the collective will, who is the guiding spirit of modern totalitarian liberalism.

Obama's world is the left wing of the US intelligence community as it emerged in the wake of President Reagan's Executive Order 12333 of 1982. It is a world composed of the Ford Foundation and other foundations specialized in social engineering, social manipulation, social control, and political counterinsurgency against possible challenges to the system of oligarchical financier domination of national affairs. It is a world populated by former Weatherman terrorists, black cultural nationalists, radical Palestinians on the CIA payroll, and left liberal ideologues financed by the foundations or even by the defense budget. It is the world of the National Endowment for Democracy, the Soros Foundation, and the veterans of the Jimmy Carter Administration.

BIRTH AND FAMILY

Many sources allege that Barack Hussein Obama was born on Aug. 4, 1961, in Honolulu, Hawaii. But even this most basic fact of Obama's existence is highly controversial, and as this book goes to press, is a contested issue in the courageous law suit of Philadelphia lawyer Philip J. Berg, who asserts that Obama is not a natural-born citizen of the United States, and accordingly cannot be considered qualified for the presidency.[2] His father, Barack Obama, Senior was a member of the Luo tribe or people from Nyanza Province, Kenya, in East Africa. His mother was Stanley [sic] Ann Dunham, an American woman who would later became an anthropologist and a consultant for the World Bank. Obama's parents met when they were both students at the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii at Manoa. When Barack Obama was only two years old, his father abandoned his wife and young son in Hawaii and went to Harvard University, where he obtained a doctorate in economics, and later returned to Kenya to become a government official. Barack Obama would see his father only once more in his life.

Barack Obama is listed as the author of two books: *Dreams from My Father: a Story of Race and Inheritance* (1995), and *The Audacity of Hope* (2006). From the first of these works, a number of themes emerge. First of all, Obama is obsessed with himself. His books do not really represent programs or promises concerning things that he wants to do for the American public, or to improve the state of the world. They are concerned above all with his own mental states, yearnings, desires, and confusions. Secondly, Obama is obsessed with the trauma of having been abandoned by his father at the age of two, and with the vicissitudes of having grown up as a fatherless boy with all the problematic syndromes this may imply. He was also later abandoned by his mother. Thirdly, Obama is obsessed with his African roots; he may at times portray himself as being multicultural, but his real center of gravity is his Afrocentrism. He is thus a radical subjectivist, and a postmodernist. His thoroughgoing postmodernism means that he espouses a method of thought which no American president has thus far represented. These are important things to bear in mind

as we proceed. Since Obama accords so much importance to his own African background, it is legitimate to follow him back to his grandfather.

GRANDFATHER OBAMA FROM KENYA: UNCLE TOM OF BRITISH COLONIALISM

Obama's grandfather was named Hussein Onyango Obama, who was born about 1895 in Kandu province, Kenya, and died in 1979. He practiced traditional polygamy and had at least three wives: Helima, who was childless; Akumu, who was the mother of Sarah Obama and Barack Hussein Obama, Sr.; and Auma Obama. He also claimed to have married a woman in Burma when he lived there as the servant of a British officer during World War II. Grandfather Obama belonged to the Luo tribe. For those who may be scandalized by the idea that the candidate belongs to a tribe, we can establish this fact by referring to Obama's own writings. In *Dreams from My Father*, Obama travels to Kenya. Here he meets a vendor, an old woman, who tries to make him pay the tourist price for a necklace. One of Obama's relatives intervenes to help him avoid paying the inflated price reserved for foreigners. The dialogue goes like this: '"She says that you look like an American to her." "Tell her I'm Luo," I said, beating my chest!"' (*Dreams* 310) So Obama, based on his own memoir, has a strong sense of tribal identity.

The Luo or Lwo people are a Nilotic group from the eastern Sudan whose language (sometimes called Dholuo) belongs to the Nilo-Saharan language family. The Luo are one of the most numerous ethnic groups of East Africa, and specialize in agriculture, livestock raising, and fishing. Their demographic center of gravity is the northeastern shore of Lake Victoria. They currently inhabit areas of five nations, including the southern Sudan, northern Uganda, eastern Congo, western Kenya, and part of Tanzania. The Luos are tall and thin Nilotic peoples of haughty and aristocratic bearing, like the Tutsis. Folklore attributes to the taller Nilotics like Tutsis and Luos the desire to dominate the shorter Hutu and Kikuyu peoples. Michelle Obama, in the initial transcripts of her infamous "whitey" tape of July 2004, reportedly takes a strong position in favor of the Tutsi, which is the very essence of the overall line of Anglo-American imperialism in this part of Africa, which has always been to support the Tutsi against the Hutu. Some famous Luos include the Kenyan politician Tom Mboya (assassinated by a Kikuyu in 1959), former Uganda president Milton Obote, and the infamous butcher Joseph Kony, the head of the Lord's Resistance Army, a new dark ages terrorist rebel group which operates in Uganda. The traditional ideological profile of the Luo is that they are clever but sometimes lethargic, and addicted to show-boating. The Luo are currently receiving US-UK imperialist support against the majority Kikuyu people in the tribal-ethnic power struggle unleashed inside Kenya. The Luo represent one of the micro-nationalities which Zbigniew Brzezinski intends to liberate in the course of his "dignity" campaign against the nation-state. The advantages for the imperialists of backing the Luo are obvious: if an independent Kurdish state would carve Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Turkey, a Luo state would carve Sudan, Uganda, Congo, Kenya, and Tanzania.

OBAMA'S LUO TRIBE: SMART, LAZY, SHOWBOATERS

What kind of people are these Luo? Modern Americans have an idea of the ideology or mentality of the French, Germans, Italians, Russians, Chinese, and so forth, but what are Luos like? A standard work on Luo mentality is A.B.C. Ocholla-Ayayo's *Traditional Ideology and Ethics Among the Southern Luo* (Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1976). Ochollo-Ayayo is a Luo writing a profile of the mentality and culture of his own people. Since Obama has

spoken about his grandmother as a "typical white person," we may perhaps be allowed here to use this same method of sampling to make some generalizations about the Luo. Let us use the first Luo we meet, in this case Ochollo-Ayayo himself, as a typical Luo person, and factor in the analysis he provides as well as critical reactions to his work, some of them also from Luos. In this way we may get at least a few insights into Luo ideology and mentality.

The overall profile of the Luo is that they are clever, lazy, and love showboating. Ochollo-Ayayo goes further, writing about "virtue boasting," which comes complete with virtue songs and virtue names or praise names. The Luo cultivate witchcraft and sorcery, although they have increasingly turned in recent decades to independent churches. The Luo have been studied for the practice of geophagy (dirt eating) among children.

In a review of Hans-Egil Hauge's *Luo Religion and Folklore* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1974), Ocholla-Ayayo lectures Hauge about using the wrong terminology in a discussion of polygamy among the Luo: "Rather than saying that the Luo are polygamous, it would have been more accurate to say that they practice polygyny [meaning, they have multiple wives at the same time]. The word 'polygamy' is ambiguous. It is also inaccurate that 'by counting the number of huts one can tell from a distance how many wives a man has,'" since some huts do not correspond to wives, but may be used for other purposes, such as sleeping quarters for children. Ocholla-Ayayo, who taught at Khartoum in the Sudan, is so pedantic that he berates Hauge, who published his book in 1974, for not citing a book that Ocholla-Ayayo published two years later, in 1976.

Much of this review is devoted to a discussion of the evil spirits (jachien), and especially the jajuok otieno, the night-runner or evil spirit who comes to steal cattle. This is an issue treated in Obama's *Dreams*. E.E. Evans-Pritchard, the famous British intelligence figure and professor of sociology at Oxford, did field work among the Luo in 1936, and produced articles like "Marriage Customs of the Luo of Kenya" and "Ghostly Vengeance of the Kenya Luo," *Man* 133 (1950). Evil spirits are often those of grandparents who afflict grandchildren because these latter have failed to carry out their filial duties. The night-runners become a large issue in Obama's memoir (*Dreams* 435 and passim). Ocholla-Ayayo's work is a "brittle inventory" of Luo norms, discussing questions like pastoralism, the role of cattle and their value, kinship, polygamy/polygyny, and the premises of Luo reasoning.

Ocholla-Ayayo's critics tell us more than he does. These reviewers are themselves anthropologists who deal in academic jargon, but they cannot suppress bursts of annoyance and resentment at the author because of his pedantic, pompous, lecturing and hectoring method. One reviewer writes that while the data presented by Ocholla-Ayayo are worthwhile, "the mannered and often incoherent fashion in which they are presented is likely to alienate even the most well-disposed of readers." (Elizabeth Hopkins, *ASA Review of Books* 5 [1979], 216) This same reviewer finds this Luo writer's "belabored pronouncements" to be "verging at times on the tautological." There is also a tedious parade of erudition which the reviewer finds insufferable: "One must also lament Ocholla-Ayayo's determination to validate the monograph to the scholarly community. The consequence is an accretion of self-conscious citations in which a hagiography as diverse as Galatians, David Hume, and Adam Smith is invoked, as well as a multitude of modern philosophers, economists, sociologists, anthropologists, and jurists. Frequent and gratuitous references to university mentors also prove regrettably intrusive and distracting." This reviewer concludes that the "fragmented, a temporal presentation of the material and the author's failure to explore the behavioral as well as the normative dimensions of traditional Luo ideology seriously undermine its value for the general reader." The lack of historical analysis is a key defect.

Obama's grandfather is described as a strange, hard, autocratic and cruel man. (*Dreams from My Father* 397, 406) "It is said of him that he had ants up his anus, because he could not sit still…. he was very serious always. He was always curious about other people's business, which is how he learned to be a herbalist." (*Dreams* 397) He was very fastidious and compulsively clean. Grandfather Obama lived at the time that the British colonialists first arrived in Kenya. Grandfather Obama was one of the first to imitate the practices of the British: at one point he went away for some months, and came back wearing European trousers, shirts, and shoes. Kandu province is located in the interior of Kenya, closer to Lake Victoria than to the Indian Ocean. When the British arrived in Kandu they began setting up a colonial administration with a district commissioner. The Kenyans "called this man *Bwana Ogalo*, which meant "the Oppressor" … he surrounded himself with Luos who wore clothes like the white man to serve as his agents and tax collectors." (*Dreams* 399) One of those who went to work for the British during this time was grandfather Obama, who "had learned to read and write, and understood the white man system of paper records and land titles. This made him useful to the white man, and during the war [World War I] he was put in charge of road crews. Eventually he was sent to Tanganyika, where he stayed for several years." (*Dreams* 400) When grandfather Obama returned to Kandu, he staked his claim to a plot of land, but he soon departed for Nairobi, where he again went to work for the British.

Obama's grandfather worked in Nairobi as a butler and cook for the British. He "was popular with employers and worked in the estates of some of the most important white men, even Lord Delamere." (*Dreams* 401) Hugh Cholmondeley, 3rd Baron Delamere, was the undisputed political boss of the British colony of Kenya from about 1900 until his death in 1931; he was known as the Kenyan equivalent of Cecil Rhodes in South Africa, meaning that he was the dominant political personality of the colony. He had huge estates in the Rift valley. According to Wikipedia, "It is believed that on one of these Somaliland hunting trips, Delamere coined the term "white hunter" – the term which came to describe the professional safari hunter in colonial East Africa." The relation with Lord Delamere is the first sign of anything extraordinary in the entire Obama clan. If Obama seizes the presidency, it will be due in some measure to the fact that his grandfather chose to go to work for the leading British imperialist politician in that part of the world.

Using his earnings, grandfather Obama was able to buy land and cattle in Kandu. He was very strict about his property, and emerges as an obsessive-compulsive personality. He was also choleric and violent, and was known for harshly beating his wives and any men who offended him. He was often involved in shouting matches with his British employers, and once beat one of them with a cane; he was fortunate to get off with a fine and a warning. He was so violent to his wife Akumu that she tried repeatedly to get away from him, and finally deserted him for good, leaving behind the young child who would become Barack Obama's father.

A BATMAN IN THE BRITISH ARMY

During World War II, grandfather Obama accompanied the British Army captain who was his employer as cook and servant. He was attached to a British regiment and was stationed in Burma, Ceylon, Arabia, and Europe. When he returned to Kandu, he was economically well-off. When he was almost 50, he decided to move to Alego, the family's ancestral home. At that time Alego was bush country, but grandfather Obama's ability as a farmer allowed him to build up a successful farming business. Grandfather Obama seems all in all to have had a Hobbesian temperament; he is quoted as saying: "The African is thick. For him to do anything, he needs to be beaten." (*Dreams* 407) Grandfather Obama appears to have started his life as a follower of traditional animist or totemic religion. What Grandfather Obama "respected was strength — discipline…this is also why

he rejected the Christian religion…For a brief time, he converted [to Christianity], and even changed his name to Johnson. But he could not understand such ideas as mercy towards your enemies, or that this man Jesus could wash away a man's sins. To [him] this was foolish sentiment, something to comfort women. And so he converted to Islam — he thought its practices conform more closely to his beliefs," Barack is told by his grandmother. (*Dreams* 407) According to some accounts, he had been exposed to Islam during some time spent in Zanzibar. It was upon converting to Islam that Grandfather Obama took the name Hussein, which lives on as the middle name of his grandson, the current presidential candidate. Much of what we learn about Grandfather Obama comes from Sarah, his third wife; this is the person Obama calls his grandmother. She is not, however, a blood relative. Sarah Obama describes herself as a devout lifelong Muslim: "I am a strong believer of the Islamic faith," she has told interviewers.

Until his first visit to Kenya in the 1990s, candidate Obama had known very little about his grandfather. The one thing he did know was that his grandfather had opposed his father's decision to marry the white woman Stanley Ann Dunham in Hawaii around 1960. Around this one incident, the future candidate Obama has built an image of his grandfather as a proud Afrocentric race patriot. Barack Hussein Obama, as the thorough postmodernist that he is, attempts in his writings to derive his sense of personal identity not so much from his own achievements as an individual as from his family and ethnic group. In *Dreams from My Father*, he tells of his bitter disappointment with the reality of his grandfather's life: "I knew that, as I had been listening to the story of our grandfather's youth, I, too, had felt betrayed. My image of Onyango, faint as it was, had always been of an autocratic man — a cruel man, perhaps. But I had also imagined him an independent man, a man of his people, opposed to white rule. There was no real basis for this image, I now realized — only the letter he had written to Gramps saying that he didn't want his son marrying white. That, and his Muslim faith, which in my mind had become linked with the Nation of Islam back in the states. What Granny had told us scrambled that image completely, causing ugly words to flash across my mind. Uncle Tom. Collaborator. House n****r." (*Dreams* 406)

FATHER: BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA SENIOR, "DRUNKEN LECHER"

Of all of Grandfather Obama's wives, it was Akumu who asserted herself the most, constantly contradicting her husband and arguing with him. Because of this, Akumu was frequently beaten, and made several attempts to run away. She disappeared for the last time when Barack Obama Senior was nine years old. She went back to her family, found a new husband, and went away with him to what was then called Tanganyika. Obama Senior was therefore raised by Sarah, another of Grandfather Obama's wives.

Several weeks after Akumu had fled from her harsh life with Grandfather Obama, Obama Senior and his elder sister attempted to rejoin their mother. For almost two weeks they trudged along the primitive roads of rural Kenya, sleeping in the fields and begging for food. They were both starving when a passerby took them in and sent for Grandfather Obama. This was their last attempt to find their mother, Akumu. Obama Senior was profoundly traumatized by losing his mother at the age of nine; he "could not forgive his abandonment, and acted as if Akumu didn't exist. He told everyone that I [Grandmother Sarah] was his mother, and although he would send Akumu money when he became a man, to the end of his life he would always act coldly towards her.... Barack [Senior] was wild and stubborn like Akumu." (*Dreams* 413)

Barack Obama Senior is described as highly intelligent and quick to learn, but also very mischievous. After Senior's first day at the Mission school in the village, he told grandfather

Obama that he did not want to attend school because he already knew everything that was being taught, and the teacher was a woman. Grandfather Obama shared this contempt for women, so Senior was sent to a school 6 miles away where the teacher was a man. Only after this male teacher beat him repeatedly did Senior learn to accept a woman teacher. Senior was often a truant, not attending school for weeks on end, but mastering the entire subject matter just before the final exams and coming in first in the class.

During World War II, many Kenyans were inducted into the British Army. When they returned home, they began to support the cause of independence from colonial rule. Grandfather Obama agreed with the demand for independence, but he refused to become associated with the independence movements. He argued that Africans could never defeat British troops. "How can the African defeat the white man," he told Senior, "when he cannot even make his own bicycle? ... That is why the black man will always lose." (*Dreams* 417) Despite his refusal to join the independence movement, Grandfather Obama was arrested by the British and held in a concentration camp for more than six months because one of his personal enemies, an employee of the British district commissioner, had settled a score by placing his name on the list of dangerous subversives. When he finally returned home, his health was broken.

OBAMA SENIOR EXPELLED FROM PREP SCHOOL FOR HANKY-PANKY

Obama Senior had taken the entrance examination for the Maseno Mission School, an elite college preparatory institution which very few Africans were allowed to attend. He was admitted to this school and seemed to have a great future ahead of him, but he soon encountered disciplinary problems. He insisted on violating the rules by bringing girls into his dormitory. He and his friends stole chickens and yams from nearby farms because the dormitory food was not to their liking. At first the teachers were indulgent because Senior was such a good student, but he was caught one too many times and was expelled. When he returned home he was severely beaten by Grandfather Obama, who forced him to go to Mombasa and take a job in the office of an Arab merchant. He quarreled with the Arab and had to take a job that paid much less. He worked for a time as a goatherd. This is the origin of BHO's claim to be a son of a goatherd. Eventually Senior moved to Nairobi and found work as a clerk for the British railway authority. He attended a pro-independence meeting, and was arrested and jailed for a few days by the British. During this time Senior married his first wife, Kezia, and soon had two children, Roy and Auma. At this time he was employed as an office boy by an Arab merchant named Suleiman.

Up to now we have been forced to rely on candidate Obama's own account of these events. From this point on, we can begin to supplement this with other sources. A more detailed view of Senior and Kezia's early years is provided by some British journalists: 'At 18, Barack Hussein Obama Sr. (Senior) married a girl called Kezia from the local village. It was Kezia who remained his one true love and to whom he always returned. She was a 16-year-old schoolgirl while Senior, two years older, had just got his first proper job as an office clerk in Nairobi. Senior convinced Kezia to elope with him to Nairobi. Her father, a local driver, was furious. Kezia said: "He did not like Obama. My father and brothers came to Nairobi to bring me back. They said I had to go back to school. When I wouldn't, they said they would never speak to me again. Barack was also worried about what his father (Grandfather Obama) would think because I was so young, but he gave us his approval. He sent my mother and father 14 cows for my dowry." Kezia and Barack Sr. set up home in Jericho, a section of Nairobi created for government employees, and began a family. First son Roy was born in March 1958.' (London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

In contrast to the media swoon of total adulation and uncritical acceptance of Obama here in the United States, the British *Daily Mail* stresses that much of the account given in *Dreams from My Father* is disingenuous and untrue. They comment: "Indeed, by offering up a conveniently plotted account of his personal history in this way, he might even have made a pre-emptive strike on those sure to pose the awkward questions that inevitably face a serious contender for the White House. Yet an investigation by *The Mail* on Sunday has revealed that, for all Mr Obama's reputation for straight talking and the compelling narrative of his recollections, they are largely myth." (London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

Senior's life began to change when he encountered two American women missionary teachers. They helped him to sign up for a correspondence course leading to a secondary school certificate. He took the equivalency test at the US Embassy, and passed. He then applied to numerous universities in the United States, and in 1958 won a scholarship at the University of Hawaii. Senior, then aged twenty-three, left as soon as possible for Hawaii, deserting his pregnant wife and son, who took refuge with Grandmother Sarah. Thus, when Senior married Stanley Ann Dunham, he was a bigamist from the point of view of US law.

These years represented an acute phase of the Cold War struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union. At about this time, the Soviets created the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow as a special institution for the education and indoctrination of African students. The Soviets sought actively to recruit the future leaders of African countries and bring them to Moscow for a free university education in the hopes that they would remain sympathetic to the Soviet cause during the rest of their careers. We must assume that a few were also recruited by the KGB. The United States intelligence agencies carried out similar operations on a somewhat more decentralized basis for the recruitment of young prospective African leaders as agents of US influence. The recruitment of Obama Senior by the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii at Manoa could very well have occurred within the framework of such a US effort. In fact, we are told that Obama Senior and Stanley Ann Dunham met for the first time in a Russian class. Some commentators have concluded from that that candidate Obama's mother was a Soviet or communist sympathizer. There is probably some truth in that thesis. But Obama Senior may have been studying Russian as part of a US-backed program aimed at making him at the very least a US sympathizer in Kenyan society, and perhaps something more. At any rate, it is quite possible that the spirit of the CIA hovered over candidate Obama's parents at the time of their wedding, if there was one. The marriage of Obama Senior with Ann Dunham must be regarded as highly unusual at a time when interracial marriage was still illegal in many U.S. states. There was, however, a high statistical correlation between interracial marriage and proximity to the Communist Party.

OBAMA SENIOR: AN ABUSIVE POLYGAMIST AND EGOMANIAC

The *Daily Mail* account stresses that even though the image of Senior presented in candidate Obama's first book is hardly sympathetic, it is nevertheless an attempt to present this unattractive individual in the best possible light: "We have discovered that his father was not just a deeply flawed individual but an abusive bigamist and an egomaniac, whose life was ruined not by racism or corruption but his own weaknesses. And, devastatingly, the testimony has come from Mr Obama's own relatives and family friends. Relatives say he was already a slick womaniser and, once in Honolulu, he promptly persuaded a fellow student called Ann - a naive 18-year-old white girl - to marry him. Barack Junior was born in August, 1961." (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

Part of candidate Obama's technique in composing his reminiscences of his fugitive father is unquestionably to project backward into the world of almost half a century ago the categories of race, Afrocentrism, and multiculturalism which were not in fact operative in those days in the ways that the current candidate suggests. As the British series points out, '"Mr Obama Junior claims that racism on both sides of the family destroyed the marriage between his mother and father. In his book, [candidate Obama] says that Ann's mother, who went by the nickname Tut, did not want a black son-in-law, and Obama Senior's father didn't want the Obama blood sullied by a white woman. In fact Ann divorced her husband after she discovered his bigamous double life. She remarried and moved to Indonesia with young Barack and her new husband, an oil company manager. Obama Senior was forced to return to Kenya, where he fathered two more children by Kezia. He was eventually hired as a top civil servant in the fledgling government of Jomo Kenyatta - and married yet again. Now prosperous with a flashy car and good salary, his third wife was an American-born teacher called Ruth, whom he had met at Harvard while still legally married to both Kezia and Ann, and who followed him to Africa. A relative of Mr Obama says: "We told him [Barack] how his father would still go to Kezia and it was during these visits that she became pregnant with two more children. He also had two children with Ruth." It is alleged that Ruth finally left him after he repeatedly flew into whisky-fuelled rages, beating her brutally. Friends say drinking blighted his life - he lost both his legs while driving under the influence and also lost his job. However, this was no bar to his womanising: he sired a son, his eighth child, by yet another woman and continued to come home drunk. He was about to marry her when he finally died in yet another drunken crash when Obama was 21."' (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

The eyewitness accounts of Obama's first trip to Kenya assembled by the *Daily Mail* suggest that candidate Obama was filled with shock and consternation when he realized that his fantasy picture of his absentee father did not correspond to anything real: 'Mr Obama's 40-year-old cousin Said Hussein Obama told *The Mail* on Sunday: "Clearly, Barack has been very deeply affected by what he has learned about his father, who was my father's older brother. You have to remember that his father was an African and in Africa, polygamy is part of life. We have assured Barack that his father was a loving person but at times it must be difficult for him to reconcile this with his father's drinking and simultaneous marriages." Said adds: "His father was a human being and as such you can't say that he was 100 per cent perfect. My cousin found it difficult when he came here to learn of his half-brothers and sisters born to four different mothers. But just as Africans find the Western world strange so Americans coming here will find Africa strange."' (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

For years, candidate Obama had attempted to interpret the little he knew about his father's life in terms coherent with popular radical books like Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*. In reality Obama Senior might have been a sad and deluded drunk out of Eugene O'Neill: 'Far from being an inspiration, the father whom Mr Obama was coming to know seemed like a total stranger. In his book, he attempts to put the best face on it. His father, he writes, lost his civil service job after campaigning against corrupt African politicians who had "taken the place of the white colonials." One of Obama Senior's former drinking partners was Kenyan writer Philip Ochieng. Ochieng says, however, that his friend's downfall was his weak character. Although charming, generous and extraordinarily clever, Obama Senior was also imperious, cruel and given to boasting about his brain and his wealth, he said. "He was excessively fond of Scotch. He had fallen into the habit of

going home drunk every night. His boasting proved his undoing and left him without a job, plunged him into prolonged poverty and dangerously wounded his ego."

Ochieng recalls how, after sitting up all night drinking Black Label whisky at Nairobi's famous Stanley Hotel, Obama Senior would fly into rages if Ruth asked where he had been. Ochieng remonstrated with his friend, saying: "You bring a woman from far away and you reduce her to pulp. That is not our way." But it was to no avail. Ruth sued for divorce after her husband administered brutal beatings. In fact he was a menace to life, said Ochieng. "He had many extremely serious accidents. Both his legs had to be amputated. They were replaced with crude false limbs made from iron. He was just like Mr Toad [from *The Wind In The Willows*], very arrogant on the road, especially when he had whisky inside. I was not surprised when I learned how he died."' (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

The *Daily Mail* was able to track down Obama Senior's third wife. 'Ruth refused to comment on the abuse charges when we tracked her down to the Kenyan school where she now works. She said: "I was married to Barack's father for seven years so, yes, you could say Barack is my stepson. Barack's father was a very difficult man. Although I was married to him the longest of any of his wives he wasn't an easy person to be around." Mr Obama has acknowledged that his father grappled with a drinking problem. But with a gift for words that makes Mrs Clinton's utterances seem stiff and stale, he has turned it into another component of the myth. Drink, he says, like drugs is one of "the traps that seem laid in a black man's soul."' (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

This other American wife is named Ruth Nidesand. The son she had with Obama Senior, who is therefore Obama's half-brother, has been located by the British press in China. We read: 'Barack Obama's half-brother has been helping to promote cheap Chinese exports in a low-profile business career while the Democratic senator has been winning worldwide fame in his race for the White House. He has gone to extraordinary lengths to avoid public attention and his family links remain unknown to most of his acquaintances in Shenzhen, a border boomtown in southern China where he has lived since 2002. Mark Ndesandjo is the son of Barack Obama's late father and his third wife, an American woman named Ruth Nidesand who runs the up-market Maduri kindergarten in Nairobi.[3] Obama, however, refers to him simply as "my brother" and says he was the only uncontested heir after their father, a Kenyan, died in a car crash in 1982.' (*Sunday Times*, July 27, 2008)

As for the rest of Obama's eight to ten siblings: 'The Italian edition of *Vanity Fair* said that it had found George Hussein Onyango Obaa living in a hut in a ramshackle town of Huruma on the outskirts of Nairobi. Mr Obama, 26, the youngest of the presidential candidate's half-brothers, spoke for the first time about his life, which could not be more different than that of the Democratic contender. "No-one knows who I am," he told the magazine, before claiming: "I live here on less than a dollar a month." According to Italy's *Vanity Fair* his two metre by three metre shack is decorated with football posters of the Italian football giants AC Milan and Inter, as well as a calendar showing exotic beaches of the world. Vanity Fair also noted that he had a front page newspaper picture of his famous brother - born of the same father as him, Barack Hussein Obama, but to a different mother, named only as Jael. He told the magazine: "I live like a recluse, no-one knows I exist." Embarrassed by his penury, he said that he does not does not mention his famous half-brother in conversation. "If anyone says something about my surname, I say we are not related.

I am ashamed," he said. For ten years George Obama lived rough. However he now hopes to try to sort his life out by starting a course at a local technical college. He has only met his famous older brother twice - once when he was just five and the last time in 2006 when Senator Obama was on a tour of East Africa and visited Nairobi.' (*Daily Telegraph*, August 21, 2008) Obama has often paraded his devotion to the poor, to the "least of these" in Gospel terms. But although Obama talks a good game of charity, it appears that he has never given a penny to this wretched man who lives in poverty and despair made more acute by the contrast with his half-brother, the glittering international celebrity. If Obama's black African brother gets no charity from Barky and Michelle, what can the American people expect except snake-like cruelty?

The *Daily Mail* account of Obama Senior in Kenya concludes with the finding that candidate Obama has been permanently traumatized by his discovery as an adult in his mid-30s of the sordid details of his father's actual biography. These details are worthy of attention, since psychological dramas, reaction formations, and related forms of psychological vulnerability have often been used in the recent past by the various White House palace guards to manipulate and control elected presidents. We must therefore pay special attention to the *Daily Mail*'s conclusion that: 'Family members and acquaintances believe that the real cloud over Mr Obama's life has been the discovery that his father was far from the romantic figure that his mother tried to portray. A family friend said: "He is haunted by his father's failures. He grew up thinking of his father as a brilliant intellectual and pioneer of African independence only to learn that in Western terms he was basically a drunken lecher." This ugly truth, say friends, has made Mr Obama ruthlessly determined to use every weapon that he has to succeed, including the glossily edited version of his father's story. "At the end of the day Barack wants the story to help his political cause, so perhaps he couldn't afford to be too honest," said Ochieng.

Significantly, it was only four years after his father's death that Mr Obama travelled to his father's ancestral Kenyan village. There he learned the full story of his father's life and met some of his relatives. One of his half-sisters, Auma, is now a council worker in southern England, but some of his other relatives are still living in huts in the village, without plumbing or electricity, farming a few scrawny goats and chicken and growing fruit and maize. They speak the tribal Luo language and depend on handouts from family members who have emigrated to the UK and the United States for their few luxuries, notably the transistor radios that they use to follow Mr Obama's rocketing political fortunes. He has positioned himself as a devout Christian (having found God, he says, after years as an atheist) …." (Sharon Churcher, "A drunk and a bigot - what the US Presidential hopeful HASN'T said about his father," London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

Candidate Obama writes in *Dreams of My Father*, "Someone once said that every man is trying to either live up to his father's expectations or make up for his father's mistakes, and I suppose that may explain my particular malady." Candidate Obama may therefore be aware to some degree of the psychological drama which he exhibits. But this still leaves important questions: Has he ever grown up? Does he have the psychological strength necessary for independent and autonomous action, as mandated by the constitutional powers of the president enumerated in the U.S. Constitution? Due in large part to the adulation and propitiation of Obama by the controlled corporate media, these life-and-death questions are far from having been answered.

MATERNAL GRANDFATHER, STANLEY DUNHAM, KANSAS ATHEIST

Obama's maternal grandparents came from Wichita, Kansas. His grandfather, Stanley Dunham, the person he calls Gramps, had worked on oil rigs during the great depression of the 1930s. Stanley

Dunham had far less social standing than Madelyn Dunham, who came from a somewhat better family; this class divide between a worker and petty bougeoise caused tension during their marriage. According to one account, Madelyn Dunham's family had been slaveholders: "one of Obama's great-great-great-great grandfathers, George Washington Overall, owned two slaves who were recorded in the 1850 Census in Nelson County, Kentucky. The same records show that one of Obama's great-great-great-great-great-grandmothers, Mary Duvall, also owned two slaves." (Wikipedia) "When World War II came, Stanley enlisted in the Army. Madelyn became a Rosie-the-Riveter at Boeing Co.'s B-29 production plant in Wichita. And Stanley Ann Dunham arrived in late November 1942. (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) After the war, Stanley went to college with the help of the G.I. Bill, and bought a house with a subsidized loan from the Federal Housing Program. Stanley and Madelyn Dunham would eventually live in 13 different places.

Stanley Armour Dunham is described by Obama as something of a freethinker or bohemian, presumably meaning that he dabbled in atheism, which was considered something radical in the early 1960s. He inclined toward the Unitarian Universalist point of view of religious syncretism, and was proud that his church was able to draw on the sacred texts of five great world religions.[4] He was friendly with several Jews, Obama tells us, and liked to listen to Nat King Cole. (*Dreams* 17) Grandfather Stanley was sympathetic to black issues and causes; Obama tells us that he had suffered some insults himself because "he looked like a 'wop.'" (*Dreams* 21) Later on, as we will see, he took Barack Obama with him when he went to visit a group of black communists in Hawaii around 1970. Stanley Dunham died in 1992.

MADELYN "TOOT" DUNHAM – GRANDMOTHER

Madelyn Dunham is called Tutu or Toot or Tut in Obama's reminiscence and in other accounts; this is the word for grandparent in the Hawaiian language. (*Dreams* 7) Interestingly, the Obama campaign has refused to facilitate interviews by interested journalists with Madelyn Dunham: "the Obama campaign declined to make Madelyn Dunham, 84, available." (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) For some reason, the Obama campaign has been very reluctant to allow Madelyn Dunham to interact with the press. Do they think that a white grandmother would cause resentment among blacks, or is there something that they are hiding? Madelyn Dunham is now well-known as the grandmother whom Obama threw under the bus in his desperate maneuvering in the wake of the explosion of the Jeremiah Wright "God damn America" scandal in mid-March 2008.

MOTHER: STANLEY ANN DUNHAM, PRO-COMMUNIST ANTHROPOLOGIST

Obama's mother was unquestionably the greatest single influence on his formative years. Her legal name was indeed Stanley Ann Dunham. She was named Stanley by her father because he had wanted very much to have a son. This incongruous gesture recalls the predicament of "A Boy Named Sue" in the humorous song by Johnny Cash. Obama makes some attempt in his reminiscences to portray his mother as a bland Eisenhower-era middle American from Kansas, but this once again represents typical disingenuous window-dressing. Obama's attempt to spin his mother into something she was not has even been noted in the normally deferential *Chicago Tribune* account: 'Implicit in [Obama's portrayal of his mother] is this message: If you have any lingering questions or doubts about the Hawaiian-born presidential candidate with a funny name, just remember that Mom hails from America's good earth. That's the log cabin story, or his version of Bill Clinton's "Man from Hope." That presentation, though, glosses over Stanley Ann Dunham's formative years, spent not on the Great Plains but more than 1,800 miles away on a small island in

the Pacific Northwest. Obama visited the Seattle area last October, and in a speech to a Democratic Party rally at Bellevue Community College, he mentioned that his mother attended Mercer Island High School before moving on to Hawaii. In *Dreams*, Obama wrote that the family moved to Seattle "long enough for my mother to finish high school."' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007)

In reality, Ann Dunham started out as something of a bluestocking, a nonconformist and radical who was profoundly ill-at-ease with the superficial normalcy of the Eisenhower years. She was a left liberal, a feminist and a parlor atheist. The Dunham family moved to the Seattle area in the mid-1950s, and it was there that Ann Dunham attended Mercer Island High School, where not just the existentialists Sartre and Kierkegaard, but even "The Communist Manifesto" were in the curriculum. Coming as she did from a heterodox and nonconformist family, it is not surprising to find Ann Dunham described as having been both a communist sympathizer and a liberal. Obama thus qualifies in some sense as a red diaper baby.

Madelyn and Stanley, originally Methodist and Baptist respectively, along with their daughter joined the East Shore Unitarian Church in nearby Bellevue, Washington. '"In the 1950s, this was sometimes known as 'the little Red church on the hill," said Peter Luton, the church's senior minister, referring to the effects of McCarthyism. Skepticism, the kind that Stanley embraced and passed on to his daughter, was welcomed here.' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) Ann Dunham actively embraced the cause of skepticism and freethinking. '"She touted herself as an atheist, and it was something she'd read about and could argue," said Maxine Box, who was Dunham's best friend in high school. "She was always challenging and arguing and comparing. She was already thinking about things that the rest of us hadn't."' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) Ann Dunham also showed a lively interest in international politics, quite possibly with a tendency to sympathize with the Moscow line: '"If you were concerned about something going wrong in the world, Stanley would know about it first," said Chip Wall, who described her as "a fellow traveler. . . . We were liberals before we knew what liberals were."' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) "Fellow traveler" is a term used during the McCarthy era to describe a communist sympathizer.

The "fellow traveler" issue became prominent at Mercer Island High School when Ann was studying there, thanks to one of the anti-Communist witch hunts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the infamous HUAC. 'In 1955, the chairman of the Mercer Island school board, John Stenhouse, testified before the House Un-American Activities Subcommittee that he had been a member of the Communist Party. At Mercer High School, two teachers — Val Foubert and Jim Wichterman — generated regular parental thunderstorms by teaching their students to challenge societal norms and question all manner of authority. Foubert, who died recently, taught English. His texts were cutting edge: "Atlas Shrugged," "The Organization Man," "The Hidden Persuaders," "1984" and the acerbic writings of H.L. Mencken.' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) As we can see, there is nothing communist about these texts, which are variously libertarian, British intelligence, foundation-funded, and simple muckraking, but Foubert and Wichterman must have loomed as a new Lenin-Trotsky or Stalin-Mao duo in the provincial imaginations of the local parents. 'Wichterman taught philosophy. The hallway between the two classes was known as "anarchy alley," and students pondered the challenging notions of Wichterman's teachings, including such philosophers as Sartre and Kierkegaard. He also touched the societal third rail of the 1950s: He questioned the existence of God. And he didn't stop there.' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007)

With Stanley always looking for better opportunities, the family moved to Hawaii. Ann Dunham "began classes at the University of Hawaii in 1960, and shortly after that…had fallen in love with a

grad student. He was black, from Kenya and named Obama." (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) Ann married Obama Senior when she was 18 years old. They met in a Russian language class, which may or may not indicate sympathy for Soviet communism (it could have indicated a desire to join the intelligence community): each one could have been there for many reasons, including training by a US intelligence agency. One person who knew Barack Obama Senior and Ann Dunham and their social set in those days is the Democratic Congressman Neil Abercrombie, who has recalled that 'while Obama was impatient and energized, Stanley Ann, whom Abercrombie described as "the original feminist," was endlessly patient but quietly passionate in her arguments. She was the only woman in the group.' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007)

Those who had known Ann Dunham as an independent woman not interested in marriage and children were surprised by her sudden decision to marry Obama Senior. '"I just couldn't imagine her life changing so quickly," said [one such friend], thinking about her independent-minded friend who had disdained marriage and motherhood.' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) Evidently the irresistible appeal of a husband from the third world had eclipsed Ann's feminism. Ironically, the third world turned out not to be the repository of unalloyed goodness which a disciple of Rousseau would have expected. The original feminist Ann Dunham would soon find herself the victim not just of a bigamist but of a polygamist who would abandon her and her infant son without a second thought. Barack Obama today bears the mental scars of this experience.

Grandfather Onyango, back in Kenya, was fiercely opposed to Obama Senior's marriage. He wrote the Dunhams a '"long, nasty letter saying that he didn't approve of the marriage." This former house servant for the British colonialists "didn't want the Obama blood sullied by a white woman." His main argument was that this American girl would never agree to return to Kenya and live under conditions of polygamy. Onyango wrote: "How can you marry this white woman when you have responsibilities at home? Will this woman return with you and live as a Luo woman? Will she accept that you already have a wife and children? I have not heard of white people understanding such things. Their women are jealous and used to being pampered. But if I am wrong in this matter, let the girl's father come to my hut and discuss the situation properly. But this is the affair of elders, not children."' (*Dreams* 422)

Ann Dunham may have felt compelled to get married because she was already pregnant. As we read in one journalistic account; 'Six months after they wed, another letter arrived in Kenya, announcing the birth of Barack Hussein Obama, born Aug. 4, 1961. Despite her husband's continued anger, Sarah Obama said in a recent interview, she "was so happy to have a grandchild in the U.S."' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007) There is also some question about the documentation and thus of the legality of the marriage of Obama Senior to Ann Dunham. This wedding may not have been properly documented, as Obama himself tells us. "How and when the marriage occurred remains a bit murky, a bill of particulars that I have never quite had the courage to explore," Obama writes in *Dreams*. In other words, this may have been a common law marriage.[5] The implication is that presidential candidate Barack Obama may be an illegitimate child born outside of wedlock, or, in plain English, a bastard.[6]

A FEMINIST DOORMAT FOR A POLYGAMIST

The later Congressman Neil Abercrombie sensed at the beginning that this marriage was not destined to last. Obama Senior was self-absorbed and self-centered, and evidently regarded the marriage as a mere temporary convenience for the time of his stay in Hawaii: 'Obama was one of the most ambitious, self-focused men he had ever met. After Obama was accepted to study at

Harvard, Stanley Ann disappeared from the University of Hawaii student gatherings, but she did not accompany her husband to Harvard. Abercrombie said he rarely saw her after that. "I know he loved Ann," Abercrombie said, but "I think he didn't want the impediment of being responsible for a family. He expected great things of himself and he was going off to achieve them."' (*Chicago Tribune*, March 27, 2007)

In 1963, Obama Senior abandoned his wife and infant son in order to enter a doctoral program in economics at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts. His decision can only be characterized as cruelly egotistical and irresponsible. Obama Senior had received two fellowships. One was to pursue a doctorate in economics at the New School for Social Research in New York City. This fellowship was generous enough so as to permit both Ann and baby Barack to accompany him to New York. The Harvard fellowship was smaller, reportedly not sufficient to support Ann and her baby. Obama Senior callously argued that he had no choice but to accept the Harvard fellowship. As Ann Dunham later told her son Barack: '"He received two scholarships, one in New York, which paid enough to support all three of us. Harvard had just agreed to pay tuition. 'How can I refuse the best education?' he told me. That's all he could think about, proving that he was the best."' (*Dreams* 126)

Naturally, Obama Senior and/or Ann could have supplemented the fellowship with a part-time or full-time job if the main goal had been to keep the family together. Once it was clear that Obama Senior was determined to abandon his family, Ann could have sued him for divorce and child support payments, since Obama Senior's polygamous outlook had no standing under US law. Instead of acting to assert the best interests of her infant child, Ann Dunham chose supinely to let herself be abused and mistreated by Obama Senior, who thus emerges as a monster of egomania. Ann was apparently so deluded by her relativistic and Rousseauvian ideological categories that she was unable to fight for her son's future.

Barack Obama glosses over Obama Senior's abandonment of his mother in detached prose in the passive voice: "A separation occurred, and he returned to Africa to fulfill his promise to the continent." (*Dreams* 10) Obsessed with his racialist ideology, Obama chooses not to recognize that his mother was treated as a doormat, and was too weak to assert herself against the outrageous actions of Obama Senior. Perhaps Obama's contempt for women is rooted in his mother's craven willingness to capitulate to the selfishness of Obama Senior. For Ann Dunham, Rousseau was much more powerful than feminism when it really mattered. When Obama was about to visit Senior in Kenya for the first time, poor Ann Dunham told Obama: I hope you don't feel resentful towards him…It wasn't your father's fault that he left, you know. I divorced him." (*Dreams* 125) This account is at variance with the fact of abandonment, and shows that even after many years, Ann refused to accept the reality of the outrageous treatment she had received, and of her own failure to fight for her son.

It is worth noting in passing that Obama qualifies as a fatherless young boy who was also abandoned by his mother before the age of 10. This pattern produces a psychological profile full of debilitating psychological complexes, including the obsessive quest for an ersatz or substitute father, and the need to be assured of one's own personal worth by a series of sexual partners, be they male or female. The last president to exhibit this pattern was William Jefferson Blythe III, the posthumous son better known as Bill Clinton, whose father was killed in an automobile accident before he was born. For some time after that, young Bill Clinton lived with his grandparents while his mother allegedly worked as a nurse in another city. Bill Clinton's case of this syndrome was complicated by the fact that his stepfather, Roger Clinton, was an alcoholic who physically abused

the future president's mother. Bill Clinton's need to obtain the validation of his ego from the well-known parade of women requires no further comment. Bill Clinton's philandering clearly resulted from a lack of ego strength: no matter how much he achieved in life, he always needed to be assured of his personal worth by a parade of women, one of whom turned out to be Miss Lewinsky. However, there is already evidence that before all is said and done, it will become evident that Bill Clinton has done a much better job of controlling his own compulsive urges than Obama has, since there is evidence that the Illinois Senator has veered recklessly into the world of bisexuality.

As the columnist Spengler of the *Asia Times* points out, Michelle Obama – who often sounds like a feminist when she is talking about her own immediate concerns – shows no indignation about the tragic spousal abuse which Ann was willing to undergo: 'Michelle Obama speaks with greater warmth of her mother-in-law than of her husband. "She was kind of a dreamer, his mother," Michelle Obama was quoted in the January 25 *Boston Globe*. "She wanted the world to be open to her and her children. And as a result of her naivete, sometimes they lived on food stamps, because sometimes dreams don't pay the rent. But as a result of her naivete, Barack got to see the world like most of us don't in this country." How strong the ideological motivation must be of a mother to raise her children on thin fare in pursuit of a political agenda. "Naivete" is a euphemism for Ann Dunham's motivation… Many Americans harbor leftist views, but not many marry into them, twice.' (*Asia Times*, February 26, 2008) Indeed: what kind of left liberal feminist is going to accept abandonment by a man whom she knew to be at least a bigamist?

ANN DUNHAM, FORD FOUNDATION OPERATIVE: THE MICROLOAN RACKET

Ann Dunham became famous posthumously when *Time* Magazine placed a picture of her with Barry (Obama) as a toddler – complete with halo – on the cover of its April 21, 2008 issue – in a forlorn attempt to humanize the recently bittergated Obama just before the Pennsylvania primary. The overall intent here is to whitewash this quasi-Marxist, Rousseauvian leftist anthropologist into a sort of middle American humanitarian – an attempt so transparent that *Time* began receiving letters impugning its journalistic integrity. Nevertheless, we do learn more about Ann's later career as Ford Foundation operative. Her specialty was the cynical financier racket known as microloans or microcredits – tiny sums of money lent at substantial interest rates to tiny third world entrepreneurs, with the classic case being the purchase of a cell phone to provide phone service to some rural village – all in lieu of real communications and transportation infrastructure which the finance oligarchs at the World Bank and the regional lending agencies had no intention of financing. Microloans represented the World Bank's notion of small is beautiful "appropriate technology" – meaning that if you are a backward country, then backward, third-rate technology is all you will get, so you had better take it with gratitude. Microloans also served to tether the third world masses to the mentality of finance capital, familiarizing them with notions of interest rates, the deadlines for installment payments, and all the dreary apparatus of usury. This entire cynical enterprise reached a paroxysm a decade after Ann Dunham's death, when Muhammad Yunus of the Bangladeshi Grameen Bank won the 1996 Nobel Peace Prize for his work in pioneering micro-credits. By this time, the micro-credit was widespread, with a 2004 report showing that some 3,200 micro-credit institutions were reaching more than 92 million clients, mainly in the poorest countries of the underdeveloped world. It was an exercise in loan sharking and predatory lending to the most desperate people in the world, the most defenseless victims of economic globalization. When Yunus won his Nobel, he was widely praised: "Muhammad Yunus is a revolutionary in the best sense of the word," said Sam Daley-Harris, director of the Microcredit Summit Campaign in Washington,

D.C. He was in fact a counter-revolutionary in the service of rapacious finance capital, and this was a good description of the mature Stanley Ann Dunham, Obama's mother. As for Ann, she no doubt kept telling herself that she was doing something very radical.

The adulatory *Time* account tells us that after her divorce from her Indonesian second husband Lolo Sotero or Soetero, Ann 'took a big job as the program officer for women and employment at the Ford Foundation, and she spoke up forcefully at staff meetings. Unlike many other expats, she had spent a lot of time with villagers, learning their priorities and problems, with a special focus on women's work. "She was influenced by hanging out in the Javanese marketplace," [her acquaintance] Zurbuchen says, "where she would see women with heavy baskets on their backs who got up at 3 in the morning to walk to the market and sell their produce." Ann thought the Ford Foundation should get closer to the people and further from the government, just as she had.' In other words, her programs would subvert the existing government by pretending to take the side of the oppressed masses – just what Soros and the other Wall Street jackals would have desired. Ann's 'home became a gathering spot for the powerful and the marginalized: politicians, filmmakers, musicians and labor organizers. "She had, compared with other foundation colleagues, a much more eclectic circle," Zurbuchen says. "She brought unlikely conversation partners together."' These eclectic and bohemian tastes live on in Barry. *Time* goes on: 'Ann's most lasting professional legacy was to help build the microfinance program in Indonesia, which she did from 1988 to '92—before the practice of granting tiny loans to credit-poor entrepreneurs was an established success story. Her anthropological research into how real people worked helped inform the policies set by the Bank Rakyat Indonesia, says Patten, an economist who worked there. "I would say her work had a lot to do with the success of the program," he says. Today Indonesia's microfinance program is No. 1 in the world in terms of savers, with 31 million members, according to Microfinance Information Exchange Inc., a microfinance-tracking outfit. […] Every so often, Ann would leave Indonesia to live in Hawaii—or New York or even, in the mid-1980s, Pakistan, for a microfinance job.' (Amanda Ripley, "Raising Obama," *Time*, April 21, 2008) As for Barack Obama, his thoughts were elsewhere; he writes that in these years of living in the ethnically diverse atmosphere of Hawaii, "I was too young to know that I needed a race." (*Dreams* 27) A strange attitude for a candidate who now poses as being virtually trans-racial and even post-racial.

LOLO SOETERO AND INDONESIA: COSMOPOLITANISM AND ANTI-AMERICANISM

Obama's mother Ann then remarried; her second husband was Lolo Soetero Mangunharjo, a student from Indonesia who was also studying at the University of Hawaii. Lolo Soetero later became an official of the Director General's office in the TNI Topography division of the Indonesian Army, and still later worked as an oil company executive in Indonesia. Soetero was studying in Hawaii under a program sponsored by the Indonesian government. At first the Indonesian government was that of Sukarno, who had led the independence struggle against Dutch colonialism in the 1940s. Sukarno, along with Nkrumah of Ghana, Nasser of Egypt, Tito of Yugoslavia, and Nehru of India had founded the non-aligned movement at the Bandung conference of 1955. This movement was made up of Third World developing countries who refused to subordinate themselves permanently to the United States or the Soviet Union, but who tried to constitute a third way in world affairs during the Cold War era.

In 1965, the CIA supported the Indonesian coup d'état of General Suharto, who overthrew the Sukarno regime and initiated a bloody reign of terror which lasted for several years and which

included the massacre of several hundred thousand Indonesian communists, leftists, and supporters of Sukarno. In 1967, when Soetero's Indonesian passport was revoked because of political unrest in Indonesia, Ann Dunham and Barack, who was then in first grade, accompanied him back to Jakarta. It appears that Lolo Soetero was called back to Indonesia because as a student he was automatically considered a politically unreliable supporter of the now ousted Sukarno regime. As soon as he returned to Indonesia, Soetero was interrogated by the authorities and then was drafted into the Indonesian army, spending at least a year in military service in New Guinea. Obama lived with his mother and stepfather in Jakarta between 1968 and 1973. Obama attended local schools in Jakarta from ages 6 to 10, where classes were taught in Indonesian. When he was in third grade he wrote an essay saying that he wanted to become president, although he was not sure of what country.

ANN DUNHAM: RAGE AGAINST THE UGLY AMERICAN

During the time that Lolo was employed in the government relations office of an American oil company, Ann was massively exposed to The Ugly American. Obama tells us: "sometimes I would overhear him and my mother arguing in their bedroom, usually about her refusal to attend his company dinner parties, where American businessmen from Texas and Louisiana would slap Lolo's back and boast about the palms they had greased to obtain the new offshore drilling rights, while their wives would complain to my mother about the quality of the Indonesian help. He would ask her how it would look for him to go alone, and remind her that these were her own people, and my mother's voice would rise to almost a shout. They are *not* my people." Obama describes his mother during this phase: "in a land where fatalism remained a necessary tool for enduring hardship, where ultimate truths were kept separate from day-to-day realities, she was a lonely witness for secular humanism, a soldier for New Deal, Peace Corps, position-paper liberalism." (*Dreams* 47, 50)

SENIOR AND LOLO: FAITHFUL TO JOHNNY WALKER, NOT THE KORAN

The two third-world men Ann Dunham had chosen to marry had a few things in common: both were nominal Moslems whose devotion to Johnny Walter Black Label scotch whiskey was greater than their devotion to the Koran. Her marriage to Lolo Soetero also ended in divorce, but she remained in Indonesia until her life was almost over; she died in 1995. One witness to Ann Dunham's life during these years was one of her later professors; this was "Alice Dewey, a granddaughter of the philosopher John Dewey and an emeritus professor of anthropology at the University of Hawaii, who was the chairman of Ann Dunham's Ph.D. thesis committee and became a close friend over many years." Alice Dewey told a reporter that 'Dunham "divorced happily" from Soetero—who died in 1987 of complications from a liver ailment—in part because "he gradually became more and more like a Westerner and she became more and more like a Javanese." Obama told me he could only laugh at the false press accounts that portray Soetero as some kind of radical Muslim who had sent him to an Islamic school. "I mean, you know, his big thing was Johnny Walker Black, Andy Williams records," Obama said. "I still remember 'Moon River.' He'd be playing it, sipping, and playing tennis at the country club. That was his whole thing. I think their expectations diverged fairly rapidly." (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) Ann Dunham, we see, had gone native in Indonesia. The commonality between the two men she married was Islam according to some, but the deeper commonality would appear to have been Johnny Walker, in which they both indulged heavily.

After Ann Dunham's divorce from Lolo Soetero, she went back to live in Hawaii, where she began the graduate study of anthropology. But she then returned to Indonesia to carry out her

anthropological field work. At this point, Barack Obama, aged about 9, was left with his grandparents. Abandonment by his father was now thus followed by prolonged separation from his mother, leading to unpredictable psychological consequences. If Larry Sinclair's allegations are accurate, Barack Obama is a closet bisexual, and the resulting potential for the blackmailing of a possible future president is an issue which voters will obviously need to consider very carefully before putting such a person into the White House.[7]

Alice Dewey further described Obama's mother as 'the most hardworking person I maybe ever have met. And did it without seeming to. She was cheerful, down to earth. She absolutely was the kind of person you wanted on your side in any situation, from a barroom brawl to an academic argument, and she was always there for the little guy, particularly the little woman." For most of the 1970s, 80s, and 90s, she shuttled between Hawaii and Indonesia, doing academic research and paying the bills by teaching English or working for nonprofit organizations such as the Ford Foundation.' (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) The Ford Foundation looms large over Obama's life: it was his mother's employer, and later the decisive influence over his church in Chicago.

ANN DUNHAM'S LATER YEARS: FORD FOUNDATION, US AID, WORLD BANK OPERATIVE

Some journalistic accounts have correctly stressed that Ann Dunham in the latter part of her career became a much more important person than is commonly recognized. One reason that she has been underestimated is undoubtedly the attempt by the Obama campaign to make the candidate's mother appear as bland and conventional as possible. But she was in fact an international civil servant who played a key role in developing the notion of microloans, one of the main tokenist World Bank strategies for parrying the demand for real Third World economic and infrastructural development under the reign of globalization. As Kim Chipman of Bloomberg writes, 'Barack Obama's mother was most at home a world away from her Midwest roots, trekking the old Silk Road or arranging small loans for weavers in Indonesia. "I'm so tired of seeing her described as just a white woman from Kansas," says Bronwen Solyom, 63, who first met Ann Dunham in the 1970s when they were graduate students in anthropology at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu. "She was much more than that."'

Ann Dunham was also known for her later work as an anthropologist and social activist for Ford Foundation counter-insurgency projects in Indonesia under the reactionary Suharto regime. Chipman notes, 'Terance Bigalke, who worked with Dunham at the Ford Foundation in Jakarta, says she also fostered social activism in her children through her work on behalf of the world's poor. "She had such a strong concern for people who were in difficult circumstances economically," says Bigalke, 59. That concern led her to study the underground economy of Jakarta street vendors.' Ann Dunham's interest in anthropology had begun in Indonesia, Chipman found. Her first months in Indonesia "sparked a lifelong passion that later led Dunham to return to Hawaii for graduate studies in anthropology and an 800-page Ph.D. thesis on Indonesian blacksmithing. Her interest in the local culture was aroused almost immediately, when she started teaching English to Indonesians." In effect, whatever her subjective intentions, Ann Dunham profiled the Indonesian population for the United States Agency for International Development (US AID), the Ford Foundation, the World Bank, all key institutions for dollar imperialism.

Chipman shows that Ann Dunham's interest in anthropology was closely linked to her contributions to imperialist strategy: 'Friends say Dunham found her calling through her work, which evolved from studying batik and ironwork to obtaining microfinancing for craftspeople,

especially women, in rural areas of developing countries. "She was a scholar who was one of the first to see about microbanking," Abercrombie says. In 1986, Dunham did a one-year development project in Pakistan. That year, mother and daughter took a two-week journey along the old Silk Route to China. Dunham's work for the Agricultural Development Bank of Pakistan was followed by stints at People's Bank of Indonesia and Women's World Banking in New York. She also did consulting work for the World Bank and US AID. "She was getting to pretty high-powered positions, working in world organizations as an expert, but she always liked the people at the bottom."' Naturally, any anthropologist doing field work needs to feel or feign a sympathetic interest in people being interviewed, the ethnographic material of the study. This does not mean that the sentiments are always genuine, but the anthropologist will be more effective if they are.

According to the *Time* magazine cover-up cover story in April 2008, Dunham became an important official of the Ford Foundation with special responsibility for women's and gender issues. Her own track record in serving as a doormat for her first husband, the imperious Obama Senior, would hardly qualify her as a feminist. Dunham's subjective devotion to third world people was by all indications sincere. 'In her 40s, Dunham talked about adopting a baby. "She loved kids, and we were taking too long making her a grandmother," says Maya, noting that her mother never got to meet any of her grandchildren. After seeing a news report about the offspring of children in Korea born to African-American soldiers, she decided that would be the perfect addition to her multiethnic family, Dewey says. Dunham was "very specific about what she wanted,"' Maya says. Instead, Dunham found herself battling both ovarian and uterine cancer. Until her death, she displayed the unflappable temperament that she passed on to Obama, Dewey says. "She took it in stride," she says. "She didn't fuss about it."' (Kim Chipman, "Obama Drive Gets Inspiration From His White Mom Born in Kansas," Bloomberg, February 11, 2008) Obama's mother thus evokes a stoic or quietist quality which we have seen in her passivity when she was abandoned by her first husband.

If, as candidate Obama categorically states in his own book, Ann Dunham represented the decisive influence on his formative years, what can we conclude to be the content of that influence? We have followed Ann Dunham from her youth as a provincial atheist and radical left liberal, through her subsequent phases as a communist sympathizer, Third World enthusiast, anti-racist, anthropologist, and to her final stage as a consultant to the Ford Foundation, US AID, and the World Bank. Is there an invariant to this process? Ann Dunham was certainly concerned about the problems of global poverty and economic underdevelopment, but she appears to have been incapable of understanding which institutions were responsible for holding back mankind's economic progress. Worse, she ended up by going to work for precisely those institutions. Who then, in her mind, was responsible for underdevelopment?

The acerbic but perceptive commentator Spengler of the *Asia Times* believes that he has discovered the ruling passion of both Ann Dunham and her son Barack Obama, and that this ruling passion is radical anti-Americanism. Spengler's perspective is doubtless tinged with the cultural and historical pessimism of *Mitteleuropa,* but his findings nevertheless compel careful attention. Spengler starts by noting that

> Soetero had been sponsored as a graduate student by one of the most radical of all Third World governments…. When Ann Dunham chose to follow Lolo Soetero to Indonesia in 1967, she brought the six-year-old Barack into the kitchen of anti-colonialist outrage, immediately following one of the worst episodes of civil violence in post-war history. Dunham's experience in Indonesia provided the material for a doctoral dissertation celebrating the hardiness of local

cultures against the encroaching metropolis. It was entitled, "Peasant blacksmithing in Indonesia: surviving against all odds.

In this respect Dunham remained within the mainstream of her discipline. Anthropology broke into popular awareness with Margaret Mead's long-discredited *Coming of Age in Samoa* (1928), which offered a falsified ideal of sexual liberation in the South Pacific as an alternative to the supposedly repressive West. Mead's work was one of the founding documents of the sexual revolution of the 1960s, and anthropology faculties stood at the left-wing fringe of American universities.' (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008) It might be more accurate to call this left-wing fringe the postmodern fringe.

The specific brand of leftism in play here is once again Rousseau's doctrine of the noble savage, which unquestionably provides the foundation for the anthropology of the entire 20th century. Rousseau's argument was that the original sin of human civilization had been to develop beyond the most primitive stage of Paleolithic hunting, gathering, and foraging. The fall from grace occurred with the introduction of village life, metallurgy, and most of all the state, with accompanying notions of property. Rousseau, who had lived in Venice as a secretary to the French ambassador, asserted that it was civilization itself which made human individuals evil and corrupt. The healing of civilization therefore required a return to the reign of the noble savage — meaning in practice the retrogression of civilization back to the old stone age. Margaret Mead's fake scholarship about the sexual mores of the South Sea Islanders represented a part of this effort to put civilization into reverse gear. Various modern day thinkers, from radical environmentalists to neocon theoreticians like Leo Strauss have also endorsed this notion of turning back the clock of civilized progress: it is a very, very reactionary notion, and would of course imply genocide on an unimaginable scale if ever attempted.

Spengler goes on to note: "Barack Obama received at least some instruction in the Islamic faith of his father and went with him to the mosque, but the importance of this experience is vastly overstated by conservative commentators who seek to portray Obama as a Muslim of sorts. Radical anti-Americanism, rather than Islam, was the reigning faith in the Dunham household. In the Muslim world of the 1960s, nationalism rather than radical Islam was the ideology of choice among the enraged. Radical Islam did not emerge as a major political force until the nationalism of a Gamal Abdel Nasser or a Sukarno failed." It might be more accurate to state that radical Islam was one of several ideological counteroffensives launched by Anglo-American imperialism during the 1950s in order to undercut the vast appeal of Nasser, Sukarno, and the other militant nonaligned leaders.

OBAMA: AN ANTHROPOLOGIST PROFILING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AS ETHNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Spengler comes to the following chilling conclusion: "Barack Obama is a clever fellow who imbibed hatred of America with his mother's milk, but worked his way up the elite ladder of education and career. He shares the resentment of Muslims against the encroachment of American culture, although not their religion. He has the empathetic skill set of an anthropologist who lives with his subjects, learns their language, and elicits their hopes and fears while remaining at emotional distance. That is, he is the political equivalent of a sociopath. The difference is that he is practicing not on a primitive tribe but on the population of the United States." (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008)

It is in this context that we should interpret the following comment from Ann Dunham's former anthropology professor, Alice Dewey. '"It's too bad she's not here," Alice Dewey says. "She'd be saying, with a little chuckle, 'Here's one of our own' and 'He's going to show them.'" (Kim Chipman, "Obama Drive Gets Inspiration From His White Mom Born in Kansas," Bloomberg, February 11, 2008) This raises the question of a possible future president who would be animated by a resentment of or even hatred towards the American people, or at least towards the blue-collar or white lower middle-class sectors of the American people, the ones most frequently accused by wealthy elitists of harboring racial prejudice. Obama may indeed harbor such feelings of hatred or resentment. It does no good to object that Obama does not propose an explicit program of using austerity and sacrifice (as demanded by the Trilateral financier oligarchy) as a means for punishing blue-collar American and the white working poor for their alleged racist crimes; Obama is much too slick an operator to make any such admissions. If anything, it is Jeremiah Wright who has already made the admissions for him. Obama approaches his task of campaigning with the cynical and manipulative detachment of an anthropologist carrying out field work among some old stone age people, like the Yanomami Indians: he is treating the American people as ethnographic material in the great Trilateral experiment of depression crisis management, and the results will be horrifying.

"HE'S GOING TO SHOW THEM"

Precisely what is it, we must ask, that Obama is going to show the American people if he should succeed in taking power? Will he proceed to act out the deeply felt resentments of his mother against American society? Will he exact revenge for the racial slights and humiliations which he believes he has undergone?

It was during his time in Indonesia that young Barack Obama underwent a dramatic experience which helped to establish the primacy of race and racial identity in his thinking. (*Dreams* 51 ff.) He was at the time nine years old, and his mother was working at the US Embassy in Jakarta. While sitting in an office waiting for his mother, young Obama was looking through some issues of *Life* magazine. Here he found an article which he says he experienced as an "ambush attack." The article described the plight of a black man who had decided to use a harsh chemical treatment in order to lighten the color of his skin. Obama says he was horrified to see a picture of the man, whose skin had been flayed off by the chemicals, leaving him scarred and disfigured. '"I imagine other black children, then and now, undergoing similar moments of revelation," Obama later wrote. According to a recent magazine article, Obama's account cannot be taken at face value because 'no such photo exists, according to historians at [*Life*] magazine. No such photos, no such article. When asked about the discrepancy, Obama said in a recent interview, "It might have been in *Ebony* or it might have been ... who knows what it was?" (At the request of the *Chicago Tribune*, archivists at *Ebony* searched their catalogue of past articles, none of which matched what Obama recalled.) In fact, it is surprising, based on interviews with more than two dozen people who knew Obama during his nearly four years in Indonesia, that it would take a photograph in a magazine to make him conscious of the fact that some people might treat him differently in part because of the color of his skin.' (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) Perhaps Obama is bending the facts in order to document what he considers to be his own growth in personal awareness from a relative indifference to racial matters to race and racial identity as a central concern, which he obviously believed by 1995 — perhaps under the influence of such race theoreticians as the Reverend Jeremiah Wright — to represent a superior level of awareness. Obama's mother Ann Dunham died in 1995 of ovarian cancer, a few months after the publication of *Dreams from My Father*.

OBAMA AND ISLAM

Because Obama's biological father and stepfather were both at least nominally Moslems, and because Obama attended Moslem schools for at least part of the time that he lived in Indonesia, a controversy has arisen due to the accusation by right-wing commentators that Obama remains a crypto-Moslem. In an attempt to answer this drumbeat, on January 24, 2007, the Obama campaign released the following statement: "To be clear, Senator Obama has never been a Muslim, was not raised a Muslim, and is a committed Christian who attends the United Church of Christ in Chicago." But this seemed to dodge the issue of Obama's attendance at the Moslem schools in Indonesia. On March 14th, 2007, the Obama campaign offered this statement to correct their previous statement: "Obama has never been a practicing Muslim." The statement added that as a child, Obama had spent time in the neighborhood Islamic center during his stay in Jakarta. In his book *Dreams from My Father*, Obama talks of studying the Quran and describes the public school as "a Muslim school." (See *Dreams*) The testimony of Obama's half-sister is also relevant: "My whole family was Muslim, and most of the people I knew were Muslim," said Maya Soetoro-Ng, Mr. Obama's younger half sister. But Mr. Obama attended a Catholic school and then a Muslim public school…." (*New York Times*, April 30, 2007)

Tine Hahiyary was one of Obama's teachers and the principal of the school he attended in Indonesia from 1971 through 1989, and has testified that Obama attended Islamic religious training during his time at the school. His teacher was named Maimunah and she resided in the Puncak area, the Cianjur Regency. "I remembered that he had studied mengaji" (or mengagi, meaning rote recitation of the Quran), Tine reported.[8] Obama himself writes that "In the Muslim school, the teacher wrote to tell mother I made faces during Koranic studies." (See *Dreams*)

A blogger from Jakarta has written more recently that 'The actual usage of the word 'mengaji' in Indonesian and Malaysian societies means the study of learning to recite the Quran in the Arabic language rather than the native tongue. 'Mengagi' is a word and a term that is accorded the highest value and status in the mindset of fundamentalist societies here in Southeast Asia. To put it quite simply**,** 'mengaji classes' are not something that a non-practicing or so-called moderate Muslim family would ever send their child to. To put this in a Christian context, this is something above and beyond simply enrolling your child in Sunday school classes. The fact that Obama had attended mengaji classes is well-known in Indonesia and has left many there wondering just when Obama is going to come out of the closet." In another internet report posted in 2007, Obama's classmate Rony Amiris, now a manager of the Bank Mandiri in Jakarta, describes him as being a devout Muslim. "Barry was previously quite religious in Islam," Amiris recalled. "We previously often asked him to the prayer room close to the house. If he was wearing a sarong he looked funny," added Rony. In 2007, Emirsyah Satar, CEO of Garuda Indonesia, stated in an internet interview: "He [Obama] was often in the prayer room wearing a sarong, at that time."[9] A blogger calling himself American Expat in Southeast Asia, who says he has lived in Indonesia for some 20 years, has written on laotze.blogspot.com that "Barack Hussein Obama might have convinced some Americans that he is no longer a Muslim, but so far he has not convinced many in the world's most populous Muslim country who still see him as a Muslim and a crusader for Islam and world peace. Barack Hussein Obama's race, his staunch opposition to the war in Iraq, his sympathy to Islam and Muslims worldwide and his Muslim heritage receive Indonesian media coverage. There is no mention of his apostasy."[10]

Mussolini, as part of his propaganda towards the Moslems of North Africa and the Middle East, described himself once as holding a Bible in one hand and a Koran in the other. Napoleon did the

same. Hitler appealed to Moslems living under British rule from Egypt to Afghanistan by dropping hints that he was either sympathetic to Islam or else actually a Moslem, and many Moslems were either flattered by these references or actually believed them. Mussolini and Hitler were in reality atheists.

OBAMA'S SIBLINGS: NINE CHANCES FOR A NEW BILLY CARTER OR NEIL BUSH

The siblings of sitting presidents have often been a source of corruption and scandal. Dwight Eisenhower was lucky in that his brother Milton was eminently respectable and served as the president of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. But Richard Nixon had much trouble with his brother Donald. Bill Clinton was embarrassed by his brother Roger, and this has also been the lot of Hillary Clinton in regard to her brother Hugh. George Bush the elder harvested negative publicity from the cooperation of his brother Prescott Bush Jr. with Japanese organized crime figures. A famous presidential brother implicated in criminal or unethical activity was Billy Carter, who accepted large bribes from the government of Libya. Most damaging of all to the taxpayers has been Neil Bush, the younger brother of the current tenant of the White House, whose role in the bankruptcy of Silverado Savings and Loan cost the Resolution Trust Corporation upwards of $3 billion. Neil Bush was also scheduled to meet with Scott Hinckley, the elder brother of purported lone assassin John Hinckley Jr., on the day after John Hinckley opened fire on President Reagan. (See Tarpley, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography*, 1992)

But all of this pales in comparison with the nepotism, graft and corruption we are likely to witness in an Obama presidency. Obama has an estimated total of 9 siblings, all half brothers and half sisters. One who has appeared in his campaign is Maya Sotero-Ng, a daughter of Ann Dunham and Lolo Soetero. The offspring of Barack Hussein Obama Senior are thought to number eight in all, by three mothers in addition to Ann Dunham.

CHAPTER II: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY AND RECRUITMENT BY ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI

> … the intelligence community has deposited provocateurs in at least some of our schools so that the conditions necessary for learning have been, through the ensuing turmoil, destroyed. – Vincent J. Salandria, 1971.

Obama was fortunate enough to enjoy some very special educational opportunities. These opportunities were not due to any special intellectual ability or capacity for hard work on the part of our future candidate. They were rather due to the fact that his mother by now had become an important operative for the Ford Foundation, and the foundation community takes care of its own because of the obvious advantages of recruiting from households in which the oligarchical, multicultural, and postmodern values of the foundation world are assumed as axiomatic. Obama's mother and grandparents clearly did everything they could to advance his upward mobility through schooling, and this paid off when he was accepted into the most exclusive prep school in Hawaii. Because of Obama's much-advertised racial identity, there can also be no doubt that preferential admissions for minorities based on affirmative action must also have played a significant role. Obama is therefore not the product of a meritocracy or a career open to talents; he is rather the fruit of special treatment meted out under the aegis of minority quotas favored by the foundation world as the keystone of their strategy for keeping the American people so fragmented as to perpetuate oligarchical financier rule. If we need to generalize about Obama, we can say that his hardware was provided by the Ford Foundation and its various lesser foundation satellites, while his software was added later through his association with the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberger Group in the person of Zbigniew Brzezinski, the evil genius of the Jimmy Carter administration of 1977-1981. To these phases of Obama's story we now turn.

ELITIST PREPPY AT THE PUNAHOU SCHOOL OF HAWAII

When Obama was ten years old, his mother Ann sent him back to Honolulu to live with his maternal grandparents so he could attend the prestigious Punahou School, an elite and exclusive prep school whose alumni also include America Online founder Steve Case: '"Ann saw first of all that he was so bright that he needed to come and really be challenged by a good school," says Benji Bennington, 73, the retired curator of the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii. Dunham also hoped that "maybe he'd meet a few blacks while here, because he was not meeting them in Jakarta." The family was reunited about a year later when Dunham separated from Soetero and returned to Honolulu for graduate school.' "He was very much the patriarch as a young person," says sister Maya. "Our mother was incredibly strong but also incredibly sensitive. She would cry easily. He was always protective of her." When Dunham moved back to Jakarta for her anthropology field work, Barack saw his mother and half-sister only for Christmas and summer break.' (Kim Chipman, Bloomberg, op. cit.)

Obama entered the fifth grade at Punahou and stayed there until he graduated from high school with honors in 1979. He reports that he was one of three black students at the school, although there were many Asians and Pacific islanders. Obama's *Dreams from My Father* provides incidents of Obama's feeling of racial humiliation while attending this school and chronicles his embrace of a specific black or African-American racial identity as a matter of his own deliberate and conscious choice. This path of development may be compared with Hitler's discovery of his own Germanic

racial identity which forms an important part of *Mein Kampf*. There is, however, some question as to whether Obama's account of his repeated racial mortification by racist or thoughtless whites is accurate, or whether it represents a fictitious construct designed to bolster his credibility for his later career in Chicago as a black identity politician. Obama was on the basketball team at Punahou and seems to have enjoyed some prestige. Some accounts report that, while he was a student in the late 1970s, he carved his name in the pavement outside the cafeteria of Punahou School. These graffiti reportedly read: "King Obama."

Here begins Obama's intense, consuming preoccupation with race, the great central issue of his subsequent life, in spite of what he now says. He learns about the imperative of race from a black friend named Ray: "Our rage at the white world needed no object, he seemed to be telling me, no independent confirmation; it could be switched on and off at our pleasure." (*Dreams* 81) Obama experiences this assumption of a racial identity as a narrowing and constriction of the spirit of his own personality which he is nonetheless driven to accept: "following this maddening logic, the only thing you could choose as your own was withdrawal into a smaller and smaller coil of rage, until being black meant only the knowledge of your own powerlessness, of your own defeat. And the final irony: should you refuse this defeat and lash out at your captors, they would have a name for that too, a name that could cage you just as good. Paranoid. Militant. Violent. N****r." (*Dreams* 85)

During one phase, Obama became intensely preoccupied with the literary expression of his own situation as found in the works of such writers as James Baldwin, Ralph Ellison, Langston Hughes, Richard Wright, W.E.B. DuBois, and Malcolm X. All but the last of this number, he judged, had been consumed by anguish, doubt, and self-contempt. Almost all of them had "eventually succumbed to its corrosive force," and these had ended up as "exhausted, bitter men, the devil at their heels." (*Dreams* 86) Malcolm X, Obama found, was better and stronger: "even as I imagined myself following Malcolm's call, one line in the book stayed with me. He spoke of a wish he'd once had, the wish that the white blood that ran through him, there by an act of violence, might somehow be expunged. I know that, for Malcolm, that wish would never be incidental." (*Dreams* 86)

The *Daily Mail* stresses Obama's later account of racial humiliation at Punahou: '…while there, says Mr Obama, he was tortured by fellow pupils – who let out monkey hoots – and turned into a disenchanted teenage rebel, experimenting with cocaine and marijuana. Even his grandparents were troubled by dark skin, he says in his book, recalling how once his grandmother complained about being pestered by a beggar. "You know why she's so scared?" he recalls his grandfather saying. "She told me the fella was black." Mr Obama says his soaring 'dream' of a better America grew out of his 'hurt and pain.' This is the incident Obama referred to later in his Philadelphia speech on racism of March 2008, after the first phase of the Jeremiah Wright scandal had exploded. The British reporters doubt that this was the real story: '"Friends, however, remember his time at school rather differently. He was a spoiled high-achiever, they recall, who seemed as fond of his grandparents as they were of him. He affectionately signed a school photo of himself to them, using their pet names, Tut and Gramps. The caption says: "Thanks... for all the good times." He worked on the school's literary magazine and wore a white suit, of the style popular with New York writers like Tom Wolf at the time. One of his former classmates, Alan Lum, said: "Hawaii is such a melting pot that it didn't occur to me when we were growing up that he might have problems about being one of the few African-Americans at the school. Us kids didn't see colour. He was easy-going and well-liked." Lon Wysard, who also attended the academy, said the budding politician was in fact

idolised for his keen sportsmanship. "He was the star basketball player and always had a ball in his hand wherever he was," Wysard recalled.' (London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007)

OBAMA AS EXISTENTIALIST POET

One of Obama's classmates and friends during this time was Keith "Ray" Kakugawa, who later observed that "Barry's biggest struggles then were missing his parents. His biggest struggles were his feelings of abandonment." Ray later went deeply into the drug culture and served three years in prison because of illegal narcotics, emerging as homeless in the spring of 2007. A window into the mentality of the youthful Obama is available in the form of a short poem he wrote during these years, and which is quoted by Purdum in *Vanity Fair*. Purdum reports that Obama 'immersed himself in the writings of James Baldwin, Ralph Ellison, Langston Hughes, and Malcolm X, only to find the same anguish, the same self-doubt, a self-contempt that neither irony nor intellect seemed able to deflect," as he did in this poem for the school literary magazine, *Ka Wai Ola*:

> I saw an old, forgotten man
> On an old, forgotten road.
> Staggering and numb under the glare of the
> Spotlight. His eyes, so dull and grey,
> Slide from right to left, to right,
> Looking for his life, misplaced in a
> Shallow, muddy gutter long ago.
> I am found, instead.
> Seeking a hiding place, the night seals us together.
> A transient spark lights his face, and in my honor,
> He pulls out forgotten dignity from under his flaking coat,
> And walks a straight line along the crooked world.

When I mentioned the poem to Obama, he at first had no memory of it. After I read it to him, he said, "That's not bad. I wrote that in high school? You know, it sounds in spirit that it's talking a little bit about my grandfather."' (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) Based on this evidence, Obama was most likely a typical teenage existentialist, preoccupied above all with his own feeling states, self-doubt, and pessimism. It is curious that he cannot remember a statement as personal as this, even when shown it years later. Is Obama's memory still intact? And if not, why not? A whole range of possibilities, from drug abuse to early onset Alzheimer's to simple prevarication need to be considered.

HAWAII CPUSA CELL: FRANK MARSHALL DAVIS

During Obama's high school years in Hawaii, he came into close contact with an older black man whom he described in his memoir as Frank. This turns out to be one Frank Marshall Davis, a devoted long-term member of the Communist Party of the United States. Marshall had moved to Honolulu from Kansas in 1948; according to the pro-communist history Professor Gerald Horne of the University of Houston, Davis made the move "at the suggestion of his good friend Paul Robeson," the well-known black singer and actor who was also a CPUSA member. Both Davis and Robeson were from Chicago, and this may have something to do with Obama's later decision to move there. 'As Horne describes it, Davis "befriended" a "Euro-American family" that had "migrated to Honolulu from Kansas and a young woman from this family eventually had a child with a young student from Kenya East Africa who goes by the name of Barack Obama, who

retracing the steps of Davis eventually decamped to Chicago." (Cliff Kincaid, "Obama's Communist Mentor," Accuracy in Media, February 18, 2008) Obama's association with a prominent Communist furnished the basis for the charge made against Obama by Allen Keyes during the Senate campaign of 2004 that he was a "hard-core academic Marxist." Frank Marshall Davis was publicly identified as a member of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA). Obama was almost like a son to Davis, listening to his poetry and hanging on each word of his advice. Davis, along with some other older black men, appear to have constituted a sort of CPUSA cell or sleeper cell in Hawaii. Obama was taken to visit them in his early teens by his grandfather, Stanley Dunham. Davis was a part of this now-informal group.

Frank Marshall Davis was mentioned in the 1951 report of the Commission on Subversive Activities to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii as a CPUSA member. The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) accused Davis of involvement in several communist-front organizations. The identification of Obama's "Frank" as Frank Marshall Davis is confirmed by Trevor Loudon, a New Zealand libertarian activist, researcher and blogger in a posting of March 2007. Obama writes that he knew "a poet named Frank" who was a purveyor of "hard-earned knowledge," and advice. Frank had had "some modest notoriety once," and was "a contemporary of Richard Wright and Langston Hughes during his years in Chicago...," Frank was now "pushing eighty." Obama was impressed that "Frank and his old Black Power dashiki self" gave him advice before he left Hawaii for Occidental College in 1979, when Obama was 18.

Davis has been seen by some critics as a precursor to Maya Angelou and Alice Walker. There is at least one book-length study of Davis entitled *Black Moods: Collected Poems of Frank Marshall Davis* by John Edgar Tidwell, a professor at the University of Kansas. In his review of Tidwell's study published in the summer/fall 2003 issue of *African-American Review*, James A. Miller of George Washington University comments: "In Davis's case, his political commitments led him to join the American Communist Party during the middle of World War II – even though he never publicly admitted his Party membership." Tidwell is an expert on the life and writings of Davis.

The decrepit intellectual periphery of the CPUSA has been notably stirred up by Obama's candidacy, doubtless in part because of Davis. Professor Horne, who is a contributing editor of the Communist Party journal *Political Affairs*, mentioned the Obama-David connection in March 2007 at the Communist Party USA archives at the Tamiment Library at New York University; Horne's talk was entitled "Rethinking the History and Future of the Communist Party." Davis also figures prominently in *The New Red Negro: The Literary Left and African-American Poetry, 1930-1946* by James Edward Smethurst, associate professor of Afro-American studies at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. Here Davis appears as a black writer who remained loyal to the CPUSA even after Stalin's infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact with Hitler, at a time when other black intellectuals like Richard Wright broke with the CPUSA line. For Frank Marshall Davis, communism was the god that did not fail. But what was Frank's understanding of communism?

Obama writes in *Dreams from My Father* that he saw "Frank" only a few days before he left Hawaii for college, and that Davis seemed just as radical as ever. Davis called college "an advanced degree in compromise" and warned Obama not to forget his "people" and not to "start believing what they tell you about equal opportunity and the American way and all that s**t." Davis also complained about foot problems, the result of "trying to force African feet into European shoes," Obama wrote. Horne gloated that the Obama-Davis connection will emerge as a theme of wide study in the near future. Horne says that Obama's giving credit to Davis will be important in history. "At some point in the future, a teacher will add to her syllabus Barack's memoir and

instruct her students to read it alongside Frank Marshall Davis' equally affecting memoir, *Living the Blues* and when that day comes, I'm sure a future student will not only examine critically the Frankenstein monsters that US imperialism created in order to subdue Communist parties but will also be moved to come to this historic and wonderful archive in order to gain insight on what has befallen this complex and intriguing planet on which we reside," he said.

Dr. Kathryn Takara, a professor of Interdisciplinary Studies at the University of Hawaii at Manoa agrees that Davis is the "Frank" in Obama's book. Takara wrote her dissertation on Davis and interviewed him frequently between 1972 and 1987, before Davis died. Takara concludes that Davis demonstrated "an acute sense of race relations and class struggle throughout America and the world." For her, Davis was a "socialist realist." Davis had been urged by Paul Robeson and Harry Bridges, the pro-CPUSA head of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), to become a columnist for the *Honolulu Record* where he could work to advance the communist cause. Takara sums up Davis's program at that time as "freedom, radicalism, solidarity, labor unions, due process, peace, affirmative action, civil rights, Negro History week, and true Democracy to fight imperialism, colonialism, and white supremacy. He urged coalition politics."

COMMUNIST PARTY USA: OBAMA IS MARX'S OLD MOLE OF REVOLUTION

To advance this ideological *Walpurgisnacht* to an even more monstrous level, the CPUSA organ, *People's World Weekly*, recently published a letter from CPUSA supporter Frank Chapman gloating over Obama's victory in the Iowa caucuses. Chapman commented: "Obama's victory was more than a progressive move; it was a dialectical leap ushering in a qualitatively new era of struggle. … Marx once compared revolutionary struggle with the work of the mole, who sometimes burrows so far beneath the ground that he leaves no trace of his movement on the surface. This is the old revolutionary 'mole,' not only showing his traces on the surface but also breaking through." (Cliff Kincaid, "Obama's Communist Mentor," Accuracy in Media, February 18, 2008) The CPUSA has formally endorsed Obama for the presidency.

Obama may well have learned a lot more from Davis than dialectical materialism. There are indications scattered across the internet that Davis was bisexual. Officially he was married to Helen Canfield David of Chicago, reportedly a woman of some social standing.[11] If Obama's mentor of those years in fact had homosexual proclivities, this would be significant in explaining the later bisexual features of Obama's life.

Shortly before leaving Hawaii to go to Occidental College, Obama experiences one of his many racial epiphanies when he learns that his grandmother Toot has been frightened in the street by a black man whom she suspects of being a mugger. Obama recounts that when he heard of this incident, "the words were like a fist in my stomach, and I wobbled to regain my composure. In my steadiest voice, I told [Gramps] that such an attitude bothered me, too, but assured him that Toot's fears would pass and that we should give her a ride in the meantime. […] after they left, I sat on the edge of my bed and thought about my grandparents. They had sacrificed again and again for me. They had poured all their lingering hopes into my success. Never had they given me reason to doubt their love; I doubted if they ever would. And yet I knew that men who might easily have been my brothers could still inspire their rawest fears." (*Dreams* 89) When it comes to matters of race, we have already learned that Obama is jumpy as an eyeball, and here his racial hypersensitivity is displayed once again. In recent years, we have had many illustrious representatives of the American black community come forward to acknowledge that they, too, are sometimes uneasy when they are approached by aggressive black panhandlers in the streets.

Obama, by contrast, continues to be so obsessed with this trifling incident that he included it in his notorious Philadelphia speech on race of March 18, 2008, where he compared the fears of a woman in late middle age with the violent invectives of the foundation-funded racist provocateur Jeremiah Wright. When it comes to matters of race, Obama clearly loses all sense of reality and proportions, and there is no reason to assume that anything whatsoever has changed in this regard.

"FRANK" – MARXIST OR GAY EXISTENTIALIST?

If Frank Marshall David had been a thorough Marxist, that would already have been bad enough. Karl Marx, as I have shown in *Surviving the Cataclysm,* was in most respects a kept ideologue of British intelligence, sponsored by David Urquhardt of the British Foreign Office, with a mission of fomenting destabilization by pitting workers against industrialists in continental Europe, and with a secondary task of whipping up sentiment against Russia. Like Mazzini the ultra-nationalist and Bakunin the hyper-anarchist, Marx the apostle of plebeian revolution was a prong of an ideological deployment by British intelligence to divide and conquer the main rivals of the British Empire. In an age when the oppressive dominion of the British Empire, then at the apogee of its power, was the leading reactionary political fact in the world, Marx chose to ignore that fact almost completely, and focus almost entirely on the opportunities for conflict that were emerging during the process of industrialization in the countries the British did not yet completely control. Marx, in other words, had a permanent blind spot when it came to the mixture of Whig Venetian party aristocrats and financiers who populated the City of London, and this blind spot lives on in his followers today. Still, Marx as a serious charlatan does reject Malthus, and does admit that economic science must face the problem of social reproduction, something that cruder charlatans like Malthus and Adam Smith are not willing to address. There is every reason to believe that Frank Marshal Davis imbibed the major negative aspects of Marx without absorbing the minor positive ones.

"Frank" was almost certainly a member of the Communist Party USA. But the quality of his assimilation of Marxism is quite another matter. The level of Marxist theoretical development in the CPUSA was notoriously very low. The lack of theory in the old CPUSA was one of the factors that made it so easy for the FBI to infiltrate it to the point of becoming a majority. Especially when it came to recruiting in the black community, the CPUSA was infamously opportunistic, always ready to jettison dialectical materialism when it appeared possible to recruit some new members on the basis of resistance to white racism. Based on what he says, Frank is not interested in proletarian internationalism in the struggle against world imperialism. He thinks that white people cannot understand his experiences as an oppressed black man. He rejects the unity of world history. Frank has nothing to do with Marxism. He is already a black cultural nationalist, with hardly a veneer of Marxist phraseology. Frank is more of an existentialist than a Marxist himself.

Immediately after the incident just reported, Obama narrates that he went to visit Frank Marshall Davis. From Davis, Obama received quantities of whiskey accompanied by a lecture on the incommunicability of race-based experience to persons on the other side of the color line, namely Obama's grandparents, the "white folk." Frank tells Obama that his grandfather is basically a good man but that the black experience for Gramps is a book sealed with seven seals: "He *can't* know me," says the communist Frank, "not the way I know him. Maybe some of these Hawaiians can, or the Indians on the reservation. They've seen their fathers humiliated. Their mothers desecrated. But your grandfather will never know what that feels like." (*Dreams* 90) Frank concludes: "what I'm trying to tell you is, your grandma's right to be scared. She's at least as right as Stanley is. She understands that black people have a reason to hate. That's just how it is. For your sake, I wish it were otherwise. But it's not. So you might as well get used to it." (*Dreams* 91)

OBAMA AS RACE-BASED EXISTENTIALIST: "UTTERLY ALONE"

By all indications, this is the experience which made Obama not only a confirmed racialist ideologue, but also a thoroughgoing existentialist in the tradition of Heidegger and Jaspers. Obama recounts the moment thus: "The earth shook under my feet, ready to crack open at any moment. I stopped, trying to steady myself and knew for the first time that I was utterly alone." (*Dreams* 91) This experience is of vital importance for understanding the mentality of the adult Obama. If Obama had been taught Marxism by Frank Marshall Davis, he would at this point say that he had decided to submerge his own existence in the greater reality of the march of class struggle through history. But he does not say that he is part of the vanguard of millions of workers. He says rather that he is absolutely, metaphysically alone. The finding here is that Obama was by this point a convinced existentialist, and that Obama's embrace of existentialism, the point of view which pervades so much of *Dreams*, gave him the prerequisites for becoming a full-fledged disciple of Frantz Fanon, an implacable enemy of Western civilization, proto-fascist, an apostle of purgative violence in the Sorel-Mussolini tradition. Obama spent years wallowing in existentialist self-pity. Obama's eager embrace of the existentialist world outlook provided some of the indispensable preconditions for his current career as a mob orator. It has equipped him to write his speeches out of a bag of alienation, despair, and absolute metaphysical loneliness, appealing with some semblance of pathos to the desire of his target audiences for community, hope, and change. At the same time, however, Obama's existentialism has provided him with his own personal path to fascism.

Many American readers may be surprised at the idea that existentialism is somehow connected to fascism, or can serve as an immediate prelude to fascism. This is probably because of the popular identification in this country of existentialism with such French writers as Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, both of whom were at pains to make a show of having supported the resistance against the Nazi occupation of their country. Later research has raised doubts about how much Sartre ever did to oppose the Nazis. Sartre was a disciple of Heidegger who took part for a while in a literary group with anti-occupation overtones, but this group, called *Socialisme et liberté,* "soon dissolved and Sartre decided to write, instead of being involved in active resistance. He then wrote *Being and Nothingness*, *The Flies* and *No Exit*, none of which was censored by the Germans, and also contributed to both legal and illegal literary magazines….the French philosopher and resistant Vladimir Jankelevitch criticized Sartre's lack of political commitment during the German occupation, and interpreted his further struggles for liberty as an attempt to redeem himself." (Wikipedia) (Obama clearly knows the French existentialists.)

We must remember that Sartre and Camus represent lesser gods in the international existentialist pantheon which is actually presided over by Martin Heidegger. Heidegger was a full throated, card-carrying member of the National Socialist party who delivered a public paean to Hitler in the form of his inaugural address as rector of the University of Freiburg. It is in this speech that Heidegger made the comment that the decision in favor of National Socialism had already been made by the youngest part of the German nation, thereby validating the fascist myth that it is youth and youth alone who are the arbiters of the political destinies of great nations — an absurd fiction which echoes through the empty vessels of the Obama lemming legions. In Obama, we see the intimate epistemological and ethical proximity of existentialism and fascism which is exemplified by Heidegger, the world's leading existentialist thinker and a Nazi at the same time.

EXISTENTIALISM AS ANTECHAMBER TO FASCISM

The Hungarian Marxist philosopher Georg Lukacs has provided the most detailed study of the ideological precursors of fascism and National Socialism in his 1952 book *Die Zerstörung der Vernunft* (The Destruction of Reason). Lukacs' summary of the existentialists Heidegger and Jaspers, both much touted by US and British philosophy departments, may give us some insights into Obama's mentality today. Lukacs sums up: "The philosophy of Jaspers as well as that of Heidegger concludes without any achievements but nevertheless with extremely important social consequences. Heidegger and Jaspers take extremely individualistic, petty bourgeois-aristocratic relativism and irrationalism to their most extreme consequences. They end up in the ice age, at the North Pole, in a world which has become empty, a senseless chaos, nothingness as the surroundings of humanity; and their despair about themselves, about their incorrigible loneliness is the inner content of their philosophy. […] Through this, the general mood of despair in broad layers of the German bourgeoisie and above all of the intelligentsia was exacerbated, while possible tendencies towards protest were discouraged, and the aggressive reactionaries received through this a significant assistance." (Lukacs 457) If fascism was able to educate wide sectors of the German intelligentsia into a more than benevolent neutrality, no small amount of the credit was due to the philosophy of Heidegger and Jaspers." In the same way that existentialism helped to open the door for fascism in central Europe, we can see that existentialism served as a kind of prelude to further fascist developments in Obama's own mental life.

Lukacs is especially interested in the role of despair in fascist ideology, both before and after 1945. Lukacs writes: "The mere word 'despair' as content of this ideology is not enough to explain it, because we have seen that Heidegger's despair was actually a direct preparation for Hitlerism. […] We are dealing here with something different with something greater and something more concrete. It is not just general despair about all human activity; just despair has led thinkers from Schopenhauer to Heidegger into the reactionary camp or at least into collaboration with the reactionaries. [Post-1945 existentialists] are not only in despair about things in general; their doubts and their despair are directed above all against those glad tidings which they are supposed to be proclaiming, namely the defense of the 'free world,'" understood as the Anglo-American sphere of world power." (Lukacs 704) For Lukacs, the pre-1945 fascists displayed cynical nihilism, while the post-1945 fascists have been characterized by cynical hypocrisy. This is a shoe that may well fit Obama.

We are arguing, in other words, that Obama's embrace of the philosophy of academic postmodernism has constituted an important stage in his development towards fascism. The postmodernism of which we speak has of course been the dominant intellectual outlook among most college and university faculties since about the 1970s. Intellectually speaking, it is a thin and unappetizing gruel, suitable for crabbed little people operating in a phase of imperialist decline. The starting point of postmodernism is the despair, disorientation, demoralization, and defeatism which emerged from the collapse of the positive social movements of the 1960s. From its very beginning, postmodernism has been much more interested in race and gender than in class. Postmodernism is an unsavory stew of existentialism, structuralism, deconstructionism, anthropological relativism, and Malthusianism, all thrown together in the cauldron of historical pessimism and cultural pessimism. The aspect of relativism has been especially important for the rejection and destruction of classical culture with its indispensable notions of human reason, human freedom, human greatness, and the heroic sense of the world historical individual. Instead, the drawings of patients in mental institutions are placed on the same plane as the works of Leonardo and Rafael, and Athens and Florence are compared unfavorably to hunting and gathering societies

where cannibalism and infanticide proliferate. Postmodernism is the creed of the morally insane. A thoroughgoing postmodernist (or "postie") must axiomatically reject any notion of objective reality; postmodernism when challenged beats a hasty retreat into a dream world of myth, metaphor, and archetype. Postmodernism gets its philosophical underpinnings most of all from Nietzsche and the other exponents of what the academics like to call "Continental philosophy," so as to avoid talking about the strong fascist overtones of many of these thinkers. The latent fascist potentialities of present day academic postmodernism are immense, and have only been waiting behind masks of cynicism and apathy for the appearance of an appropriate demagogue to mobilize them into the obvious forms of frenetic sociopathic activism.

FRANK WARNS OBAMA HE IS ABOUT TO BE RECRUITED

Before leaving for Occidental College, Obama visits Frank one last time to get his advice, somewhat on the model of Laertes going to Polonius in *Hamlet*. Frank tells Obama that college represents "an advanced degree in compromise." Frank explains that Obama has to understand the "real price of admission." The real price is "leaving your race at the door. Leaving your people behind. Understand something, boy. You're not going to college to get educated. You're going there to get *trained*. They'll train you to want what you don't need. They'll train you to manipulate words so they don't mean anything anymore. They'll train you to forget what it is that you already know. They'll train you so good, you'll start believing what they tell you about equal opportunity and the American way and all that s**t. They'll give you a corner office and invite you to fancy dinners, and tell you you're a credit to your race. Until you want to actually start running things and then they'll yank on your chain and let you know that you may be a well-trained, well paid n****r, but you're a n****r just the same." (*Dreams* 97)

This is one of the most illuminating passages in Obama's personal memoir. He is in effect confessing to the reader what is about to happen to him at Occidental College and above all with his encounter with Zbigniew Brzezinski at Columbia University: to become a wholly-owned asset and career sponsored by the networks of the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberger group, and the Council on Foreign Relations. Obama describes a process of training and indoctrination so thorough that it needs to be described as brainwashing. The personal identity of the individual is largely erased, resulting in a kind of automaton or zombie. Obama has now passed beyond the stage of brainwashing into the phase of spouting slogans to get ahead. He knows that what awaits him is a phase of nominal authority masking the reality of his role of abject puppet and stooge of his masters. This chapter might be subtitled "The Confessions of St. Barack," since he gives us a thumbnail sketch of his life, past, present, and future. This extraordinary revelation of the real nature and basis of Obama's career is of course a potential source of immense embarrassment, so it must have taken a compulsive urge to impel Obama to include it in the published text. This elementary lack of prudence illustrates another aspect of Obama's existentialism and fatalism: powerful, sincere emotions acquire for the existentialist a validity and justification which cannot be questioned, no matter how irrational and sociopathic those sincere emotions may be.

OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE: BONG HITS FOR FANON

Obama has conceded that he had made "some bad decisions" as a teenager involving drugs and drinking; this admission was made in a talk to high school students in New Hampshire in November 2007. The adulatory *Vanity Fair* profile attempts to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear by congratulating Obama on his frankness in admitting his systematic drug use. Here we read: "Mr.

Obama's admissions are rare for a politician (his book, *Dreams from My Father*, was written before he ran for office.) They briefly became a campaign issue in December when an adviser to Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, Mr. Obama's chief Democratic rival, suggested that his history with drugs would make him vulnerable to Republican attacks if he became his party's nominee. Mr. Obama, of Illinois, has never quantified his illicit drug use or provided many details. He wrote about his two years at Occidental, a predominantly white liberal arts college, as a gradual but profound awakening from a slumber of indifference that gave rise to his activism there and his fears that drugs could lead him to addiction or apathy, as they had for many other black men." It was doubtful that the GOP's Karl Rove attack machine would be so charitable with Obama.

Occidental black students self-segregated themselves; Obama writes that they were "like a tribe." (*Dreams* 98) They attempted to enforce conformity on students they considered non-white. Obama recounts the story of Joyce, a smart young multiracial woman. Joyce complains that it is "*black people* who always have to make everything racial. They're the ones making me choose. They're the ones who are telling me that I can't be who I am." (*Dreams* 99) Obama comments that "Only white culture had individuals." (*Dreams* 100) His obsession with race and identity remains constant throughout.

OBAMA'S "I DIDN'T INJECT' MOMENT

At Occidental College near Los Angeles, Obama began to experiment intensively with illegal narcotics. He claims that he dabbled with marijuana and cocaine, but stopped short of shooting up heroin. Obama himself writes: "I blew a few smoke rings, remembering those years. Pot had helped, and booze; maybe a little blow when you could afford it. Not smack, though – Mickey, my potential initiator, had been just a little too eager for me to go through with that." (*Dreams* 93) Obama says he was confronted with "the needle and the tubing" and then got cold feet (while standing in a meat freezer in a deli) and backed out. He had been on his way to the life of an addict, like his friend Ray: "Junkie. Pothead. That's where I'd been headed: the final, fatal role of the young would-be black man." (*Dreams* 93) So Obama was on the verge of heroin but did not inject, a familiar refrain.

As a freshman at Occidental, Obama had an international circle of friends — "a real eclectic sort of group," recalled Vinai Thummalapally from Hyderabad, India. Obama became especially friendly with Mohammed Hasan Chandoo and Wahid Hamid, two wealthy Pakistanis. Thummalapally also recalls a French student, plus black and white Americans. One of these was Jon K. Mitchell, who later played bass for country-swing band Asleep at the Wheel. Mitchell says he remembers that Obama wore puka shell necklaces all the time, even though they were not in style, and that "we let it slide because he spent a lot of time growing up in Hawaii.") (Adam Goldman and Robert Tanner, "Old friends recall Obama's years in LA, NY," AP via *Newsday*, May 15, 2008) Later, these friendships would make it possible for Obama to visit Pakistan in 1981. At that time Obama traveled to Pakistan and spent "about three weeks" with Hamid, and staying in Karachi with Chandoo's family, said Bill Burton, Obama's press secretary. "He was clearly shocked by the economic disparity he saw in Pakistan. He couldn't get over the sight of rural peasants bowing to the wealthy landowners they worked for as they passed," commented Margot Mifflin, who has a bit part in Obama's memoir. Obama often claims that the fact he has traveled abroad makes him better able to understand international relations; his trip to Pakistan appears to have prepared him above all to make his outrageous demand for the unilateral US bombing of Pakistan, with all the inevitable slaughter, in search of "al Qaeda." There is also some suggestion that Obama may have been visiting gay friends on this trip.

Obama tells us that it was at Occidental College that he came under the influence of Frantz Fanon. Obama writes: "To avoid being mistaken for a sellout, I chose my friends carefully. The more politically active black students. The foreign students. The Chicanos. The Marxist professors and structural feminists and punk-rock performance poets. We smoked cigarettes and wore leather jackets. At night, in the dorms, we discussed neocolonialism, Frantz Fanon, Eurocentrism, and patriarchy." (*Dreams* 100) Here is the aspiring president wandering through the post-modernist proto-fascist rubble field. He is overwhelmingly other-directed, obsessed with his image in the eyes of others. The name that stands out is that of Frantz Fanon, probably the biggest intellectual influence on the young Obama.

BEFORE POL POT AND KHOMEINI, THERE WAS FANON

Fanon (1925-1961) was a French-speaking psychiatrist born on the island of Martinique in the Caribbean. Like Rousseau before him, Fanon was promoted and made famous by Venetian cultural operatives, notably by Umberto Campagnolo of the enormously influential Société Européenne de Culture, one of the most important international think tanks of the time between 1945 and 1975. It was the Venetian foundation operative Campagnolo who first brought Fanon to Europe and made him a celebrity. The preface to the first edition of Fanon's *Wretched of the Earth* in Paris in 1961 was written by the French existentialist pope, Jean-Paul Sartre. Fanon attempted to identify himself with the merging anti-colonial revolutions of the third world and joined the Algerian FLN, but he always remained a European existentialist decadent in methodological terms, and not a denizen of a third world rice paddy or *favela*. Fanon, a disciple of Merleau-Ponty, was always a hater of science, technology, and human progress, since he always thought of technology as something imposed by the European colonial masters which had to be rejected as part of liberation from the colonial yoke. This made Fanon a direct precursor of the New Dark Ages faction which emerged during the 1970s in the form of such figures as Pol Pot of Cambodia, the "Islamo-marxists" Ali Shariati and Bani-Sadr of Iran, and other declared enemies of western civilization. The problem was the aspirations of the third world peoples to a better life could never be fulfilled without the large scale realization of science and technology. Fanon was accordingly a thinker who appealed to degenerate third world oligarchies, anxious to get independence but equally determined to prevent the masses from gaining upward mobility through the social effects of industrialization, which this school tried to define as ethnocide because it wiped out the backward and primitive dead-end cultures festering in the backwaters of the planet.

The other leading idea of Fanon was the necessity of violence, which he exalted in direct contradiction to Gandhi and Martin Luther King. Fanon was evidently under the spell of Georges Sorel, the theoretician of purgative violence who was so important for the young Mussolini. The combination of anti-science demagogy couched in hyper-revolutionary third world terms, plus a demand for violence which easily shaded over into terrorism, made Fanon's writings a key tool for the left wings of US, British and French intelligence during the phase of decolonization in the 1960s and 1970s. Fanon was also important for the European terrorists of the Italian Red Brigades and the German Baader-Meinhof group. Fanon, much more than Marx, must be seen as one of the permanent keys to Obama's thinking. Obama turns out to be an ultra-left existentialist, with Fanonist-Sorelian fascist overtones.

Fanon expresses the utopian desire to eliminate all the problems inherited from European colonialism by bringing an entirely new world, a utopia, into being. As so often happens, the chosen tool to abolish the historical past is "absolute violence." (Fanon citations are from *The Wretched of the Earth*, chapter VI, conclusion, transl. Dominic Tweedie) Violence purifies, and it is only

through violence that the dichotomy of white and black can be transcended. "Violence," says Fanon, "is a cleansing force. It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect." Fanon also posed as an ideologue of world revolution, opining: "In guerrilla war the struggle no longer concerns the place where you are, but the places where you are going. Each fighter carries his warring country between his toes." And again: "The national bourgeoisie will be greatly helped on its way toward decadence by the Western bourgeoisies, who come to it as tourists avid for the exotic, for big game hunting, and for casinos. The national bourgeoisie organizes centers of rest and relaxation and pleasure resorts to meet the wishes of the Western bourgeoisie. Such activity is given the name of tourism, and for the occasion will be built up as a national industry."

At the center of the belief structure of the mature Fanon is the total rejection of European civilization on racial grounds: "We must leave our dreams and abandon our old beliefs and friendships of the time before life began. Let us waste no time in sterile litanies and nauseating mimicry. Leave this Europe where they are never done talking of Man, yet murder men everywhere they find them, at the corner of every one of their own streets, in all the corners of the globe. For centuries they have stifled almost the whole of humanity in the name of a so-called spiritual experience. Look at them today swaying between atomic and spiritual disintegration. And yet it may be said that Europe has been successful in as much as everything that she has attempted has succeeded. Europe undertook the leadership of the world with ardour, cynicism and violence. Look at how the shadow of her palaces stretches out ever farther! Every one of her movements has burst the bounds of space and thought. Europe has declined all humility and all modesty; but she has also set her face against all solicitude and all tenderness. She has only shown herself parsimonious and niggardly where men are concerned; it is only men that she has killed and devoured. So, my brothers, how is it that we do not understand that we have better things to do than to follow that same Europe? Come, then, comrades, the European game has finally ended; we must find something different. We today can do everything, so long as we do not imitate Europe, so long as we are not obsessed by the desire to catch up with Europe. Let us decide not to imitate Europe; let us combine our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us try to create the whole man, whom Europe has been incapable of bringing to triumphant birth."

FANON: THE UNITED STATES IS A MONSTER

In Fanon's world picture, the only thing worse than Europe is the United States. Fanon's condemnation of the United States should be carefully read, since it is here that we find the roots of Obama's hatred of the country he chose to be his own: "Two centuries ago, a former European colony decided to catch up with Europe. It succeeded so well that the United States of America became a monster, in which the taints, the sickness and the inhumanity of Europe have grown to appalling dimensions. Comrades, have we not other work to do than to create a third Europe? The West saw itself as a spiritual adventure. It is in the name of the spirit, in the name of the spirit of Europe, that Europe has made her encroachments, that she has justified her crimes and legitimized the slavery in which she holds four-fifths of humanity."

Fanon also makes clear that European workers have become integrated into European capitalist society; contrary to Marxist theory, they have sold out. Nothing positive can be expected from these workers, since they are just as corrupt as the other Europeans. Fanon thinks that race is everything, that class is nothing, and that race war, the more violent the better, will be the answer. Here we see the germ of the anti-working class hatred which was common to Fanon, to the Ayers-Dohrn Weatherman terrorist faction of SDS, and which lives on in the statements of the Obama campaign

today: "Yes, the European spirit has strange roots. All European thought has unfolded in places which were increasingly more deserted and more encircled by precipices; and thus it was that the custom grew up in those places of very seldom meeting man. A permanent dialogue with oneself and an increasingly obscene narcissism never ceased to prepare the way for a half delirious state, where intellectual work became suffering and the reality was not at all that of a living man, working and creating himself, but rather words, different combinations of words, and the tensions springing from the meanings contained in words. Yet some Europeans were found to urge the European workers to shatter this narcissism and to break with this un-reality. But in general the workers of Europe have not replied to these calls; for the workers believe, too, that they are part of the prodigious adventure of the European spirit." Working class voters are right to identify in Obama a class enemy, since that is exactly what he is.

The utopian theme of the New Man, the radical reform of human nature itself, and the overcoming of alienation are all utopian themes which play a central role in fascist movements, as we will show in more detail in the final chapter of this book. Fanon argues strongly for a utopian approach of this type, which depends on rejecting western civilization: "The Third World today faces Europe like a colossal mass whose aim should be to try to resolve the problems to which Europe has not been able to find the answers. If we wish to live up to our peoples' expectations, we must seek the response elsewhere than in Europe. Moreover, if we wish to reply to the expectations of the people of Europe, it is no good sending them back a reflection, even an ideal reflection, of their society and their thought with which from time to time they feel immeasurably sickened. For Europe, for ourselves and for humanity, comrades, we must turn over a new leaf, we must work out new concepts, and try to set afoot a new man."[12]

Just to make sure that the point about violence was thoroughly understood by Fanon's gullible young readers, the premier French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre in 1961 contributed the following preface to the edition of Fanon which Obama is likely to have read: "… read Fanon; for he shows clearly that this irrepressible violence is neither sound and fury, nor the resurrection of savage instincts, nor even the effect of resentment: it is man re-creating himself. I think we understood this truth at one time, but we have forgotten it — that no gentleness can efface the marks of violence; only violence itself can destroy them. The native cures himself of colonial neurosis by thrusting out the settler through force of arms. When his rage boils over, he rediscovers his lost innocence and he comes to know himself in that he himself creates his self. Far removed from his war, we consider it as a triumph of barbarism; but of its own volition it achieves, slowly but surely, the emancipation of the rebel, for bit by bit it destroys in him and around him the colonial gloom. Once begun, it is a war that gives no quarter. You may fear or be feared; that is to say, abandon yourself to the disassociations of a sham existence or conquer your birthright of unity. When the peasant takes a gun in his hands, the old myths grow dim and the prohibitions are one by one forgotten. The rebel's weapon is the proof of his humanity. For in the first days of the revolt you must kill: to shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time: there remain a dead man, and a free man; the survivor, for the first time, feels a national soil under his foot." The decadent French intellectual embraces Fanon most of all because of his call for violence, thus unerringly singling out the sickest part of Fanon's work.

OBAMA'S NICOTINE ADDICTION BEGINS

Obama apparently started smoking when he was at Occidental College. In his fawning cult biography of Obama, author David Mendell writes about Obama's life as a "secret smoker" and how he "went to great lengths to conceal the habit." Jeff Stier has analyzed the degree to which

Obama's quarter century of smoking may have impacted his health: the conclusion is that Obama may well have more health problems than John McCain. Stier writes: "So how long and how much did Sen. Obama smoke? The information has not been officially released, and the campaign has not returned calls or emails posing this question. But he smoked a lot over his life. He admits to having smoked up to ten cigarettes a day, but usually closer to five or six. Most people underestimate how much they smoke, but let's take him at his word. Let's also assume he really did quit when he said he did, in February 2007 (although he admits to having fallen off the wagon). That's about twenty-six years, given that we know he was smoking by the time he was a freshman at Occidental College. That's more than 55,000 — maybe 70,000 cigarettes! Has this aspect of Sen. Obama's ability to serve really been explored? Just because he's young, looks great, and exercises doesn't mean he's healthy. Recall Jim Fixx. An overweight smoker when he turned his life around at thirty-five, Fixx became the icon of fitness. He quit smoking and started running. Then he died in 1984 at age fifty-three — while running. Sen. Obama, while not overweight, smoked a lot longer than Jim Fixx did. And while the stresses of running may have contributed to Fixx's death, it was his years of smoking, not his running, that caused the plaque to build up in his arteries. Doctors say the stress of being president may in fact exceed the stress of running. And it's an unhealthier kind of stress. The public deserves to know how long and how much Sen. Obama really smoked. Does he have other risk factors for heart disease? Compared to whites, for instance, African-Americans are more likely to die of a stroke, according to the American Heart Association. This, in fact, is probably the only time race is a legitimate question to raise this campaign season — and just one of several health question on voters' minds." (Jeff Stier, *Obama's Health*, April 19, 2008) McCain, we see, may be in better health than Obama, despite appearances.

Smoking is subject to an ineffable taboo in the rich elitist, affluent suburbanite, academic, and global warming circles which provide Obama's base of support, so he has striven to hide his horrible dirty vice from public view. Pictures showing Obama smoking have been greeted with unalloyed horror by Obama's backers. However, the candidate has confessed that he has gone back to puffing his coffin nails as a result of the stress of the campaign trail. One reporter who penetrated Obama's terrible secret, despite his evasive action, was the perceptive Jake Tapper, who exposed the issue in April 2008: 'As any close friend or family member can attest, I have an unusually keen sense of smell and immediately I smelled cigarette smoke on Obama. Frankly, he reeked of cigarettes. Obama ran off before I could ask him if he'd just snuck a smoke, so I called his campaign. They denied it. He'd quit months before, in February [2007], they insisted. He chewed nicorette. But I knew what I'd smelled and I asked his campaign to double-check and to ask him if he'd had a cigarette. They reported back that he had told them he hadn't had a cigarette since he quit. And maybe that was true. Maybe I imagined the cigarette smoke. My olfactory nerve somehow misfired. Except….last night on MSNBC's Hardball, Obama admitted that his attempt to wean himself from the vile tobacco weed had not been entirely successful. "I fell off the wagon a couple times during the course of it, and then was able to get back on," he said. "But it is a struggle like everything else."' (Jake Tapper, "Obama is Smokin'," abcnews.com, April 3, 2008) Because of the importance of the presidency, it is imperative that all candidates release their medical records, including the results of any mental health treatments and of any and all HIV testing.

THE LOST YEARS AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY: OBAMA'S WALL OF SECRECY

Obama's years at Columbia University between 1981 and 1983 constitute the greatest single mystery of his life. From the point of view of all available biographical material published and in

the public domain, these are quite simply Obama's lost years. *Dreams from My Father*, as we have seen, is a book prodigal with details about Obama's drug use — a question that may have a serious potential to damage his political career. By contrast Obama's attendance at Columbia University, a member of the prestigious Ivy League, ought to be a selling point and indeed a point of honor for our candidate. Instead, any attempts to establish the relevant facts about Obama's years at Columbia runs up against a brick wall of silence, evasion, and prevarication. The result is a gaping hole in Obama's autobiographical narrative, a serious lacuna precisely where this inveterate showboater would normally be showcasing his academic achievements. It is in part one, chapter 6 of *Dreams* that Obama covers up these years at Columbia. There is almost nothing about his activity as a student, or about his mental life. The Associated Press ran up against the same wall: "The Obama campaign declined to discuss Obama's time at Columbia and his friendships in general. It won't, for example, release his transcript or name his friends. It did, however, list five locations where Obama lived during his four years here: three on Manhattan's Upper West Side and two in Brooklyn — one in Park Slope, the other in Brooklyn Heights. His memoir mentions two others on Manhattan's Upper East Side." (Adam Goldman and Robert Tanner, "Old friends recall Obama's years in LA, NY," AP via *Newsday*, May 15, 2008)

The biographical surveys of Obama published by the *New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune* are equally incapable of providing any details about Obama's time on the Columbia campus. As Janny Scott of the New York Times reported, 'Senator Obama, an Illinois Democrat now seeking the presidency, suggests in his book that his years in New York were a pivotal period: He ran three miles a day, buckled down to work and "stopped getting high," which he says he had started doing in high school. Yet he declined repeated requests to talk about his New York years, release his Columbia transcript or identify even a single fellow student, co-worker, roommate or friend from those years. "He doesn't remember the names of a lot of people in his life," said Ben LaBolt, a campaign spokesman. Mr. Obama has, of course, done plenty of remembering. His 1995 memoir, *Dreams from My Father*, weighs in at more than 450 pages. But he also exercised his writer's prerogative to decide what to include or leave out. Now, as he presents himself to voters, a look at his years in New York — other people's accounts and his own — suggests not only what he was like back then but how he chooses to be seen now.' Why so secretive when he could be showboating, according to his preferred custom? Or, are we dealing with some form of mental impairment?

In an article by the insufferable British snob and Obama partisan Richard Wolffe (know to the few viewers of the Olberman propaganda show, *Newsweek* magazine attempted to convinced its readers that Obama is some kind of Christian. This required grotesque contortions, which need not concern us here. Wolffe reflects the same cone of silence encountered by other researchers into Obama's lost years at Columbia, about which he reports virtually no facts and few lies: Obama, alleges Wolffe, 'enrolled at Columbia in part to get far away from his past; he'd gone to high school in Hawaii and had just spent two years "enjoying myself," as he puts it, at Occidental College in Los Angeles. In New York City, "I lived an ascetic existence," Obama told *Newsweek* in an interview on his campaign plane last week. "I did a lot of spiritual exploration. I withdrew from the world in a fairly deliberate way." He fasted. Often, he'd go days without speaking to another person. For company, he had books. There was Saint Augustine, the fourth-century North African bishop who wrote the West's first spiritual memoir and built the theological foundations of the Christian Church. There was Friedrich Nietzsche, the 19th-century German philosopher and father of existentialism. There was Graham Greene, the Roman Catholic Englishman whose short novels are full of compromise, ambivalence and pain. Obama meditated on these men and argued with them in

his mind.' Notice that the racist-terrorist-Luddite Fanon, the writer who influenced Obama the most, has disappeared. He is now replaced by Nietzsche, the classic protofascist philodoxer of the nineteenth century. The top Nazi ideologue, Alfred Rosenberg rightly claimed Nietzsche along with Richard Wagner, the antisemite Lagarde and the racist Houston Stewart Chamberlain as a precursor of the Nazi movement. As we argue elsewhere, it is most likely through existentialism, of which Nietzsche was a precursor, that Obama developed as a social fascist. ("Finding His Faith," *Newsweek*, July 12, 2008, http://www.newsweek.com/id/145971)

Obama's acolytes at the reactionary *Chicago Tribune* found even less about Obama's Columbia years than the swooning liberals at the *New York Times*.

> Obama spent just two years at Occidental. He said in a recent interview that he had begun to weary of the parties and fretted about a lackadaisical approach to his studies. He grew more introspective and serious. His mother's warnings were beginning to take hold. Seeking a fresh start, he transferred to Columbia University in New York City. Classmates and teachers from those days remember him as studious and serious, someone who hit the library in his off hours instead of the bars. "If I had to give one adjective to describe him, it is mature," said William Araiza, who took an international politics class with Obama. "He was our age, but seemed older because of his poise." (Maurice Possley, "Activism Blossomed in College," *Chicago Tribune*, March 30, 2007)

That's it. Nothing more. No Dink Stover at Yale, no *This Side of Paradise*. Before you know it, Obama has left Columbia and is out in the big world: "After his graduation from Columbia University in 1983, he worked briefly for a New York financial consultant and then a consumer organization." Bob Secter and John McCormick, "Portrait of a Pragmatist," *Chicago Tribune*, March 30, 2007) Some postings on the Internet have alleged that Obama is seeking to hide a phase of flamboyant homosexuality during his years at Morningside Heights. This may be so. However, the principal thesis argued here, based on very strong circumstantial evidence, is that Obama is seeking to conceal the central event of his entire personal story: his recruitment by Zbigniew Brzezinski as a long-term controlled political asset and sponsored career of the Rockefeller-controlled Trilateral Commission.

OBAMA AND ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI AT COLUMBIA, 1981-1983

Brzezinski during these years was fresh from having directed the National Security Council during Jimmy Carter's sole term in office. As we have seen elsewhere in this book, it was in precisely this period of the early 1980s that Brzezinski, Samuel Huntington, and other long-term Trilateral planners were reflecting on the results of the Carter regime, while looking forward to wrecking and frustrating a general political upsurge in the United States (known in Huntington's parlance as a creedal passion period) which they could already see on the horizon, and which they located at that time in the years between 2010 and 2030. It is safe to assume that Brzezinski and Huntington were also concerned with recruiting young political talent which they could develop, groom, indoctrinate, and brainwash for various purposes, including that of political candidate, over the coming decades. Brzezinski and Huntington, in short, were looking for political assets which they might employ during a quarter century perspective which was the framework for their future activity. Because of the strong Ford Foundation pedigree of Obama's mother, young Barack would have been an obvious choice as a subject to be interviewed and vetted. The contention here is that Obama was recruited in the context of this effort, and that since then, his career has been fostered and sponsored by the circles of the Trilateral Commission.

Zbigniew Brzezinski during these years was working as the boss of the Institute for Communist Affairs at Columbia — a notorious anti-Soviet think tank and propaganda center. What little we know about Obama includes that he was a politics major with a specialty in international relations who wrote his senior thesis on the topic of Soviet nuclear disarmament. This, needless to say, is a topic which has Zbigniew Brzezinski written all over it. If Senator Obama wishes to refute the contention that he has been a member of the Brzezinski Trilateral stable of politicians and other operatives since approximately 1981-1983, he is invited to offer documentation to that end. For his part, Zbigniew Brzezinski understood quite soon in his career that his Dr. Strangelove television persona was a decided political liability in this country. It has been forgotten today, but at the time he left office at the end of the Carter administration, Brzezinski was by all odds the most hated member of a very unpopular administration. In fact, it would seem that Brzezinski ranks down to this day as the most hated government official serving in Democratic administrations since the departure from the White House of Lyndon B. Johnson in January 1969. Any doubts about this profound unpopularity had been clarified when Brzezinski was loudly booed by the delegates to the 1980 Democratic National Convention. Since those times, Brzezinski has been extraordinarily gun shy when it comes to publicity or to stating in public what he actually thinks and intends. Brzezinski, in other words, has learned that he must conceal his own political operations, lest they be disrupted by hostile scrutiny. Obama has represented one of these long-term, concealed Brzezinski operations.

Obama's presence at Columbia remains shrouded in mystery. According to published reports, many of his classmates don't remember Obama. According to one account, he does not appear in the yearbook of his graduating class. In response to inquiries made by journalists during 2007, Columbia University was unwilling or unable to find a picture of him during his years at that university. Obama has attempted to conceal his years at Columbia with the usual cloak of complaints about the alleged racism of the place: 'Mr Obama was later admitted to read politics and international relations at New York's prestigious Columbia University where, his book claims, "no matter how many times the administration tried to paint them over, the walls remained scratched with blunt correspondence (about) n****rs." But one of his classmates, Joe Zwicker, 45, now a lawyer in Boston, said yesterday: "That surprises me. Columbia was a pretty tolerant place. There were African-American students in my classes and I never saw any evidence of racism at all."' (London *Daily Mail*, January 27, 2007) Nevertheless, Obama does reveal in veiled terms that coming to Columbia was a great watershed in his life: '"There was a fundamental rupture in my life between Occidental and Columbia, where I just became more serious," Obama said.' (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) It was Brzezinski's intervention that made the difference, we believe. And: is Obama suggesting that this was when he turned away from illegal drugs? He never says so specifically, leaving a plethora of questions.

In a September 5, 2008 interview with Matt Welch, the Libertarian Party candidate for vice president Wayne Allyn Root, a member of Obama's Columbia class of 1983, reports that he never met or heard of anybody called Obama, and has not been able to find anyone who can among his fellow alumni. Root majored in the same department where Obama claims to have majored. Here is an excerpt from this revealing exchange:

> "Wayne Allyn Root: I think the most dangerous thing you should know about Barack Obama is I don't know a single person at Columbia that knows him, and they all know me. I don't have a classmate who *ever knew* Barack Obama at Columbia. Ever!
>
> Matt Welch: So tell us what we should know about Barack

Welch: Yeah, but you were like selling, you know, Amway in college or something, weren't you?

Root: Is that what you think of me! And the best damned Amway salesman ever!

Welch: No, I'm sure that you were an outgoing young man, I'm just guessing.

Root: I am! That's my point. Where was Obama? He wasn't an outgoing young man, no one ever heard of him.

Tim Cavanaugh: Maybe he was a late bloomer.

Root: Maybe. Or maybe he was involved in some sort of black radical politics.

Welch: Ooooooooooh.

Root: Maybe he was too busy smoking pot in his dorm room to ever show up for class. I don't know what he was doing!

Welch: Wait, you weren't smoking pot in your dorm room?

Root: No, I wasn't. I wasn't. But I don't hold that against anybody, but I wasn't.... Nobody recalls him. I'm not exaggerating, I'm not kidding.

Welch: Were you the exact same class?

Root: Class of '83 political science, pre-law Columbia University. You don't get more exact than that. Never met him in my life, don't know anyone who ever met him. At the class reunion, our 20th reunion five years ago, 20th reunion, who was asked to be the speaker of the class? Me. No one ever heard of Barack! Who was he, and five years ago, nobody even knew who he was.

Other guy: Did he even show up to the reunion?

Root: I don't know! I didn't know him. I don't think anybody knew him. But I know that the guy who writes the class notes, who's kind of the, as we say in New York, the macha who knows everybody, has yet to find a person, a human who ever met him. Is that not strange? It's very strange.

Welch: That's peculiar! Do you have any theories?"[13]

In spite of his intent to deceive and dissemble, Obama has lavished praise on Zbigniew, as for example in his first foreign policy speech in Iowa in 2007, when he called in Zbiggy to introduce him. On this occasion, Obama paid homage to the Polish revanchist in effusive terms: "Brzezinski is someone I have learned an immense amount from," and "one of our most outstanding scholars and thinkers." The *New York Times* account of this critical and decisive phase in Obama's life stresses the obsessive secrecy with which the Obamakins attempt to shroud this entire phase.

Barack Obama does not say much about his years in New York City. The time he spent as an undergraduate at Columbia College and then working in Manhattan in the early 1980s surfaces only fleetingly in his memoir. In the book, he casts himself as a solitary wanderer in the metropolis, the outsider searching for a way to "make myself of some use." He tells of underheated sublets, a night spent in an alley, a dead neighbor on the landing. From their fire escape, he and an unnamed roommate watch "white people from the better neighborhoods" bring their dogs to defecate on the block. He takes a job in an unidentified "consulting house to multinational corporations," where he is "a spy behind enemy lines," startled to find himself with a secretary, a suit and money in the bank.

He barely mentions Columbia, training ground for the elite, where he transferred in his junior year, majoring in political science and international relations and writing his thesis on Soviet

> nuclear disarmament. He dismisses in one sentence his first community organizing job — work he went on to do in Chicago — though a former supervisor remembers him as "a star performer." […] In a long profile of Mr. Obama in a Columbia alumni magazine in 2005, in which his Columbia years occupied just two paragraphs, he called that time "an intense period of study." "I spent a lot of time in the library. I didn't socialize that much. I was like a monk," he was quoted as saying. He said he was somewhat involved with the Black Student Organization and anti-apartheid activities, although in recent interviews, several prominent student leaders said they did not remember his playing a role. (Janny Scott, "Obama's Account of New York Years Often Differs From What Others Say," *New York Times,* October 30, 2007)
>
> One person who did remember Mr. Obama was Michael L. Baron, who taught a senior seminar on international politics and American policy. Mr. Baron, now president of an electronics company in Florida, said he was Mr. Obama's adviser on the senior thesis for that course. Mr. Baron, who later wrote Mr. Obama a recommendation for Harvard Law School, gave him an A in the course. Columbia was a hotbed for discussion of foreign policy, Mr. Baron said. The faculty included Zbigniew Brzezinski, the former national security adviser, and Zalmay Khalilzad, now the American ambassador to the United Nations. Half of the eight students in the seminar were outstanding, and Mr. Obama was among them, Mr. Baron said.

One of Obama's friends at Columbia was his roommate Sadik or Siddiqi, who is described as "a short, well-built Pakistani" who smoked marijuana, snorted cocaine and liked to party. Obama's campaign adamantly refused to identify "Sadik," but the Associated Press located him in Seattle, where he raises money for a community theater. When Obama arrived in New York, he already knew Siddiqi — a friend of Chandoo's and Hamid's from Karachi who had visited Los Angeles. Looking back, Siddiqi acknowledges that he and Obama were an odd couple. Siddiqi would mock Obama's idealism — he just wanted to make a lot of money and buy things, while Obama wanted to help the poor. "At that age, I thought he was a saint and a square, and he took himself too seriously," Siddiqi said. "I would ask him why he was so serious. He was genuinely concerned with the plight of the poor. He'd give me lectures, which I found very boring. He must have found me very irritating." Siddiqi offered the most expansive account of Obama as a young man. "We were both very lost. We were both alienated, although he might not put it that way. He arrived disheveled and without a place to stay," said Siddiqi, who at the time worked as a waiter and as a salesman at a boutique…. The apartment was "a slum of a place" in a drug-ridden neighborhood filled with gunshots, he said. "It wasn't a comfortable existence. We were slumming it." What little furniture they had was found on the street, and guests would have to hold their dinner plates in their laps. …'

Obama commented: '"For about two years there, I was just painfully alone and really not focused on anything, except maybe thinking a lot." In his memoir, Obama recalls fasting on Sunday; Siddiqi says Obama was a follower of comedian-activist Dick Gregory's vegetarian diet. "I think self-deprivation was his schtick, denying himself pleasure, good food and all of that." But it wasn't exactly an ascetic life. There was plenty of time for reading (Gabriel Garcia Marquez, V.S. Naipaul) and listening to music (Van Morrison, the Ohio Players, Bob Dylan). The two, along with others, went out for nights on the town. "He wasn't entirely a hermit," Siddiqi said. Siddiqi said his female friends thought Obama was "a hunk." "We were always competing," he said. "You know how it is. You go to a bar and you try hitting on the girls. He had a lot more success. I wouldn't out-compete him in picking up girls, that's for sure." Obama was a tolerant roommate. Siddiqi's mother, who had never been around a black man, came to visit and she was rude; Obama was nothing but polite. Siddiqi himself could be intemperate — he called Obama an Uncle Tom, but "he was really patient. I'm surprised he suffered me." Finally, their relationship started to fray. "I was partying all

the time. I was disrupting his studies," Siddiqi said. Obama moved out.' (Adam Goldman and Robert Tanner, "Old friends recall Obama's years in LA, NY," AP via *Newsday*, May 15, 2008)

TRILATERAL COMMISSION POST-CARTER PERSPECTIVE, 1981-1983

During these years, Trilateral leaders Brzezinski and Samuel Huntington were pondering the future transformation of the United States into a bureaucratic-authoritarian or totalitarian state. In his book *American Politics*, Huntington developed a perspective for the future based on conflict between increasingly authoritarian and ultimately totalitarian state control, on the one hand, and an underlying American value system and world-outlook – which he calls the "American Creed" – on the other. In Huntington's view, there was no doubt that the regime would become more oppressive: "An increasingly sophisticated economy and active involvement in world affairs seem likely to create stronger needs for hierarchy, bureaucracy, centralization of power, expertise, big government specifically, and big organizations generally." (p. 228) This is a kind of shorthand for what most experts could identify as the fascist corporate state.

The problem Huntington saw was the American Creed, based on liberty, equality, individualism, and democracy and rooted in "seventeenth-century Protestant moralism and eighteenth-century liberal rationalism." (p. 229) Huntington predicted in 1981 that the conflict between individualistic values and the centralized regime may explode early in the coming century, specifically between 2010 and 2030, in a period of ferment and dislocation like the late 1960s: "If the periodicity of the past prevails, a major sustained creedal passion period will occur in the second and third decades of the twenty-first century." At this time, he argued, "the oscillations among the responses could intensify in such a way as to threaten to destroy both ideals and institutions." (p. 232) Such a process would be acted out as follows:

> "Lacking any concept of the state, lacking for most of its history both the centralized authority and the bureaucratic apparatus of the European state, the American polity has historically been a weak polity. It was designed to be so, and the traditional inheritance and social environment combined for years to support the framers' intentions. In the twentieth century, foreign threats and domestic economic and social needs have generated pressures to develop stronger, more authoritative decision-making and decision-implementing institutions. Yet the continued presence of deeply felt moralistic sentiments among major groups in American society could continue to ensure weak and divided government, devoid of authority and unable to deal satisfactorily with the economic, social and foreign challenges confronting the nation. Intensification of this conflict between history and progress could give rise to increasing frustration and increasingly violent oscillations between moralism and cynicism. American moralism ensures that government will never be truly efficacious; the realities of power ensure that government will never be truly democratic. This situation could lead to a two-phase dialectic involving intensified efforts to reform government, followed by intensified frustration when those efforts produce not progress in a liberal-democratic direction, but obstacles to meeting perceived functional needs. The weakening of government in an effort to reform it could lead eventually to strong demands for the replacement of the weakened and ineffective institutions by more authoritarian structures more effectively designed to meet historical needs. Given the perversity of reform, moralistic extremism in the pursuit of liberal democracy could generate a strong tide toward authoritarian efficiency." (p. 232)

Huntington then quotes Plato's celebrated passage on the way that the "culmination of liberty in democracy is precisely what prepares the way for the cruelest extreme of servitude under a despot."

The message is clear: sooner or later, all roads lead to Behemoth. (Tarpley, *Project Democracy*, [Washington: EIR, 1987])

Trilateral fascination with a totalitarian transformation in this country did not start after Carter, but began well before he came on the scene. A good example is Brzezinski's own book, *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Era* (1970), where the Polish revanchist conjured up the glittering image of a "technetronic era," whereby a more controlled society would gradually emerge, dominated by an oligarchical elite unrestrained by traditional values.

Brzezinski predicted that "Power will gravitate into the hands of those who control information" (Brzezinski 1), adding that surveillance and data mining will foster "tendencies through the next several decades toward a technocratic era, a dictatorship leaving even less room for political procedures as we know them" (Brzezinski 12). Information Technology would become the key to mass social control: "Unhindered by the restraints of traditional liberal values, this elite would not hesitate to achieve its political ends by the latest modern techniques for influencing public behavior and keeping society under close surveillance and control." (Brzezinski 252) These are remarks which ought to remind fatuous left liberals, who have been deluded by Zbig's re-invention of himself in an anti-Bush and anti-Iraq war mode, that they are dealing here with one very sinister totalitarian elitist.

HYPOTHESIS: A QUARTER CENTURY OF TRILATERAL INDOCTRINATION

The inevitable corollary of the Brzezinski-Huntington analysis as developed in the post-Carter era is the need to prepare political operatives to intervene in the creedal passion period or general political upsurge which was expected to emerge around 2010. This would suggest that Brzezinski, Huntington, and other Trilateral operatives were keeping their eyes open for suitable political talent which they could identify, recruit, and begin grooming for use a quarter-century in the future. To those for whom such a protracted process might seem to be fantastic and conspiratorial, let it be pointed out that the career timescale involved hardly differs from the typical career of a military officer, a bank executive, or a top-flight academic. To those who are accustomed to living from one paycheck to the next, a 25-year perspective may seem like extraordinary foresight. To those accustomed to viewing the world from the apex of huge organizations, it looks like something rather routine and prosaic.

The hypothesis advocated here is therefore that Obama has been a protected and controlled asset of the Trilateral Commission since his time at Columbia University between 1981 and 1983. Since the moment of his recruitment, Obama's career has been promoted, fostered, preferred, and otherwise protected by the Trilateral financier network.

DEVAL PATRICK: BRZEZINSKI'S SPARE OBAMA

The interchangeability of Obama and Massachusetts governor Deval Patrick is important because the two of them remind us of the procedures used by the Trilateral managers the last time they installed a puppet president – Jimmy Carter. As Zbigniew Brzezinski tells us with startling brutality in his memoir entitled *Power and Principle*, the Trilaterals did not put all their eggs in one basket when it came to grooming a puppet for the 1976 election. Their favored choice was that messianic peanut farmer from Plains, Georgia who in fact won the presidency. But they always retained a fallback option as well. As Brzezinski relates, this was another southern Democratic Governor, Reubin Askew of Florida. If Carter had overdosed, suffered a nervous breakdown, or

been indicted, Askew would have been rushed into the breach to take his place. Since the spare candidate or fallback option needed had to be a relatively prominent public figure, it is virtually impossible to conceal the fact that an understudy is waiting in the wings. The existence of Patrick as Obama's virtual twin is therefore of critical importance for the argument that Obama is in fact a Manchurian candidate created and controlled by the Trilateral commission and its allies.

The parallels are indeed striking, starting with the fact that both Obama and Patrick are fatherless boys who are therefore susceptible to seeing a powerful institution or authority figure as an *ersatz* father. Patrick was born on the South Side of Chicago, Illinois, into an African-American family living on welfare in a two-bedroom slum apartment. In 1959, his father Laurdine "Pat" Patrick, a member of jazz musician Sun Ra's band, deserted Deval, his mother, and his sister in order to pursue his music career in New York City, where he had fathered a daughter by another woman. Deval's relationship with his father, like Obama's, was a lamentable one. Deval was in middle school when he was picked up by a foundation called A Better Chance, a national non-profit organization for identifying, recruiting, co-opting, and developing leaders among smart black students. Thanks to this foundation backing, Deval was able to attend the exclusive, costly, and elite Milton Academy in Milton, Massachusetts – a local prep school equivalent to Obama's Punahou School in Hawaii. Patrick graduated from Milton Academy in 1974, and from Harvard College in 1978. At Harvard, Patrick was co-opted into the ultra-elitist Fly Club, Harvard's answer to Yale's Skull and Bones secret society. He then spent a year working for the United Nations in Africa. In 1979, Patrick enrolled in Harvard Law School. While in law school, Patrick was elected president of the Legal Aid Bureau; Obama would top that by becoming the editor of the law review. Patrick got his first job defending poor families in Middlesex County, Massachusetts – similar to Obama's apprenticeship as a community organizing counter-insurgency operative. Patrick's wife, like Obama's, is an upwardly mobile member of the black affirmative-action overclass.

OBAMA DISCREDITED IN MASSACHUSETTS, NEW HAMPSHIRE, RHODE ISLAND

Patrick spoiled Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island (where the television comes from Boston) for Obama's future chances by his blatant nepotism and greedy rapacity in office. He spent $11,000 on drapery for the governor's state house suite, changed the governor's car from a Crown Victoria to a Cadillac, and hired a chief of staff for his wife at an annual salary of almost $75,000. He commandeered a state helicopter for his private use. Patrick lavished all this on himself while demanding austerity and service cuts for the people, as Obama is also sure to do. Patrick was also remarkably corrupt: he placed a call to Citigroup Executive Committee chair Robert Rubin on behalf of the financially beleaguered mortgage company Ameriquest, a subsidiary of ACC Capital Holdings, of which Patrick is a former board member. Patrick later attempted to lie his way out of this predicament with the absurd claim that he was calling not as governor but as a private citizen. When this ploy failed, the skewered Patrick plaintively confessed: "I appreciate that I should not have made the call. I regret the mistake."

Patrick, like Jeremiah Wright, was a devotee of the blowback theory of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, a hallmark of left CIA sponsorship. On the sixth anniversary of the 9/11 events on September 11, 2007, Patrick declaimed: "It was a mean and nasty and bitter attack on the United States. But it was also about the failure of human beings to understand each other and to learn to love each other. It seems to me that lesson of that morning is something that we must carry with us every day." In

another telling incident, one of Patrick's aides (a certain Carl Stanley McGee) was arrested in Florida in December 2007 for the sexual assault of a 15-year old boy in a Florida hotel.

Early in Patrick's term, only 48 percent of Massachusetts voters approved of the way he was handling the job, while 33 percent disapproved — a relatively high number for a governor's honeymoon period, said Andrew E. Smith, director of The Survey Center at the University of New Hampshire. 44 percent said Massachusetts is headed in the right direction, while 56 percent said the state is off course. (*Boston Globe*, April 8, 2007)

BUSINESS INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

Obama's first job after leaving Columbia was with Business International Corporation (BIC), a private intelligence company which provided information and know-how to US companies seeking to do business overseas. Obama worked as a consultant and financial journalist. So far as is known, Business International Corporation was never identified as a CIA front company, but it had the tell-tale earmarks of one. Its business of journalism and reporting, ferreting out information about conditions in foreign countries was a perfect cover story for spying of all sorts. Business International went out of existence when it was acquired the *London Economist* Intelligence Unit, an operation that notoriously moved in the orbit of British intelligence.

Once again, Obama covers up whatever may have happened in reality by throwing up a smokescreen of racial conflict. This time it was the first temptation of St. Barack by the devil ("white" society, as always). Dan Armstrong, who knew Obama when he was working at BIC, has stressed that Obama's account of the firm and his job there is far from accurate: 'Mr. Armstrong's description of the firm, and those of other co-workers, differs at least in emphasis from Mr. Obama's. It was a small newsletter-publishing and research firm, with about 250 employees worldwide, that helped companies with foreign operations (they could be called multinationals) understand overseas markets, they said. Far from a bastion of corporate conformity, they said, it was informal and staffed by young people making modest wages. Employees called it "high school with ashtrays." Mr. Obama was a researcher and writer for a reference service called Financing Foreign Operations. He also wrote for a newsletter, Business International Money Report. […] "It was not working for General Foods or Chase Manhattan, that's for sure," said Louis Celi, a vice president at the company, which was later taken over by the Economist Intelligence Unit. "And it was not a consulting firm by any stretch of the imagination. I remember the first time I interviewed someone from Morgan Stanley and I got cheese on my tie because I thought my tie was a napkin."' (Janny Scott, "Obama's Account of New York Years Often Differs From What Others Say," *New York Times,* October 30, 2007) Armstrong's view is that Obama has distorted what went on at BIC to make himself look good, specifically by concocting a moment in which he turns away from the corrupt fleshpots of whitey's world.

THE TEMPTATIONS OF ST. BARACK

Obama writes the following about his career at BIC in *Dreams*: "Eventually a consulting house to multinational corporations agreed to hire me as a research assistant. Like a spy behind enemy lines, I arrived every day at my mid-Manhattan office and sat at my computer terminal, checking the Reuters machine that blinked bright emerald messages from across the globe. As far as I could tell I was the only black man in the company, a source of shame for me but a source of considerable pride for the company's secretarial pool." Armstrong refutes most of these points, noting that there were other black people working there at the time, and noting:

> … after reading his autobiography, I have to say that Barack engages in some serious exaggeration when he describes a job that he held in the mid-1980s. I know because I sat down the hall from him, in the same department, and worked closely with his boss. I can't say I was particularly close to Barack – he was reserved and distant towards all of his co-workers – but I was probably as close to him as anyone. I certainly know what he did there, and it bears only a loose resemblance to what he wrote in his book. First, it wasn't a consulting house; it was a small company that published newsletters on international business. Like most newsletter publishers, it was a bit of a sweatshop. I'm sure we all wished that we were high-priced consultants to multinational corporations. But we also enjoyed coming in at ten, wearing jeans to work, flirting with our co-workers, partying when we stayed late, and bonding over the low salaries and heavy workload. Barack worked on one of the company's reference publications. Each month customers got a new set of pages on business conditions in a particular country, punched to fit into a three-ring binder. Barack's job was to get copy from the country correspondents and edit it so that it fit into a standard outline. There was probably some research involved as well, since correspondents usually don't send exactly what you ask for, and you can't always decipher their copy. But essentially the job was copyediting. It's also not true that Barack was the only black man in the company. He was the only black professional man. Fred was an African-American who worked in the mailroom with his son. My boss and I used to join them on Friday afternoons to drink beer behind the stacks of office supplies. That's not the kind of thing that Barack would do. Like I said, he was somewhat aloof.

Out of these mundane facts, Obama (or more likely his ghostwriters) construct a modern morality play to burnish the credentials of an ambitious young proto-pol: "…as the months passed, I felt the idea of becoming an organizer slipping away from me. The company promoted me to the position of financial writer. I had my own office, my own secretary; money in the bank. Sometimes, coming out of an interview with Japanese financiers or German bond traders, I would catch my reflection in the elevator doors—see myself in a suit and tie, a briefcase in my hand—and for a split second I would imagine myself as a captain of industry, barking out orders, closing the deal, before I remembered who it was that I had told myself I wanted to be and felt pangs of guilt for my lack of resolve." (*Dreams*)

Armstrong notes ironically: "If Barack was promoted, his new job responsibilities were more of the same – rewriting other people's copy. As far as I know, he always had a small office, and the idea that he had a secretary is laughable. Only the company president had a secretary. Barack never left the office, never wore a tie, and had neither reason nor opportunity to interview Japanese financiers or German bond traders." Obama wants the reader to believe that he was saved from a life of corporate ambition by a telephone call from his African, Kenyan sister, who wanted to tell him that their brother (or half-brother) David had been killed in a motorcycle accident: "Then one day, as I sat down at my computer to write an article on interest-rate swaps, something unexpected happened. Auma called. I had never met this half sister; we had written only intermittently …a few months after Auma called, I turned in my resignation at the consulting firm and began looking in earnest for an organizing job." (*Dreams*) Armstrong points out that what Obama "means here is that he got copy from a correspondent who didn't understand interest rate swaps, and he was trying to make sense out of it."

PORTRAIT OF THE CANDIDATE AS A YOUNG MEGALOMANIAC

In Armstrong's view, the entire story of this turning point in the life of the selfless young community organizer was a tissue of lies: "All of Barack's embellishment serves a larger narrative

purpose: to retell the story of the Christ's temptation. The young, idealistic, would-be community organizer gets a nice suit, joins a consulting house, starts hanging out with investment bankers, and barely escapes moving into the big mansion with the white folks. Luckily, an angel calls, awakens his conscience, and helps him choose instead to fight for the people. I'm disappointed. Barack's story may be true, but many of the facts are not. His larger narrative purpose requires him to embellish his role. I don't buy it. Just as I can't be inspired by Steve Jobs now that I know how dishonest he is, I can't listen uncritically to Barack Obama now that I know he's willing to bend the facts to his purpose." Dan Armstrong, "Barack Obama Embellishes His Resume," http://analyzethis.net/blog/index.php

Here appears an aspect of Obama's life which has since become notorious – the identification of his undistinguished self with Jesus Christ, the Messiah and Son of God. If Armstrong is right about this parable of the temptations, Obama really does believe that he is the Savior, and has thought this for almost fifteen years at minimum. Some choose to mimic Christ, some choose to mimic Napoleon, but the common denominator is megalomania, the most succinct summary of Obama's mentality – and, ironically, one that puts him in the same psychopathological class with his apparent polar opposite, George W. Bush, who is also a megalomaniac, as Dr. Justin Frank has pointed out.

There was another dangerous temptation lurking in Obama's life. Obama had expressed his scorn for those he called "half-breeds" who preferred white people to blacks. After college, he lived with a white woman, but then decided to push her away when he realized that he would have to assimilate into her ("white") world, and not vice versa. He later married Michelle, the upwardly mobile black woman lawyer. Obama's choices were based on very solid political reasoning: if he had come forward to run for the presidency with a white woman for his consort, he would have been politically doomed by the resentment of black women, many of whom would have interpreted this choice as a confirmation of racial stereotypes held by black males against them, stereotypes concretely expressed in preference for white women. A white wife would have been political suicide. When the Greenwich Village poetaster LeRoi Jones wanted to become the black nationalist organizer Amiri Baraka, it was imperative that he jettison his white wife, who would have been a fatal impediment for his planned activity in the service of the Prudential Insurance Company – provoking clashes with poor Italians in the streets of Newark, New Jersey as part of a counterinsurgency scheme.

NADERITE PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, NEW YORK CITY

After BIC, Obama moved on for a stint at Ralph Nader's Public Interest Research Group in New York City, a nonprofit group which billed itself as promoting "consumer, environmental and government reform." According to Janny Scott, Obama "became a full-time organizer at City College in Harlem, paid slightly less than $10,000 a year to mobilize student volunteers." Nader's groups attempt to carry out feasible reforms in the areas of health, safety, and consumer issues, all under the banner of "good government" – the eternal slogan of reform Democrats and upscale suburbanites who are horrified by the venality of politics among poor people and the underclass.

Obama's specific assignment was the one he has tried and failed to carry out in 2008: to take projects that were designed to appeal to affluent suburbanites and sell them to people much lower on the socioeconomic scale. His job was an exercise in condescending Malthusian elitism: 'Mr. Obama says he spent three months "trying to convince minority students at City College about the importance of recycling" — a description that surprised some former colleagues. They said that more "bread-and-butter issues" like mass transit, higher education, tuition and financial aid were

more likely the emphasis at City College. "You needed somebody — and here was where Barack was a star — who could make the case to students across the political spectrum," said Eileen Hershenov, who oversaw Mr. Obama's work for Nypirg. The job required winning over students on the political left, who would normally disdain a group inspired by Ralph Nader as insufficiently radical, as well as students on the right and those who were not active at all."' (Janny Scott, "Obama's Account of New York Years Often Differs From What Others Say," *New York Times,* October 30, 2007) Obama failed then, and he is failing again this time in his quest to market elitist issues among those with urgent economic needs.

GAMALIEL FOUNDATION, CHICAGO: ALINSKYITE COUNTERINSURGENCY

Obama embarked on what he says, even now, was the hardest work of his life: the three and a half years of community organizing in the impoverished neighborhoods of Chicago's far South Side. His job: to work with the Developing Communities Project, a church-based effort that aimed to organize low-income residents to improve local conditions. … his friend Valerie Jarrett, former chairman of the Chicago Stock Exchange, told me. Obama himself described the years in Chicago to me as the time when he "finally and fully grew up." (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

Obama loves to boast that he served for some years as a community organizer. The problem for most people is that they have very little concrete notion what this might mean. This needs a few words of explanation. The Developing Communities Project was an operation of the Gamaliel Foundation, the temple of the organizing methods associated with Saul Alinsky, who had been preaching community organizing since the World War II era. The Gamaliel Foundation was also a satellite of the Ford Foundation, the flagship US foundation devoted to preventing the emergence of any social-political challenge to the dominance of Wall Street financiers over the crumbling US society. Money for Obama also came from the Woods Fund, a foundation created by the reactionary Woods family, who owned coal mines that provided the coal for Commonwealth Edison, where the dominant figure was Thomas Ayers, the father of Obama's terrorist friend, foundation operative Bill Ayers.

The best term for Saul Alinsky was that he was a counter-insurgent, quite independent of his personal understanding of the matter. Alinsky's community organizing specified that people ought to be organized locally and on the basis of the lowest common denominator, generally some petty local grievance, although sometimes based on poverty, but only if it were understood as a purely local issue. Alinsky was obsessed with everything that was fragmented, parochial, localistic, balkanized, sub-divided neighborhood by neighborhood, precinct by precinct, block by block. In his dream world, one local group of Hungarian steelworkers would fight to get a sewer fixed. A few hundred yards away, a black community group would fight the city government to get a public library. Nearby a group of women would be demanding a daycare facility. A men's club would struggle to clean up the public park. None of these groups would be in any contact with any others. They would not act politically, would not support candidates; they would only exert pressure on corporations, governments, and so forth.

Each of these tiny groups would be fragmented and impotent and helpless in a real emergency, like a depression, a war, or a police state. Above all, they would never be able to advance an alternative to Wall Street domination, which was so far beyond the local purview that it never came up – and yet, this was always the heart of the matter. It was more likely that a black local group would fight a white one, with unemployed or parents fighting the teachers' union, or some other futile clash. Sometimes Alinsky's methods won some trifling local concession, but often the yield

was nil. The more common outcome was that the local organizers became demoralized by a long series of defeats, and drifted off into boredom, despair, and de-politicization. This is in fact the outcome that appears to have crowned the career of Barack Obama as a community organizer in Chicago in the 1990s; after three years of futility, Obama was canny enough to depart the scene in favor of the Harvard Law School, another stepping stone in his glittering political career.

Obama went to Chicago in 1985. He worked as a community organizer among low-income residents in Chicago's Roseland community and the Altgeld Gardens public housing development on the city's South Side. The Developing Communities Project (DCP) counter-insurgency effort was funded by the Gamaliel Foundation, which was heavily funded by the flagship Ford Foundation. DCP purported to offer job training and college prep on Chicago's South Side. The real problems of blacks on the South Side of Chicago were the soaring unemployment and imprisonment among the area's mostly black workers – issues that Obama never addressed.

The Gamaliel Foundation's own website informs the public that "the Gamaliel Foundation receives grants from the Bauman Family Foundation, the Public Welfare Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Ford Foundation, George Soros' Open Society Institute, and others." (www.gamaliel.org) Obama has thus been a Ford Foundation-Soros asset going back more than twenty years. The Developing Communities Project (DCP) was associated with the Calumet Community Religious Conference (CCRC) in Chicago. Both the CCRC and the DCP were built on the Alinsky model of community agitation, wherein paid organizers learned how to "rub raw the sores of discontent," as Alinsky put it. The element of manipulation is clear enough, even in the abstract theory. One of Obama's early mentors in the Alinsky method was Mike Kruglik, presumably the Marty Kaufman (or part of that composite character) that Obama writes about in *Dreams*. Kruglik later told the *New Republic* that Obama "was a natural, the undisputed master of agitation, who could engage a room full of recruiting targets in a rapid-fire Socratic dialogue, nudging them to admit that they were not living up to their own standards. As with the panhandler, he could be aggressive and confrontational. With probing, sometimes personal questions, he would pinpoint the source of pain in their lives, tearing down their egos just enough before dangling a carrot of hope that they could make things better."

Alinsky had told his agitators to bring people to the "realization" that they are indeed miserable, that their misery is the fault of unresponsive governments or greedy corporations. (This is already absurd, since it is the economic breakdown crisis itself that radicalizes those who experience it. The task of an organizer is to develop strategy and programs to allow a popular movement to challenge the financier elite at the highest level – state power, not petty community control or local control, where defeat is always guaranteed.) The task of the agitator is then to help them to bond together to demand what they deserve, and to agitate so energetically that governments and corporations will see "self-interest" in granting the demands of the local agitators. Obama had a four-year education in these crude Alinsky methods, which he often says was the best education he ever got anywhere – in profiling and manipulation, since these are the essence of the Alinsky divide-and-conquer method of counterinsurgency.

PREVARICATION IN THE HOOD

Obama paints a moderately flattering picture of himself as a community organizer in *Dreams*. But even here, he has faced charges of embroidering and embellishing his record to make himself look good. The criticism comes from the long-time local activist Hazel Johnson, who has disputed the account of events at Altgeld Gardens that Obama put into his book, and which he has repeated at

innumerable political appearances over the years. The local CBS affiliate in Chicago went to the Altgeld neighborhood and found that 'some say Illinois Senator Barack Obama gave himself a little too much credit for his work as a community organizer. Obama's past work in the troubled Altgeld Gardens housing project is a staple of his presidential stump speeches, and a significant part of his first book. …at least one resident who worked with Obama back then is unhappy with the senator's recollection. Hazel Johnson and her daughter Cheryl are disputing some parts of the version of events Obama tells. They do not, however, dispute that he worked hard at Altgeld Gardens and say they are supporting his presidential campaign. But, Johnson says in his book, *Dreams from My Father*, and in campaign stump speeches, Obama gets some things wrong about the months he spent working in Altgeld Gardens in the 1980s. She and her daughter Cheryl produced a document, for example, showing Obama's 1987 salary as an organizer in the development to be $25,000 – not the $13,000 he often talks about. There is a very simple explanation for that, Obama's aides say. He did indeed make $25, 000 in 1987, but he was initially hired in 1985 at a salary of $13,000. And, they claim, Obama didn't work cleaning up asbestos at Altgeld, but fiberglass, another environmental hazard. They also dispute his version of an incident in which Obama claimed Altgeld Gardens residents beat on the car of a government official they were unhappy with. "I think he portrayed us as barbaric that we ran behind CHA officials beating on the car, and that didn't take place, because I was in that particular meeting" Cheryl Johnson said.' Perhaps Obama thinks that the masses are after all a great beast.

Interestingly, the one community source who came forward to endorse Obama's version of events is a person who was currently on the payroll of the Gamaliel Foundation, and who can thus be located in the larger orbit of the Ford Foundation. This was the Jesuit priest Greg Golluzzo. '"I discussed every item of this," said Greg Golluzzo of the Gamaliel Foundation. … Johnson says that since all of this has come up, she thinks Obama should go talk to her.'(Mike Flannery, "Altgeld Gardens Resident Who Worked With Senator in 1980s Says He Is Exaggerating His Role," Cbsnews.com, 2007) Obama has not returned to Altgeld to answer the criticisms of Hazel Johnson. When Obama's fellow foundation operative Gerald Kellman summed up Obama's years of work, he recognized that it had all been a big failure: "It is clear that the benefit of those years to Mr. Obama dwarfs what he accomplished. Mr. Kellman said that Mr. Obama had built the organization's following among needy residents and black ministers, but "on issues, we made very little progress, nothing that would change poverty on the South Side of Chicago."[14] So Obama was a failure as a community organizer. His other big project, the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, was also a failure in improving education in Chicago, as we will see.

HILLARY REJECTED ALINSKY; OBAMA EMBRACED HIM

Other commentators have tried to show that Obama is still using Alinsky methods in the running of his presidential campaign. One right-wing observer writes: "Obama also appears to have mastered the playbook used by…the legendary amoral guru of left wing activism, Saul Alinsky…." (Kyle-Anne Shiver, Obama's Alinsky Jujitsu, *American Thinker*, February 25, 2008) In fact, right-wing writers on the Clinton-Obama contest have attempted to equate the outlooks of these two candidates based on the bare fact that they both came into contact with the Alinskyite counter-insurgency doctrine. The big difference is that Obama looked at the Alinskyite school of organizing, and decided to join it. Hillary looked at Alinsky in considerable depth, found it totally inadequate, and turned away.

Hillary's views are found in her senior thesis from Wellesley College which, contrary to popular belief, is readily available to the public. Hillary saw an Alinsky who tried to escape ideological

categories: '"Alinsky, cringing at the use of labels, ruefully admitted that he might be called an existentialist," she found. [We already know what that can mean.] Rodham tried to probe his moral relativism — particular ends, Alinsky maintained, often justify the means — but Alinsky would only concede that "idealism can parallel self-interest." Hillary tentatively accepted Alinsky's contention that the problem of the poor isn't so much a lack of money as a lack of power, as well as his skeptical view of federal anti-poverty programs as ineffective. (Alinsky took the facile view, shared by the GOP, that Johnson's War on Poverty was a "prize piece of political pornography," even though he collected funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity.) It is clear that Alinsky wanted everything to come out of the do-it-yourself bag of the local community organizer, a kind of nomadic left-wing anarchist who viewed the state as an adversary. Organizing in the Democratic Party was too broad, and might develop into an actual challenge to the ruling class, the very thing that Alinsky's owners were using him to head off. Hillary conceded what was obvious: "A cycle of dependency has been created," she wrote, "which ensnares its victims into resignation and apathy." Hillary advanced a "perspective" or critique of Alinsky's methods, citing especially scholars who claimed that Alinsky's small gains actually delayed attainment of bigger goals for the poor and minorities.

Hillary noted the "few material gains" that Alinsky's methods were capable of obtaining, such as forcing Kodak to hire blacks in Rochester, New York, or delaying the University of Chicago's expansion into the Woodlawn neighborhood, the very Hyde Park community later represented by Barack and policed by Michelle. Hillary attributed part of Alinsky's failure to shifting demography and the diminishing role of neighborhoods in American life. She also showed that many projects depended completely on the presence of Alinsky personally – hardly a recipe for empowering others: "One of the primary problems of the Alinsky model is that the removal of Alinsky dramatically alters its composition," she wrote; "Alinsky is a born organizer who is not easily duplicated, but, in addition to his skill, he is a man of exceptional charm."

Hillary's final verdict was that the Alinsky school of micro-organizing could never work in a mass society; the Alinsky "power/conflict model is rendered inapplicable by existing social conflicts" — over-arching national issues such as racial tension and segregation, prosperity and economic depression. Alinsky never had any success in forming an effective national movement, she said, suggesting the futility of "the anachronistic nature of small autonomous conflict." Alinsky sometimes threatened small-scale disruptions to extort temporary, local concessions. Hillary concluded that the mini-conflict approach to large-scale power is limited. "Alinsky's conclusion that the 'ventilation' of hostilities is healthy in certain situations is valid, but across-the-board 'social catharsis' cannot be prescribed," she wrote.

Hillary brought Alinsky to Wellesley in January 1969 to speak at a private dinner for a dozen students; he expressed dissatisfaction with New Left protesters such as the Students for a Democratic Society. Rodham closed her thesis with the obligatory flourish by saying that she reserved a place for Alinsky in the pantheon of social justice activists next to Martin Luther King, Walt Whitman, and perennial socialist presidential candidate Eugene Debs. She also ironically suggested that Alinsky was a part of the establishment: "In spite of his being featured in the Sunday *New York Times*," she wrote, "and living a comfortable, expenses-paid life, he considers himself a revolutionary. In a very important way he is. If the ideals Alinsky espouses were actualized, the result would be social revolution. Ironically, this is not a disjunctive projection if considered in the tradition of Western democratic theory. In the first chapter it was pointed out that Alinsky is regarded by many as the proponent of a dangerous socio/political philosophy. As such, he has been feared — because each embraced the most radical of political faiths — democracy."' (Bill Dedman,

"Reading Hillary Clinton's Hidden Thesis," MSNBC, May. 9, 2007) Alinsky offered Hillary a job as a community organizer, which she had the good sense to refuse. Obama later accepted just such a job from the Gamaliel Foundation after Alinsky's death.[15]

OBAMA'S ROOTS TRIP TO KENYA

After quitting his job as a community organizer, Obama decided to make his obligatory pilgrimage to Kenya, where he had never been. By this time his father was deceased. He traveled by way of London. A conversation about political and economic conditions in Africa with a young Englishman in the airplane gives Obama another chance to reflect on his favorite obsession, race. Here he found yet another opportunity to reflect on his "own uneasy status: a Westerner not entirely at home in the West, an African on his way to a land full of strangers." (*Dreams* 310) He has an opportunity to travel around Europe for three weeks in a grand tour that most American middle class families of whatever race were already unable to provide for their children, or for themselves in retirement. Obama tells us that he visited London, Paris, Madrid, and Rome, and then concluded that it was all a terrible mistake:

> …by the end of the first week I realized that I'd made a mistake. It wasn't that Europe wasn't beautiful; everything was just as I'd imagined it. It just wasn't mine. I felt as if I were living out someone else's romance; the incompleteness of my own history stood between me and the sites I saw like a hard pane of glass. I began to suspect that my European stop was just one more means of delay, one more attempt to avoid coming to terms with the Old Man. Stripped of language, stripped of work and routine – stripped even of the racial obsessions to which I'd become accustomed and which I had taken (perversely) as a sign of my own maturation – I had been forced to look inside myself and had found only a great emptiness there. (*Dreams* 301-302)

Obama, we see, was a convinced existentialist.

OBAMA AND THE DECLINE OF THE WEST

Here Obama's racist psychopathology is displayed in the sharpest relief. Had he already been imbibing Wright's hate-mongering theories about the Italian garlic noses and the inferiority of the Irish? Europe represents a huge chunk of the historical experience of humanity as a whole, but Obama's racist obsession leads him to conclude that it does not belong to him – despite the obvious facts that the language, institutions, science, technology, and all the related components of his life derive from European models. Obama rejects what he sees, and clings to the empty abstraction of Afrocentrism, albeit tinged with a heavy dose of existentialism. If he had gone to China, Obama would not have pondered that the majority of the man-days lived by humanity have probably been Chinese; he would have rejected China too, on the same explicitly racist grounds. Obama explicitly rejects the unity and wholeness of human history. He imagines that history is made up of a series of self-contained and hermetically sealed races, and that no race exercises any influence over the internal life of another race. With this, historical reality goes out the window, and is sure to be replaced by racist myths.

Obama turns out to be close to the pre-fascist pessimist Oswald Spengler, the 1920s theoretician of the *Decline of the West*, who also thought of each *Kultur* as being axiomatically independent of and untouched by all the others, with each one living out its own appointed life span. Obama's contemptuous dismissal of Europe obliges us to label him as a fanatic and an incurable racist.

Obama's *maître à penser* Jeremiah Wright has mocked and derided European classical music in general and Georg Friedrich Handel in particular. The common ground between Obama and Wright, which some have suspected even as others indignantly denied it, turns out to be quite substantial.

Turning away from Europe, Obama was confronted with the pervasive polygamy of his own father, his own tribe, and his own Kenyan ancestors. Obama's 40-year-old cousin Said Hussein Obama later recalled, "My cousin found it difficult when he came here to learn his six half-brothers and sisters were born to four different mothers." In reality, the number of Obama Senior's offspring may be even greater, as we have already seen. "The person who made me proudest of all," Obama added in his memoir, "was Roy. Actually, now we call him Abongo, his Luo name, for two years ago he decided to reassert his African heritage. He converted to Islam, and has sworn off pork and tobacco and alcohol." (*Dreams* 441) This Abongo "Roy" Obama is a Luo activist and a militant Muslim who now contends that the black man must "liberate himself from the poisoning influences of European culture." In other words, Roy has also embraced Fanon. Roy has called on his younger half-brother to embrace his African heritage. (*Dreams* 441) Roy's role, if any, in the violent tribal conflict which has been convulsing Kenya in 2007-2008 is not known.

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL: ANOTHER WALL OF SECRECY, 1988-1991

Obama then entered Harvard Law School in 1988. In February 1990, he was elected the first African-American editor of the Harvard Law Review, and received a first wave of positive publicity in the *New York Times*. Obama graduated from Harvard Law magna cum laude in 1991. Obama's professors were aware that he was slippery: "He then and now is very hard to pin down," said Kenneth Mack, then a classmate and now a professor at the law school. Becoming the first black president of the law review was a highly political process, and not only an academic or technical one. Winning the position was a matter of political finesse, and clearly of some successful manipulation. "He was able to work with conservatives as well as liberals," says Obama's friend Michael Froman, who is currently an executive at Citigroup.

Obama's greatest fan appears to have been Professor Laurence Tribe, the Carl M. Loeb Professor at Harvard University. Tribe taught Obama and employed him as a research assistant. He remembers him as a "brilliant, personable, and obviously unique" person. Tribe said that Obama's theoretical perspective on applying modern physics to law was "very impressive." Obama never talks about this theory, but it reeks of the unbridled relativism that can make of the Constitution whatever one wants. Tribe is of course a darling of the liberal media who later argued Al Gore's Florida case before the Supreme Court in December 2000. Tribe says that Obama was one of his two best students ever, and adds: "He had a very powerful ability to synthesize diverse sources of information." (Wallace Wood, *Rolling Stone*)

Obama is alleged to have contributed to Tribe's bizarre 1989 article in the *Harvard Law Review* entitled "The Curvature of Constitutional Space: What Lawyers Can Learn From Modern Physics." This is a 39-page treatise which argues that constitutional jurisprudence should be revised in a way which recalls the process by which Einstein's theory of relativity replaced Newtonian mechanics. On the surface, Tribe and Obama were arguing against the absurd and suffocating "original intent" method of the right-wing reactionary Federalist Society. But their arguments would also open the door to boundless arbitrary caprice and abuse by removing any notion of natural law from the method of construing the Constitution. Obama is thus capable of rejecting the manacles of original intent for a Cole Porter doctrine of "anything goes" in legal positivism, which would open the door

to fascist innovation in a way that even "original intent" has not been able to do. Once again, we are looking here at the transition from reaction to fascism.

OGLETREE AND REPARATIONS

Another significant mentor for Obama was the black Professor Charles Ogletree, who is one of the leading proponents of reparations for slavery. Reparations are a favorite tactic of the foundations and the counter-insurgency community in general, since this ploy holds out the promise of a whole new cycle of futile and self-defeating racial conflict in the United States, thus safeguarding financier rule for another historical epoch. It is especially absurd in the light of the growing numbers of Latinos, Asians, and other more recent immigrants who have no connection whatsoever to slavery and Jim Crow. The serious approach would be a class-based approach, with working people of all ethnic and racial groups forming a united front to extract from Wall Street the necessary means for social and economic renewal in housing, health care, jobs, education, mass transit, and related areas. This is exactly what the reparations issue is designed to prevent.

When Wright went to the National Press Club, the only specific demand he made was for an apology for slavery. It is widely assumed that such an apology, while fully justified in itself, would be seized on by the foundation-funded affirmative action black overclass to demand reparations, of which the black overclass would receive the lion's share, while the inner-city ghetto would sink ever deeper into despair and poverty. "This matter is growing in significance rather than declining," Ogletree recently commented. "It has more vigor and vitality in the 21st century than it's had in the history of the reparations movement." Professor Ogletree was an advisor to Obama during his 2004 Senate candidacy and serves as an advisor to him now. (AP, July 9, 2006) It is therefore quite possible that, in addition to a global warming tax and a third world solidarity tax, a future Obama regime might try to impose a slavery reparations tax. Under the likely conditions of economic breakdown in this country such an attempt, whatever the abstract balance of equities, might well lead to the worst of all possible outcomes, civil war. We will have more to say about Obama's secret agenda for reparations later in this study.

Evelyn Pringle, who has delved into the labyrinth of Chicago corruption in which Obama wallowed for so many years, has found that the mafioso and underworld figure Antoin Rezko, Obama's prime moneybags for much of his earlier career, came into contact with Obama while he was still in law school and tried to hire him immediately as a mouth-piece for Rezko's underworld empire: in the arguments at the spring 2008 Rezko trial, it was revealed that he '"met Barack Obama when he was in Harvard Law School and tried to hire him" to be the lawyer for his development company.'

A well-informed expert on Chicago political corruption, Pringle shows that Rezko and Obama go way back together: 'Obama says he met Rezko, when he got a call right out of the blue from David Brint, after he was elected president of the Harvard Law Review, wanting to know if he would be interested in being a developer for Rezko's real estate company, Rezmar. Because they read that he was interested in community development work, Obama says, Rezko and his two partners, Mahru and Brint, met with him to discuss the job. "I said no, but I remained friendly with all three of them," Obama said in the *Chicago Tribune* on November 1, 2006. In fact, Obama told the Tribune that Rezko "might have raised $50,000 to $75,000" for one campaign alone in his failed run for Congress in 2000.' (Evelyn Pringle, op-ed news) In Obama's life, there are too many of these coincidences; we can feel the mysterious action of the Trilateral invisible hand. As for Obama and Rezko, they go back to 1991 or earlier.

OBAMA'S WORLD: THE FOUNDATIONS

We have already seen Obama in his role as a community organizer for the Gamaliel foundation. We must stress that Obama's role as a foundation operative begins here, but certainly does not end when he goes off to law school. No indeed: the vocation of being a foundation operative constitutes Obama's family business. His mother was a Ford Foundation operative, and most of the jobs Obama has ever held were with foundations. When it came time for Obama to start going to church, he unfailingly chose a congregation where Ford Foundation race theory is projected onto the plane of heaven and eternity in the form of the provocateur religion of Black liberation theology.

Before we go any further with Obama's own story, it will be useful to offer an overview of the strategic orientation of US foundation operations during this timeframe. Foundations represent an extremely important part of the social control mechanisms which prevail today in the United States.

The foundations are all the more effective in their chosen work of social control, engineering and political manipulation because many people are simply unaware of the immense scale of their operations, even though every broadcast on public television or National Public Radio is always accompanied by a litany of the foundations which have financed that program. One way to understand the pervasive influence of foundations is to say that they are as omnipresent in this country today as the CIA and the FBI were during the Cold War. This is partly because many intelligence community operations of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s have morphed into foundations under the auspices of President Reagan's Executive Order 12333, which privatized many of the existing spook activities. Many naïve people still think of foundations as being humanitarian or charitable institutions concerned with education, health, and the improvement of the human condition. Nothing could be further from the truth. Like Henry Ford himself, the Pew family and many other oligarchical plans whose family fortunes have been transformed into foundations harbored fascist sympathies during the 1920s and 1930s. Today, they are overwhelmingly multicultural, politically correct, Malthusian, and neo-Luddite in their ideology. They hate science and technology because these are seen as avenues of upward social mobility for the lower orders, and as a threat to continued financier domination. Perhaps more than any other agency, the foundations have engaged in the strangulation and perversion of the American spirit over these past four decades in particular.

The late Christopher Lasch, in his classic study *The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy* (New York: Norton, 1995), notes the important role of class prejudice in forming elite attitudes in this country today. He describes how well-to-do liberals, when confronted with resistance to their ideas of social engineering, "betray the venomous hatred that lies not far beneath the smiling face of upper-middle-class benevolence," and turn on those who "just don't get it." (Lasch, 28) The result is an academic culture which appears to be contemptuous of the human potential of vast strata of the American population. This is the kind of mentality which we can see in Obama's infamous San Francisco "Bittergate" rant. This is a condensed version of the elitist and left authoritarian mental world of the pro-oligarchical foundation bureaucrats. In order to understand Obama's mentality and the decisions he might make as the head of the future regime, we are therefore obliged to review some critical points about the recent historical record of the Ford Foundation and its satellites.

Most discussions of Obama's career as what he calls a "community organizer" are crippled by a total lack of historical background on the Ford Foundation and its satellites, and further by any comprehension of the goals of foundation-funded social engineering. Because Obama is so totally a product of the Ford Foundation and the foundation world of which it is the center, we will have to

repeat several times in this volume that the main purpose of these foundations by the latter half of the 20th century was to exercise social control, so as to perpetuate the uncontested political domination of Wall Street financial interests over the legitimate aspirations of the various ethnic groups, economic strata, and other components of the American population.

The watchword of the Ford Foundation is Divide and Conquer. The goal of its projects is always to play one group in the population against some other group so as to create conflict, strife, and division, so that the **Wall Street interests can emerge unscathed and triumph**. The individual foundation grant officers involved in this process may well be motivated by some hallucination of Marxism, multiculturalism, or political correctness, but it is not these values which the foundations finally serve: their goal is to disrupt and abort the emergence of anything approaching a politically conscious united front of the American people capable of demanding radical economic reforms, and especially to ward off a revival of the New Deal, new political formations based on economic populism, a Marshall Plan for the cities, including the urban ethnic minority populations, and so forth.

POVERTY PIMPS FOR THE FOUNDATIONS

When Obama says that he was a community organizer, it would be far more accurate to say that he was a poverty pimp for the Ford Foundation network, a paid race-monger whose job it was to organize politically naïve and desperate groups on the south side of Chicago into corporatist, dead-end, fragmented, parochial projects from which they would derive little or no benefit, and the goal of which was simply to use up enough of their lives in futility until they dropped out altogether in despair. The only exception to this was the use of these community control or local control or community action advocacy projects as political pawns against certain state and local political factions, or as battering rams against other groups of working people, above all trade unions made up of municipal employees, especially teachers. This is where Obama learned to support "merit pay" as a weapon against teachers' unions.

In order to understand the foundation world, it is necessary to recall that these foundations generally represent the family fortunes of industrialists and businessmen of the 19th and early 20th centuries – the robber barons – which have been placed into tax-free status as charitable trusts, all the while perpetuating the urge for power of their founders. The foundations represent family fortunes or *fondi* which have attained a kind of oligarchical immortality by transcending the mere biological existence of the individuals and families who created them, and becoming permanent institutions destined to endure indefinitely.

These foundations once upon a time had to maintain some credibility by funding hospitals, universities, libraries, scientific research, and other projects which often had genuine social utility. Shortly after the Second World War, there began a trend towards social engineering and social action on the part of the foundations. The leader in this was the Ford Foundation, which, because it was the largest and wealthiest of the US foundations quickly became the flagship and opinion leader for the other foundations. Foundation officers represent the very essence of the financier oligarch mentality, and one result of this is that they generally all do the same thing at the same time in their respective fields of specialization. Because of this, control over the Ford Foundation represents a social control mechanism of great strength, which has been a decisive force in shaping the decline of US society and national life, especially over the last 40 years.

Dean Rusk had served Averill Harriman and Dean Acheson during the Truman administration, and then became president of the Rockefeller Foundation in the late 1950s; he 'once described

Ford's influence on other foundations: What the "fat boy in the canoe does," he said, "makes a difference to everybody else." And Ford's influence was never stronger than after it adopted the cause of social change. Waldemar Nielsen's monumental studies of foundations, published in 1972 and 1985, only strengthened the Ford effect, for Nielsen celebrated activist philanthropy and berated those foundations that had not yet converted to the cause. "As a result," recalls Richard Larry, president of the Sarah Scaife Foundation, "a number of foundations said: 'If this is what the foundation world is doing and what the experts say is important, we should move in that direction, too.'" The Rockefeller Brothers Fund, for example, funded the National Welfare Rights Organization—at the same time that the organization was demonstrating against Governor Nelson Rockefeller of New York. The Carnegie Corporation pumped nearly $20 million into various left-wing advocacy groups during the 1970s.' (Heather Mac Donald, "The Billions of Dollars That Made Things Worse," *City Journal*, Autumn 1996)

AGGRESSIVE FOUNDATION ACTIVISM OF THE LATE 1960S

In the second half of the 1960s, the social ferment generated by defeat in Vietnam, the student movement, the antiwar movement, the civil rights movement, and the gathering economic decline of the country spurred the foundations into action. With unerring oligarchical class instinct, they could see the grave danger that might be represented for financier domination by the possible fusion in a united front of the civil rights movement, the antiwar movement, the labor movement, and the student movement. Their answer to this was to promote and fund organizational forms that were so narrow, so fragmented, and so parochial, that they prevented the necessary cooperation among these movements, thus blocking them from attaining most of their principal goals. Alan Pifer was the head of the Carnegie Foundation in 1968; in his annual report for that year, Pifer

> exhorts his comrades [sic] in the foundation world to help shake up "sterile institutional forms and procedures left over from the past" by supporting "aggressive new community organizations which . . . the comfortable stratum of American life would consider disturbing and perhaps even dangerous." No longer content to provide mainstream knowledge dispassionately, America's most prestigious philanthropies now aspired to revolutionize what they believed to be a deeply flawed American society. […] Foundation-funded minority advocates fought for racial separatism and a vast system of quotas—and American society remains perpetually riven by the issue of race. On most campuses today, a foundation-endowed multicultural circus has driven out the very idea of a common culture, deriding it as a relic of American imperialism. Foundation-backed advocates for various "victim" groups use the courts to bend government policy to their will, thwarting the democratic process. […] The net effect is not a more just but a more divided and contentious American society. (Heather Mac Donald, "The Billions of Dollars That Made Things Worse," *City Journal*, Autumn 1996)

Right-wing commentators like the one just cited are generally incapable of analyzing the real motivations for what the foundations do; they usually attribute the catastrophic results of foundation social engineering to some misguided instincts to do good. Nothing could be further from the truth: the goal of the foundations is to maintain the brutal regime of finance capital, and this presupposes that there be no national coalition capable of expressing a national interest in contradiction to the dictates of the Wall Street financiers. The rightwingers are therefore forced to make up fantastic stories of how Marxists have crept in to the temples of finance capital by the dark of the moon, so as to advance their work of revolution. In reality incendiary race baiting and pseudo-revolutionary and hyper-revolutionary rhetoric are most often the stock in trade of the foundation-funded political operative, who gets paid good money to inflame the mutual animosities and resentments of groups

that ought to be uniting against Wall Street, rather than squabbling with each other for some petty and futile local concession. Barack Hussein Obama is precisely one of these foundation-funded political operatives or poverty pimps.

The Ford Foundation became more aggressive in its social engineering and more radical in its methods in order to ward off the threat which was latently present in the political upsurge of the late 1960s: 'From its start, Ford aimed to be different, eschewing medical research and public health in favor of social issues such as First Amendment restrictions and undemocratic concentrations of power, economic problems, world peace, and social science. […] But by the early 1960s, the trustees started clamoring for a more radical vision; according to Richard Magat, a Ford employee, they demanded "action-oriented rather than research-oriented" programs that would "test the outer edges of advocacy and citizen participation."' (Heather Mac Donald)

FORD FOUNDATION COMMUNITY ACTION AND THE 1960s GHETTO RIOTS

The beginnings of the local control-community control-poverty pimp apparatus of domestic social engineering and counterinsurgency goes back to the Ford Foundation's Gray Areas Project of the 1960s, which was spearheaded by an obscure and highly influential Ford Foundation operative named Paul Ylvisaker. 'The first such "action-oriented" program, the Gray Areas Project, was a turning point in foundation history and—because it was a prime mover of the ill-starred War on Poverty—a turning point in American history as well. Its creator, Paul Ylvisaker, an energetic social theorist from Harvard and subsequent icon for the liberal foundation community, had concluded that the problems of newly migrated urban blacks and Puerto Ricans could not be solved by the "old and fixed ways of doing things." Because existing private and public institutions were unresponsive, he argued, the new poverty populations needed a totally new institution—the "community action agency"—to coordinate legal, health, and welfare services and to give voice to the poor. According to Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan… Ford "proposed nothing less than institutional change in the operation and control of American cities . . . . [Ford] invented a new level of American government: the inner-city community action agency." Ylvisaker proceeded to establish such agencies in Boston, New Haven, Philadelphia, and Oakland.' (Heather Mac Donald)

The initial phase of Ford Foundation intervention into the black inner-city ghetto under the rubric of the Gray Areas strategy helped to fuel the Watts, Detroit, and Newark riots of 1965-67. The community action projects that were begun in these years did not deliver what they promised, but did set the stage for the futile and self-defeating violence of "Burn, baby, burn," which was considered fashionable in the radical chic salons of the day. "Unfortunately, because it was so intent on persuading the federal government to adopt the program, Ford ignored reports that the community action agencies were failures," according to historian Alice O'Connor.

Reincarnated as federal Community Action Programs (CAPs), Ford's urban cadres soon began tearing up cities. Militancy became the mark of merit for federal funders, according to Senator Moynihan. In Newark, the director of the local CAP urged blacks to arm themselves before the 1967 riots; leaflets calling for a demonstration were run off on the CAP's mimeograph machine. The federal government funneled community action money to Chicago gangs—posing as neighborhood organizers—who then continued to terrorize their neighbors. The Syracuse, New York CAP published a remedial reading manual that declared: "No ends are accomplished without the use of force. . . . Squeamishness about force is the mark not of idealistic, but moonstruck morals." Syracuse CAP employees applied $7 million of their $8 million federal grant to their own salaries.' (Heather Mac Donald) McGeorge Bundy should have been arrested for inciting to riot,

since that is exactly what he was doing. The political benefits of the resulting backlash would of course be harvested by demagogues like Nixon and Agnew.

THE 1968 NEW YORK CITY TEACHERS' STRIKE AS A TURNING POINT

A much-neglected turning point of recent American history was unquestionably the disastrous events associated with the New York City teachers' strike of 1968. These events have almost been forgotten, one suspects, because no foundation is eager to dredge them up. Contemporary observers, however, were clear that they had lived through a deliberately provoked catastrophe: 'One of the most polarizing events in our recent history was the Ocean Hill-Brownsville dispute over decentralization and community control which led to the New York teachers' strike of 1968. Martin Mayer said of this strike: "The New York teachers' strike of 1968 seems to me the worst disaster my native city has experienced in my lifetime." McGeorge Bundy's Ford Foundation's experiment caused New York City to shut down its educational system. That city became polarized: new - black militant radicals against old - left radicals, black trade unionists against anti-union black-power advocates, black against Jew, black against white, striker against non-striker, and ACLU civil libertarians against seekers of due process.' ("The Promotion of Domestic Discord," Vincent J. Salandria, October 23, 1971)[16]

MCGEORGE BUNDY: FROM VIETNAM STRATEGIC HAMLETS TO COMMUNITY CONTROL

In order to fragment, divide, and frustrate the ongoing political upsurge, the organizational forms which the Ford Foundation was using its fabulous wealth to create had to be as narrow, fragmented,apolitical, exclusive, and petty as possible. "Community Action Programs were a calculated means of keeping control. To deliver a particular point of view, foot soldiers got busy. Militants and Black Power were a joke! The Ford Foundation, through its president, McGeorge McBundy, was one step ahead and positioned to penetrate the movement. In promising to help achieve full domestic equality, they played a vanguard role and become the most important organization manipulating the militant black movement." (Pulling No Punches, October 28, 2007) McGeorge Bundy was a Skull and Bones graduate of Yale, a protégé of Dean Acheson, and the director of the National Security Council under President Kennedy who bears one of the heaviest individual burdens of responsibility for unleashing the genocidal Vietnam War. Bundy had left government in 1966, and would stay on as boss of the Ford Foundation until 1979. For much of this time, Bundy was considered to be the informal spokesman for the US Eastern Anglophile banking establishment, otherwise known as the financier oligarchy or ruling class. Accurate accounts of Bundy's activities are very hard to come by, because no foundation has been willing to pay for an in-depth analysis of how foundation-funded social engineering is destroying this country.

Bundy was, in short, a butcher, but he was also a sophisticated ruling-class political operative. Bundy was a slightly younger colleague of the generation of self-styled "wise men" who had reorganized the Anglo-American world empire in the wake of World War II. Bundy was a dyed-in-the-wool, hereditary, silver-spoon oligarch, who was conscious of representing one of the most powerful and aggressive centers of imperialist social engineering. 'David Halberstam was correct to quote one of McGeorge Bundy's colleagues as stating that Bundy "... is a very special type, an elitist, part of a certain breed of men whose continuity is to themselves, a line to each other and not the country."' (Vincent J. Salandria, "The Promotion of Domestic Discord," an address at the

conference of the New England Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, October 23, 1971)

Bundy was determined to ram through the Ford Foundation counterinsurgency strategy, whatever the cost to New York City and its people: as one student of these events observes, 'McGeorge Bundy was not a man given to self-doubt. (He once cut off discussion at a foundation meeting by announcing to a group of program officers: "Look, I'm settled about this. Let's not talk about it any more. I may be wrong, but I'm not in doubt.") And if he had second thoughts about the path down which he was taking the foundation, he did not express them at the time. Indeed, his speeches and writings in that period showed a confident determination to continue working with black militants.' ("McGeorge Bundy: How the Establishment's Man Tackled America's Problem with Race," Tamar Jacoby) [17]

GONZALEZ: FORD FOUNDATION "REVERSE RACISM" AMONG LATINOS

Bundy started by revamping the grant priorities inside the Ford Foundation to focus on black oppression, as well as the parallel problems of other ethnic minorities. It is important to note that racial oppression was never defined by the Ford Foundation in broad-based economic terms, such as the need for modern housing, new urban mass transit, top-flight medical care, high-tech jobs with union wages, a quality college education for all ghetto youth, and other reforms which would have necessitated a domestic Marshall Plan costing hundreds of billions of dollars. This was something which the oligarchs had no intention of paying for. Rather, the Ford Foundation claimed that the oppression of the black community was a matter of white racist attitudes, as reflected in institutional arrangements which prevented black self-determination, community control, and self-esteem. In this case, the oligarchs could claim that white blue-collar workers were the real culprits, since they were the ones who came into the most intensive daily contact with oppressed blacks. "Bundy reallocated Ford's resources from education to minority rights, which in 1960 had accounted for 2.5 percent of Ford's giving but by 1970 would soar to 40 percent." The same methods were also applied to Hispanics and Latinos in programs that were the precursors of the lunatic provocateur propaganda of groups like Atzlan, which makes the absurd demand that many American states be restored to Mexico. The only purpose of such raving delirium is to provide grist for the right-wing xenophobic radio talk show hosts and other ideologues, who can use this transparent posturing as "proof" in the minds of their gullible listeners of a nefarious Mexican plot to subvert the United States.

> Under Bundy's leadership, Ford created a host of new advocacy groups, such as the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (a prime mover behind bilingual education) and the Native American Rights Fund, that still wreak havoc on public policy today. Ford's support for a radical Hispanic youth group in San Antonio led even liberal congressman Henry B. Gonzalez to charge that Ford had fostered the "emergence of reverse racism in Texas." (Heather Mac Donald)

Congressman Gonzalez, a real fighter who later pioneered in the effort to impeach George Bush the elder,

> complained that the Ford Foundation had promoted racism among his people, Mexican-Americans. He related how the Ford Foundation made a grant of $630,000 to the Southwest Council for LaRaza. He said: The Ford Foundation wanted to create new leadership, and in fact the new leaders it has created daily proclaim that existing leadership is no good ... ... the president of MAYO, ... likes to threaten to 'kill' what he terms 'gringos' if all else fails I

> must come to the sad conclusion that, rather than fostering brotherhood, the foundation has supported the spewings of hate, and rather than creating a new political unit, it has destroyed what little there was ...' (Salandria)

We will see later on that the methods of the Ford Foundation in regard to the subversion and manipulation of the American Indian movement for financier and provocation purposes are virtually identical to the approach employed towards black and Hispanic target populations.

THE FORD FOUNDATION VS. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Martin Luther King was perceived by the Ford Foundation as a very serious threat, because of the inclusive united-front methods by which he proposed to merge the struggles of the black community with those of labor and the antiwar movement. The oligarchical class instinct of the Ford Foundation therefore dictated that ultra-radical racist provocateurs be thrown into the fray who would condemn Dr. King as a collaborationist Uncle Tom who was out of touch with younger firebrand radicals. The general heading for these Ford Foundation provocateurs was the Black Power movement or the pork chop cultural nationalists, who were always notoriously eager for their foundation checks.

> In a sense, in this, Ford was only following up on its own early initiative: the foundation's Gray Areas program, working in six inner cities in the early 1960s, had pioneered the idea of helping the ghetto help itself. But in 1964 the War on Poverty had taken the notion one step further, urging "maximum feasible participation" by the poor as a virtue in itself - calling on ghetto people not just to help run local services but teaching them to organize politically so that they could bargain with the government. As the idea gained credence, the emphasis of many anti-poverty programs shifted away from health care and education and job-training to teaching "leadership" and in effect telling "Whitey" off. Some people at the foundation were troubled by this new development. But they were largely unable to resist the growing pressure for any and all kinds of participatory programs. And it wasn't long before Ford found itself paying for street gangs and avowed Black Power leaders. (Tamar Jacoby)

And again, the decision to fund the most incendiary lunatic agitators was a very conscious one, since their outrageous statements could be used to fuel the backlash of the white middle class against the militants and their demands.

FORD'S MCKISSICK, ANTI-MARTIN LUTHER KING

Thanks to the sheer power of its multi-billion-dollar endowment, the Ford Foundation was able to create a new fad for shameless, race-baiting provocateurs on the national scene. H. Rap Brown became infamous for his favorite slogan that "violence is as American as cherry pie." Rap also issued ominous threats, including his classic "If America don't come around, we're gonna' burn it down." This was the age of "burn, baby, burn," while reactionary Republican strategists around Nixon and others thanked heaven for their extraordinary good fortune.

A good example of the Ford Foundation sponsorship for the most extreme black power militants as a countergang to Martin Luther King was the grant allocation in Cleveland, Ohio:

> Among the most controversial of these grants went to the Cleveland chapter of CORE [Congress of Racial Equality]. Like even the most moderate civil-rights organizations, CORE had been drifting leftward through the 1960s. Its integrationist national director James Farmer

had been replaced in 1966 by the younger and angrier Floyd McKissick, who along with Carmichael was among the first proponents of Black Power. Outflanked on the left by SNCC [Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee] and even tougher ghetto leaders advocating violence and a separate black nation, McKissick felt under strong pressure to prove his militancy. He began to talk of "revolution" and to forge links with black Muslims; he explicitly repudiated the phrase "civil rights," replacing its appeal to morality with bristling talk of race-based "power." Before long, his escalating racial rhetoric had driven most white members out of CORE. By 1967, SNCC had actually expelled whites, and in July CORE deleted the word "multiracial" from its constitution. With this, it dropped all pretense that it was pursuing integration or the hope of progress based on racial harmony.

None of this apparently bothered the Ford Foundation, which announced two weeks later - even as the Newark ghetto erupted in riots - that it was giving $175,000 to CORE's Cleveland chapter. Bundy explained at a press conference that his board had considered the grant "with particular care." (In fact among some 16 trustees, only Henry Ford himself had expressed any doubts.) What's more, said Bundy, "neither Mr. McKissick nor I suppose that this grant requires the two of us - or our organizations - to agree on all public questions." The foundation had chosen Cleveland because it had been particularly hard hit by riots the past summer; Ford's theory was that CORE might channel the ghetto's grievances in a more constructive way, averting further violence in the streets. The money was earmarked for voter registration and the training of community workers who were then to help other blacks articulate their needs.' (Tamar Jacoby, "McGeorge Bundy: How the Establishment's Man Tackled America's Problem with Race," http://www.aliciapatterson.org/APF1303/ Jacoby/Jacoby.html)

Bundy the patrician had made McKissick the minority plebeian into his mercenary as part of an incipient war on the part of the financiers against the majority of the American people in the form of the white middle class and lower middle class.

Rational spokesmen for the black community were horrified by the kinds of reckless and irresponsible agitation which the Ford Foundation was creating: 'In Cleveland, 'A black city councilman who opposed the program said the youths were being taught "race hatred" and that they had been heard telling younger children that "we are going to get guns and take over." Yet Ford continued to defend the grant: "I see it," said a foundation consultant, "as a flowering of what Black Power could be." In August 1968, the program was renewed, with explicit instructions to include local gang leaders.' (Tamar Jacoby) The Ford Foundation was not making mistakes; it was rather acting with diabolical effectiveness to pursue its oligarchical class agenda.

BUNDY AND MAYOR LINDSAY ATTACK THE NEW YORK SCHOOLS, 1968

At this time, the mayor of New York City was a liberal Republican bankers' boy named John V. Lindsay. Lindsay was expected by Wall Street to maintain full payment on the municipal bonds of the city, no matter what the consequences might be for schools, hospitals, transportation infrastructure and so forth. The bankruptcy of New York City which would explode in 1974-75 was now on the horizon, so it was time for the finance oligarchs to take preemptive action to divide, disrupt, and abort any potential for a united front of New Yorkers against their outrageous and exorbitant demands, which would later be carried out by the infamous Municipal Assistance Corporation or Big Mac, directed by the austerity fanatic and future Obama backer Felix Rohatyn. Bundy was able to convince Lindsay that a counterinsurgency project based on black community

control of the public schools would offer vast potential for mobilizing the black ghetto against the largely Jewish teachers' union, the United Federation of Teachers or UFT.

The result was a sinister triumph of foundation-funded social engineering and political manipulation. The idea was to give the newly created community control apparatus the right to hire and fire teachers, in flagrant violation of the legally binding contract the UFT had fought so hard to obtain from the city only a few years before. Bundy was no doubt gleeful as he contemplated the potential for busting a union in the short run, using duped black parents, egged on by foundation-funded poverty pimps:

> The most notorious Bundy endeavor, the school decentralization experiment in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section of Brooklyn, changed the course of liberalism by fracturing the black-Jewish civil rights coalition and souring race relations in New York for years afterward. Bundy had led a mayoral panel under John Lindsay that recommended giving "community control" over local public school districts to parents. The panel's report, written by a Ford staffer, claimed that New York's huge centralized school system was not sufficiently accountable to minority populations. Black and Puerto Rican children could not learn or even behave, the report maintained, unless their parents were granted "meaningful participation" in their education. Translation: parents should hire and fire local teachers and school administrators. (Heather Mac Donald)

> Bundy launched the program with characteristic energy and dispatch. The very month he arrived in New York, he secured the board's formal blessing to make race the top priority. Then he got down to studying the issue in earnest. He read everything he could get his hands on and spared no effort to get to know "Negro leaders." He reached out to individuals and heads of organizations, meeting them individually and in small groups. There were Sunday lunches at his home and dinner meetings at the elite, all-male Century Club. The Century round-tables became a kind of an institution in themselves: a dozen or more black and white men, from government, social work and academia, would gather on the club's musty top floor and take turns around the table, each speaking his piece, then removing their jackets and arguing late into the night.' (Tamar Jacoby)

> 'The Bundy Report on decentralization contains one inexcusable folly – inexcusable because ... Bundy ... recognized it as folly ... that communities can 'unite' around the issue of education. In fact, communities inevitably divide about the issue of education.' (Salandria)

If this was folly on the part of Bundy, it was very willful folly. Later Obama would repeat the same divisive tactics as head of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge.

RACIST RHODY MCCOY, FORD OPERATIVE AND ROLE MODEL FOR OBAMA

The success of the community control gambit for purposes of counterinsurgency and political manipulation depended in large part on the personal qualities of the boss of the new experimental community control school district. As could be expected, the Ford Foundation selected for this post the most incendiary and outrageous racist provocateur in sight:

> Ford chose as the head of its $1.4 million decentralization experiment in three Brooklyn school districts a longtime white-hater, Rhody McCoy, who dreamed of creating an all-black school system, right up through college, within the public schools. McCoy was a moderate, however, compared to the people he tapped as deputies. Although the school board blocked his appointment of a militant under indictment for conspiracy to murder, he did manage to hire Les

> Campbell, the radical head of the Afro-American Teachers Association, who organized his school's most violent students into an anti-Semitic combat force. According to education scholar Diane Ravitch, McCoy had an understanding with racist thug Sonny Carson that Carson's "bodyguards" would intimidate white teachers until McCoy would diplomatically call them off.' (Heather Mac Donald)

Since the majority of the New York City teachers were Jewish leftists with radical New Deal backgrounds, the most scurrilous anti-Semitic baiting was prescribed for all the Ford Foundation operatives who wished to advance their careers:

> Ford's experimental school districts soon exploded with anti-Semitic black rage, as militants argued that black and Puerto Rican children failed because Jewish teachers were waging "mental genocide" on them. The day after Martin Luther King's assassination, students at a junior high school rampaged through the halls beating up white teachers, having been urged by Les Campbell to "[s]end [whitey] to the graveyard" if he "taps you on the shoulder."
>
> …white teachers at one school found an anti-Semitic screed in their mailboxes, calling Jews "Blood-sucking Exploiters and Murderers" and alleging that "the So-Called Liberal Jewish Friend . . . is Really Our Enemy and He is Responsible For the Serious Educational Retardation of Our Black Children." McCoy refused to denounce the pamphlet or the anti-Semitism behind it. Nor did Ford publicly denounce such tactics—or take responsibility after the fact. McGeorge Bundy later sniffed self-righteously: "If private foundations cannot assist experiments, their unique role will be impaired, to the detriment of American society." But if the experiment goes awry, the foundation can saunter off, leaving the community to pick up the pieces. (Heather Mac Donald)

Another commentator noted, "Not the least of the political questions left dangling at the end of the tragedy of the teachers' strikes is the best way to make tax-exempt foundations responsible for the consequences of their actions." (Salandria) In reality, American society would be best served by a policy of taxing these oligarchical parasites out of existence, and returning their ill-gotten loot to the public treasury.

FORD OPERATIVES PROVOKE THE TEACHERS TO STRIKE

With the start of the new school year in September 1968, the great Ford Foundation experiment in community control and social engineering exploded into chaos, a chaos which engulfed New York City as a whole.

> Everything the skeptics predicted – and more – came to pass in Ocean Hill-Brownsville, one of the three experimental districts funded by Ford. Within weeks of the foundation's $59,000 grant, the militant activists who made up the board in this forsaken Brooklyn ghetto found themselves at odds with some dozen allegedly "incompetent" teachers charged by the board with being disloyal to the decentralization experiment. (The board was largely black, the teachers were white – and even a black judge who later investigated the dispute could find little cause, apart from race, for the board's dissatisfaction.) In May 1968, the offending teachers were asked to leave their posts, and when the union rallied to their defense, the local board went to war against the union. The union struck; the board resisted — by hiring several hundred irregular teachers and organizing people from the ghetto to demonstrate at the schools. Then, throughout the fall of 1968, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville schools were the scene of daily violence. (Tamar Jacoby)

Every institution in the city quickly chose sides between the teachers union and the black community control apparatus, splitting New York into two opposed camps. It is this kind of ominous precedent which allows us to predict that an Obama presidency carried on with these same foundation methods of social engineering will bring civil war in the United States as a whole much nearer. In the fall of 1968,

> a typical day brought out pickets and counter-pickets, shouting at each other across wooden police horses, threatening each other and inciting schoolchildren. Both sides organized rallies at City Hall; both spread hateful and largely racial innuendo. Black anti-Semitism (many of the teachers were Jewish) vied in fury with whites' race-charged fear and anger, and the cumulative venom spiraled out of control. The eight schools in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district were at the center of the storm – and many white teachers there reported they feared for their lives. But the striking union gave as good as it got, spreading bitterness throughout the city by shutting down the entire school system and causing more than 1 million students to miss nearly 40 days of the fall term. By November, when the strike was settled, integration – and race relations in general – had been set back 20 years or more. (Tamar Jacoby)

> Naomi Levine described how the Ford Foundation under McGeorge Bundy used Ocean Hill-Brownsville to deliberately provoke a confrontation:

> Why did the Ocean Hill governing board order the "termination of employment" of the nineteen teachers and administrators in Ocean Hill in such a peremptory manner and at a time when the State Legislature was considering various proposals that would have enacted into law many of the Bundy report recommendations? Why did the union react so strongly? […] The conclusion is inescapable that the Ocean Hill governing board wanted a confrontation with the Board of Education in order to fix its powers and responsibilities once and for all, and that it created the situation to provoke such confrontation. (Salandria, "The Promotion of Public Discord," http://educationforum.ipbhost.com/lofiversion/index.php/t7653.html)

Significant parts of the community control experiment were rolled back, but by then the vast damage had already been done. There was even a backlash against the high-handed and elitist approach of the Ford Foundation, but this fell far short of wiping out this poisonous and malignant institution:

> In the end, state education authorities approved a much watered-down version of the Bundy panel proposals. But Ford was made to pay dearly for its activist involvement. Conservative journalists and congressmen riding the backlash of the late 1960s seized on the foundation's involvement in both Ocean Hill and Cleveland. These were only two small grants, a few hundred thousand dollars of the many millions Ford had spent on race relations – for education, voter registration, housing integration and poverty research. But that did not stop critics like Texas congressman Wright Patman, who suggested apocalyptically on the House floor that "the Ford Foundation [had] a grandiose design to bring vast political, economic and social changes to the nation in the 1970s." Thanks largely to his efforts, in 1969 Congress passed legislation that significantly restricted all foundation giving (not just Ford's) with excise taxes and federal oversight. (Tamar Jacoby)

Wright Patman was that rarity, a genuine populist fighter against the Federal Reserve and the financier elite in general.

The events around the New York City teachers' strike of 1968 partially destroyed the government of the City of New York in a manner from which it has never really recovered. It also

set the stage for the personal ruin of Mayor Lindsay, who had in effect turned over large parts of the city to unelected and unaccountable Ford Foundation mindbenders. Here is an account of these events from the point of view of City Hall which appeared in the *New York Times* obituary for Mayor Lindsay in 2000:

> Lindsay initiatives… were widely viewed as special concessions to black New Yorkers…
>
> In 1968, Mr. Lindsay responded to black parents' demands for more control and more black teachers in their neighborhood schools by putting into effect, on an experimental basis, a school decentralization plan in several black areas of the city, including Ocean Hill-Brownsville, in Brooklyn.
>
> Studies were cited that said integration was sputtering in New York, that schools had a poor record educating black children, that it was psychologically harmful for blacks to attend schools with mostly white teachers and administrators. The Ford Foundation, among others, had urged the city to pursue decentralization, and the Legislature had agreed to finance the plan.
>
> Challenging a white, largely Jewish school bureaucracy, whose authority was to be pared by decentralization, Rhody McCoy, the administrator of Ocean Hill-Brownsville, transferred 13 teachers and 6 administrators, most of them Jewish, out of his district. In effect, he dismissed them without pedagogic reasons, and it was said that their real offense was to oppose decentralization.
>
> The action was denounced as illegal by the United Federation of Teachers, which called a strike that closed 85 percent of the city's 900 schools for 55 days, putting a million children out of classrooms and disrupting thousands of families. The strike's bitterness was horrendous, with threats of violence and diatribes laced with racism and anti-Semitism; Mr. Lindsay denounced the slurs and ugly conduct as intolerable.
>
> The strike ended when the state suspended Mr. McCoy and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville board on grounds that it had violated valid union contracts by transferring the teachers and administrators without cause. Later, the Legislature fashioned a compromise, decentralizing city schools into 32 districts and giving locally elected boards power to run their elementary and junior high schools, but adopting strong protections for teachers' jobs. But the episode left a legacy of tensions between blacks and Jews that went on for years, and Mr. Lindsay called it his greatest regret.
>
> The last six months of 1968 were "the worst of my public life," Mr. Lindsay later said. The schools were shut down, the police were engaged in a slowdown, firefighters were threatening job actions, sanitation workers had struck for two weeks and the city was awash in garbage, and racial and religious tensions were breaking to the surface.
>
> The depth of feeling against Mr. Lindsay in the boroughs outside Manhattan was not widely understood beyond New York. But it became apparent to the nation after a Feb. 9, 1969, blizzard buried the city in 15 inches of snow. While major arteries were plowed quickly, side streets in Queens were buried for days, and homeowners greeted the visiting mayor with boos, jeers and curses. The scenes, captured on national television, conveyed a message that the mayor of New York was indifferent to the middle class. (*New York Times*, Dec. 21, 2000)

In other words, Lindsay was widely seen as an arrogant elitist full of contempt for blue-collar and middle-class New Yorkers; these harbingers of a possible Obama regime in Washington are too obvious to require any further commentary.

A CLASSIC PATRICIAN-PLEBEIAN ALLIANCE TO CRUSH THE MIDDLE CLASS

In Machiavelli's *Discourses*, the perspicacious Florentine secretary points out that one of the most dangerous political alliances that can come to dominate a state is one between the wealthy patricians and the poorest inhabitants of the city. This seems to have been exactly what McGeorge Bundy was aiming at, and the results were and continue to be catastrophic based on any rational conception of American national interest. As Vincent Salandria, an intelligent lawyer, observed several years after the dust began to settle,

> A new political alliance is being forged in this country between the super-rich and the super-poor – especially the alienated and activist members of minority groups.
>
> The Ford Foundation, under the aggressive leadership of McGeorge Bundy, is providing the major thrust for this power bloc ... This is a dangerous game but it doesn't seem to worry those members of the "Eastern Establishment" who are involved. They're sure that no matter what happens they'll still be on top.

Salandria saw that the scope of the social manipulation being attempted by the Ford Foundation was so vast that it implied nothing less than a foundation coup to impose a new oligarchical political order in the United States:

> The Ford Foundation's support of provocateurs and revolutionaries throughout the nation is raising numerous eyebrows. Many believe Bundy, former coordinator of intelligence for President Kennedy, is fostering a new political alliance. Its effect, at the moment, appears to be the destruction of the American constitutional system. The Foundation seems to be bypassing the legally constituted federal bureaucracy, Congress and state and local governments in order to build a movement of revolutionary proletarians.' (Salandria, "The Promotion of Public Discord.")

It was clear that the teachers and the black parents were essentially fighting each other for a share of a pie of economic concessions that was rapidly shrinking because of the incipient economic decline and deindustrialization of the United States. These two groups would have had everything to gain by forming an alliance to extract urgently needed concessions from the Wall Street banks. As Salandria puts it,

> I feel that McGeorge Bundy's social engineering experiments with ethnics are designed to cause this country to unravel under a systematic program of polarization. Where the foundations leave off, the government agencies directly involve themselves in provocateur attempts to splinter this nation. […] Coleman McCarthy has very wisely shown the evil and cynicism behind the approach used by McGeorge Bundy. He points out the only legitimate function that the intellectual should play in dealing with ethnics and racism is to: ... explain that the blacks and white working class are actually in the same urban fix together. Instead of letting them fight each other for useless inner-city leftovers, the intellectuals could act as a referee, creating a black-white coalition based on hard, mutual needs, not any sentimental notions of integration. (Salandria)

It was also very clear that the Ford Foundation continues to regard the black community as second-class citizens who had to be maintained as wards and clients of the foundation community.

> Edith Kermit Roosevelt describes this process: The operations in New York City of the Ford Foundation typically illustrate the ruthless tactics used by the foundation's self-described 'elite'

> in their drive for political power. One of the Ford Foundation's goals has been to fundamentally change the direction and control of New York City's public-school system. City educational institutions provide the Ford Foundation with a vehicle in their drive to control minority and ethnic groups in urban areas through dollars distributed to key personnel who will be beholden to them. (Salandria)

A DISASTROUS WATERSHED IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Salandria, who was a leftist, typifies the rage of Italian, Jewish, Irish, Polish, and other New Yorkers who had witnessed the rape of the city by a group of leftist elitists in the pay of the Ford Foundation. He reflects:

> But let us not be so outraged as to lose our bearings. Yes, admittedly I have difficulty at times in maintaining my poise. This is especially true when I hear that McGeorge Bundy, the great-nephew of A. Lawrence Lowell, one of the murderers of my Italian brothers, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, through Ford Foundation grants will provide aid aimed at increasing minority opportunities in higher education. How ironic that the Ford Foundation which has polluted the urban school systems with its provocateur activities and thereby foreclosed educational opportunities for so many ethnic children, seeks to parade as the ethnics' friend by buying off scholars of ethnic backgrounds! (Vincent J. Salandria, "The Promotion of Domestic Discord," an address at the conference of the New England Branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, October 23, 1971)

The aftermath of the strike was marked by a rapid rightward shift by many of the white ethnic groups. In fact, the emergence of the neoconservative or neocon movement is unthinkable without the backlash generated by the foundation operatives through these events. There were of course many other causes, but this strike was the one which more than any other turned the nation's largest city into a raging political and social battlefield, where reason and reconciliation were inevitably the first casualties. Every left-wing organization in New York City had to take a position on one side or the other of the teachers' strike. The Columbia University chapter of Students for a Democratic Society split into two factions over this issue. The anarchist, proto-fascist "action faction" of spoiled suburbanite youth under Weatherman co-founder Mark Rudd enthusiastically supported the Ford Foundation racist provocateurs, and were eager to bust the union. Rudd was reportedly already on the foundation payroll as a provocateur. This group quickly joined forces with the SDS national office clique around Bernardine Dohrn, and became the terrorist-fascist Weatherman tendency.

Obama's affinity for the Weather Underground bombers Ayers and Dohrn accordingly has deep roots, since these figures represent the most militant and aggressive anti-working class figures from that degraded sector of the self-styled left who chose to support and uphold the fiendish strategy of the Ford Foundation and the US intelligence community to divide and conquer on racial lines. The Weathermen gave precious left cover to McGeorge Bundy, and it is no accident that they find themselves today at the side of Obama, a second-generation racist provocateur for the foundations. The Weathermen were the most violent of those who wanted radical politics to follow the line dictated by the oligarchical foundations. So it is not surprising to find Ayers and Dohrn as darlings and grant recipients of the foundations today, even as they act as the core of Obama's support network. The pro-labor part of the Columbia SDS chapter was the part already known as the Labor Committee, and soon expanded to other cities as the New York-Philadelphia Labor Committees, and then as the National Caucus of Labor Committees; the present author was a member of the

Cornell University branch in Ithaca, New York, starting in September 1968. The issues of those days are still central today, despite Obama's attempt to push them out of public view.

The methods used by McGeorge Bundy in New York City in 1968 to exacerbate racial conflict are essentially identical to the underlying approach of the Annenberg Chicago Challenge of the 1990s, which was organized through a consortium of foundations by the Weatherman terrorist bomber Bill Ayers, who had suddenly become respectable as a professor of education and foundation operative. Ayers recruited Obama to be the chairman of the board of this Annenberg Chicago challenge, and this was unquestionably one of the biggest steps up the career ladder for our young Messiah.

The centerpiece of the Annenberg Chicago challenge was the decentralization of the school system through the creation of local school councils (LSCs), with the same kind of community control and local control illusions which had been peddled by Bundy. In this case, the effect was less explosive than in New York City, because during the 1990s a much larger percentage of the Chicago teachers' union was black. Nevertheless, the existence of the local school councils allowed the Chicago banking community through its political operatives like Ayers and Obama to play desperate black parents against the teachers union, against municipal agencies, and against the mayor, if that were required. This is why the New York example of 1968 is so indispensable in understanding what the goals of Obama's operations actually were.

BUNDY DICTATES AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO THE SUPREME COURT

The crowning achievement of McGeorge Bundy's career was doubtless his success in engineering a majority on the United States Supreme Court in favor of affirmative action programs by which token numbers of organic black intellectuals and community leaders would be co-opted into the elite career tracks of the prevailing finance oligarch institutions, while leaving the vast majority of the black ghetto in a situation of worsening poverty and despair. Bundy thus scored his

> last, and perhaps most significant, achievement in the realm of race relations – his role in the Supreme Court's Bakke decision endorsing the use of racial criteria in university admissions. Bundy's contribution was an article in *The Atlantic* making the case for affirmative action. It was, even for Bundy, an unusually subtle and brilliant argument – but if that was all it was, it would hardly matter today. What made it important was its impact on one particular reader: Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun, who provided a crucial fifth vote in favor of the use of racial criteria. His short opinion on the case was so close to Bundy's piece that it all but quoted him. "Precisely because it is not yet 'racially neutral' to be black in America," Bundy wrote, "a racially neutral standard will not lead to equal opportunity." Thus, he concluded. "To get past racism, we must here take account of race." Blackmun borrowed the phrase almost verbatim, and it has stood for [many] years as the nation's primary rationale for affirmative action. For better of worse, it encoded the key idea of the late 60s - that racial progress can come only through racial consciousness - at the center of American law. The distilled essence of Bundy's thinking on "the Negro question," it remains a telling emblem of all that he did to encourage black consciousness and race-based strategies. (Tamar Jacoby)

With the Bakke decision, which was argued under the Carter regime, we come to the world of racial quotas, set-asides, and preferential treatment in such areas as college admissions. Far from favoring a relaxation of racial tensions and an improved climate of national unity, these methods have kept racial issues and racial stereotypes alive, as part of a cynical divide-and-conquer strategy. Clinton sponsored an extensive debate about race, and today we have Obama announcing that yet

another racial conversation is needed. Instead, the view here is that what is needed is political education based on class, poverty, exclusion, and economic decline. How can the government determine race? Will we use light meters? Will we measure skulls, as in phrenology? Will we demand family trees? These ideas must be rejected. What we can determine is if someone is in poverty, and those are the people we must urgently assist into modern, productive employment.

Today, 30 years later we are in a position to see the real shape of the river as we observe the characteristic human types which this system has created. Notable among these are Barack Hussein Obama and Michelle Obama, who both assume the hypocritical stance of victims of racial discrimination, when in fact the only discrimination they have known has all been in their favor, and against the competition. Even as they amass luxury automobiles, significant wealth, mink coats, and their legendary mansion, they must parade themselves as people who repeatedly rejected the materialistic allure of the corporate world for a life of ascetic dedication and personal sacrifice in the service of high principle. They also know that at least two-thirds of the black community for which they claim to speak does not benefit, but demonstrably suffers, from this system.

Because of the obvious psychological stress between their rapacious greed, and their public pose of altruism in the service of the black community, their troubled consciences require special care, and it is this care which Reverend Jeremiah Wright, Otis Moss, and Dwight Hopkins have been funded by the foundations to provide. Today Obama is running as the affirmative action candidate for president, demanding and getting unprecedented and unheard of special treatment from the hacks of the Democratic National Committee in the form of delegates from the state of Michigan, where he deliberately took his own name off the ballot to avoid humiliating defeat while saving resources. Obama demands the Democratic nomination despite the fact that Senator Clinton won the popular vote or raw vote. All this will provide yet another lesson that affirmative action perpetuates racial conflict, condemns the poor to a life of despair, and promotes a parasitic overclass of race-mongers notable for their personal mediocrity and incompetence.

THE RACIST WORLD VIEW OF THE FOUNDATIONS

Let there be no confusion that racial problems in the United States have proven to be so intractable precisely because they have been continuously exacerbated by never-ending campaigns of foundation-funded social engineering.

> Today, the full-blown liberal foundation worldview looks like this: First, white racism is the cause of black and Hispanic social problems. In 1982, for example, Carnegie's Alan Pifer absurdly accused the country of tolerating a return to "legalized segregation of the races." The same note still sounds in Rockefeller president Peter C. Goldmark Jr.'s assertion, in his 1995 annual report, that we "urgently need . . . a national conversation about race . . . to talk with candor about the implications of personal and institutional racism." Second, Americans discriminate widely on the basis not just of race but also of gender, "sexual orientation," class, and ethnicity. As a consequence, victim groups need financial support to fight the petty-mindedness of the majority. Third, Americans are a selfish lot. Without the creation of court-enforced entitlement, the poor will be abused and ignored. Without continuous litigation, government will be unresponsive to social needs. Students in foundation-funded ethnic studies courses learn that Western culture (whose transmission is any university's principal reason for existence) is the source of untold evil rather than of the "rights" they so vociferously claim. […] Liberal foundations are straining to block popular efforts to change the country's discriminatory racial quota system.' (Heather Mac Donald)

The dead hand of foundation grant officers has also helped to throttle the creative arts in this country by imposing their bankrupt and artificial notions of diversity and multiculturalism. These can be seen for example in the world of drama, where

> The large foundations now practice what Robert Brustein, director of the American Repertory Theater, calls "coercive philanthropy," forcing arts institutions to conform to the foundations' vision of a multicultural paradise—one that, above all else, builds minority self-esteem.' (Heather Mac Donald)

During the 1990s, it sometimes seemed that the counterinsurgency and social manipulation efforts of the foundations have been so successful as to turn the United States into a political graveyard. As Heather Mac Donald of the neocon Manhattan Institute comments,

> the impulse toward the activism that over the past 30 years has led the great liberal foundations to do much more harm than good remains overwhelming. In a pathetic statement of aimlessness, the president of a once great foundation recently called up a former Ford poverty fighter to ask plaintively where all the social movements had gone.' (Heather Mac Donald)

1980s COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS AND COLLABORATIVES: OBAMA'S BACKGROUND

By the time Barack Hussein Obama arrived on the foundations scene in the mid-1980s, the original community action/community control/local control counterinsurgency strategy of the foundation community had somewhat evolved into community development corporations. These CDCs were first of all a reflection of the fact that economic conditions had become much more desperate as a result of rampant economic misrule under the Reagan regime. The trade union movement in its traditional form had now been largely broken. The CDCs were basically apolitical, in that they presuppose that any attempt to change the policies of the government in Washington was hopeless, and that the most that could be attempted was to make the slide into de-industrialization and poverty a little more comfortable. The CDCs were also corporatist in the strict sense borrowed from the Mussolini fascist corporate state: as an organizational form, they brought together workers, bankers, foundation bureaucrats, and government officials in an attempt to cajole corporate interests into creating a few jobs in poverty-stricken and blighted neighborhoods. Alternatively, they sought some minor reform such as measures to reduce asbestos or lead poisoning in schools and public buildings.

This is precisely the strategy which Barack Hussein Obama was implementing for the Gamaliel foundation, a satellite of the Ford Foundation, in the Altgeld neighborhood on the south side of Chicago. Obama was therefore a second-generation poverty pimp carrying out an overtly corporatist political plan designed to maintain the control of bankers and financiers over the city of Chicago in just the same way that McGeorge Bundy had done this in New York.

> Ford never exactly repudiated community control – or Black Power. Nor did it give up entirely on Bundy's paradoxical idea that the best way to spur integration was to bolster separate black institutions and strengthen black identities. Yet Bundy and his officers quietly retreated to a far safer form of black institution-building – investment and grants for ghetto-based enterprises known as "community development corporations." […] The theory is simple: Ford - and the government and private lenders - funnel money to a local nonprofit "board" that builds up the neighborhood and tries to attract business. These businesses create jobs, while the "corporation" – acting as a kind of local government – provides an array of social services. In the past 20

> years, Ford has spent some $200 million on what it now estimates to be 2000 CDCs. The difference between today's CDC and the community activism of the 1960s is small but critical: participation is still the key word, but the emphasis is on substantive participation – community involvement in a particular activity like rehabilitating local housing – rather than on participation for participation's sake. Success is hard to measure. Few of these "corporations" could exist without outside support: yet to Ford and to the communities that host them, they represent an important kind of "self-help." And that, for the moment, is still the most urgent priority – with the goal of integration still deferred indefinitely. (Tamar Jacoby)

This is the kind of thing Obama is talking about when he claims that he was trying to organize a community to bring back jobs that had been lost when a steel mill shut down. The way to create jobs is to organize politically and expand the New Deal policies which have been proven effective in creating high technology jobs at union wages. Instead, Obama offered an exercise in futility leading to no tangible gains and the burnout of most of his main cadre, which was the plan.

These community development corporations were also termed "collaboratives." Once again, the scale of organization is always minuscule, the dominant ideology localist in the extreme, and the chances of any success asymptotically approaching zero. The collaboratives also include an attempt to wipe out prevailing moral values in the target population, which reminds us of Obama's infamous San Francisco "Bittergate" tirade, in which he criticized rural populations facing high unemployment for their devotion to religion, gun ownership, ethnic pride, and the resistance to economic globalization. This is the mental world of the foundation-funded social engineer and political manipulator in unalloyed form. One analyst notes that

> The so-called "collaboratives" movement in community development is emblematic of the 30-year-long foundation assault on the bourgeois virtues that once kept communities and families intact. The idea behind this movement, which grows out of the failed community action programs of the 1960s, is that a group of "community stakeholders," assembled and funded by a foundation, becomes a "collaborative" to develop and implement a plan for community revitalization. That plan should be "comprehensive" and should "integrate" separate government services, favorite foundation mantras. To the extent this means anything, it sounds innocuous enough, and sometimes is. But as with the foundations' choice of community groups in the 1960s, the rhetoric of "community" and local empowerment is often profoundly hypocritical. (Heather Mac Donald)

This is the world of local, small-scale corporatism, with communitarian overtones – this is truly Obama's world.

"PATRONAGE TROUGHS FOR POLITICAL OPPORTUNISTS"

Here is another example of the same foundation social control strategy based on community development corporations as it has been implemented over the past decades in Miami, Florida, in the wake of a serious urban riot a quarter of a century ago. We quote it at length because it is important for the reader to understand as clearly as possible what cynical manipulation lurks behind the benevolent-sounding job description of "community organizer" in Obama's constantly touted resume:

> If you haven't had a couple of bloody, terrifying urban riots down the street from your corporate headquarters, the experiences of Knight-Ridder's CEO, James K. Batten, 53, can help you capture the feeling, and lead you to one of our first "heroes." After Miami's lacerating Liberty City riot of 1980, Batten helped mobilize the business community. Says he: "Suddenly

there was a surge of conscience among businessmen — some of it sparked by idealism and concern for humankind, and some of it by pragmatism and self-interest. Nineteen-eighty left a sense of foreboding about what Miami really was and where it was headed. Even the most cynical recognized that no one wants to vacation in a war zone." In the aftermath, officials from a newly formed Ford Foundation-backed outfit called LISC, for Local Initiatives Support Corp., came to Liberty City in search of struggling community development organizations to help. They found none, but they did discover Otis Pitts, an educated native of Liberty City with a varied background as a military policeman, railroad cook, and Miami city cop. After his police partner was killed by his side on a call in Liberty City, he took up youth counseling work and was running a successful agency in Liberty City when LISC found him. LISC and Pitts set up something called the Tacolcy Economic Development Corp., to which LISC provided money for plans and such, plus a small loan and expertise to get additional financing for rebuilding a looted supermarket on a pivotal corner. LISC acted as a facilitator, but the project was essentially on Pitts's shoulders, and it had to make commercial sense. It took off when he persuaded Winn-Dixie Stores to come in as anchor tenant, after the original tenant refused to return. "I learned quickly that a deal is finite," he recalls now. "You can't put too many risks on one deal. As soon as something like this gets started, all the aspirations and demands of the community come together. We were under pressure to hire minority employees, to build with minority contractors, even to help start a minority grocery chain. Well, if you just keep piling up the risks like that with unrealistic expectations, the deal will collapse."

So, says Pitts, he became single-minded. "The major objective," he says, "was to build a damn shopping center to provide quality goods and services at competitive prices in a safe and decent environment" — basically the economic cornerstone of any community. At that, he did bring in mostly black subcontractors and workers. Today, Pitts's crisply appointed offices are located in Edison Plaza, which is just what he describes. Its success has attracted a McDonald's to an opposite corner, and Pitts has gone on to other victories. His most recent accomplishment is the 121-unit, eight-story Edison Towers apartment house for low-income tenants, a beautifully appointed, exquisitely maintained private residence with excellent security smack in the middle of Liberty City. Financed with LISC help and mostly private funds, Edison Towers is a model of how community development corporations get the job done. The financing included a $100,000 grant from the Ford Foundation, plus loans from the foundation, LISC, Dade County, Southeast Bank, and Equitable, as well as a $1.6 million grant from a developer called Swire Properties. […] LISC — basically a creation of the Ford Foundation — is far in front of the curve on business involvement with poverty. With tax credits as a partial inducement, it has assembled more than $200 million from some 500 corporations and foundations and leveraged over $1 billion of direct investment in more than 500 community development corporations across the country. In the South Bronx alone, LISC has invested upwards of $5 million in some 36 development projects. "We make it an attractive proposition for a corporation or foundation to work through us," says LISC President Paul S. Grogan. "They may want to attack these problems, but they don't have the capacity themselves to evaluate the opportunities, or to make judgments about these community organizations. They don't know the landscape. There's still sort of a stereotype of unscrupulous neighborhood organizations that don't do anything but take the money." LISC officials admit that many community development corporations aren't as successful as Pitts's or Rivero's, but all of them counter the "poverty pimp" images from the 1970s. "We're able to provide the opportunity recognition and the screening, and that's been crucial to us," says Grogan. The lesson we can learn from LISC: "There's an appetite and an interest on everybody's part if you can make something happen in a businesslike way, and that

says something about the directions for the future." (John Huey, "How We Can Win the War on Poverty," *Fortune*, April 10, 1989)

"POVERTY PIMPS, POVERTY-CRATS, POVERTICIANS, BUREAUCRAT-POLITICIANS"

The same patterns can be observed in the history of the National Puerto Rican Coalition, a group which billed itself as having been established in 1977 to advance the interests of the Puerto Rican community. In 1981, the NPRC received about 90% of its funding in the form of a grant from the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. By 1991, 50% of the funding came from corporate grants, while 30% came from foundations, with the Ford Foundation leading the pack. The Puerto Rican community generated numbers of militant leaders, but these were so extreme that they had little or no impact on elections. Leaders who were moderate enough to be able to run for office posed other crippling problems: these moderate leaders

> were more concerned with good government goals than with poverty issues. These leaders, variously referred to as "bureaucrat-politicians," "poverty-crats," "poverticians," and "poverty pimps," were intensely focused on the acquisition of power. But instead of using it to improve the economic condition of Puerto Ricans, they invested it in shoring up their organizations. At times they did this under the guise that the quality of life for Puerto Ricans depended on the resources they controlled, while in effect securing "nothing more than patronage troughs for political opportunists."' (José E. Cruz, "Unfulfilled Promise: Puerto Rican Politics and Poverty," *Centro Journal* XV:1 2003)

Back during the Cold War, retired spies wrote books with titles like *I Led Three Lives*. An honest autobiography by a foundation operative like Obama might thus have a title along these lines:

"I WAS A POVERTY PIMP FOR THE FOUNDATIONS"

The role of poverty pimp within the framework of foundation-funded strategies for mass political and social manipulation, with a view to keeping the American people in a state of apathy, fragmentation, passivity, and oppression, is a very exact characterization of what Obama did during his years as a "community organizer." To talk about poverty pimps is of course politically incorrect in the extreme, but it is the only way to convey the social reality of what we are dealing with in the case of Obama. For further background, we read in Wikipedia:

> Poverty pimp or "professional poverty pimp" is a sarcastic label used to convey the opinion that an individual or group is benefiting unduly by acting as an intermediary on behalf of the poor, the disadvantaged or other some other "victimized" groups. Those who use this appellation suggest that those so labeled profit unduly from the misfortune of others, and therefore do not really wish the societal problems that they appear to work on so assiduously be eliminated permanently, as it is not in their own interest for this to happen. The most frequent targets of this accusation are those receiving government funding or that solicit private charity to work on issues on behalf of various disadvantaged individuals or groups, but who never seem to be able to show any amelioration of the problems experienced by their target population.

This self-serving cynicism, in feeding off the plight of a group of desperate dupes who are turned into a salable political commodity, is the essence of Obama's career.

SOCIAL ENGINEERING THROUGH ENDLESS LITIGATION

There is one further aspect of foundation activity which should be mentioned, since it bears on the activities of Barack Hussein Obama, Michelle Obama, and their close friend Bernardine Dohrn in their professional careers as lawyers. Bernardine Dohrn in particular received a large grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to undertake the institutional reform of the juvenile justice and Family Court systems in Chicago. The veteran terrorist bombthrower Dohrn was supposed to do this through a special institute she controlled at Northwestern University. This MacArthur grant to the aging terrorist *pasionaria* is coherent with another dimension of foundation strategy, which is to pervert the courts into tools of social engineering and political manipulation. Heather MacDonald writes:

> Public interest litigation and advocacy embodies the foundations' longstanding goal of producing "social change" by controlling government policy. Foundations bankroll public interest law groups that seek to establish in court rights that democratically elected legislatures have rejected. Foundations thus help sustain judicial activism by supporting one side of the symbiotic relationship between activist judges and social-change-seeking lawyers. Foundations have used litigation to create and expand the iron trap of bilingual education; they have funded the perversion of the Voting Rights Act into a costly instrument of apartheid; and they lie behind the transformation of due-process rights into an impediment to, rather than a guarantor of, justice. Foundation support for such socially disruptive litigation makes a mockery of the statutory prohibition on lobbying, since foundations can effect policy changes in the courts, under the officially approved banner of "public interest litigation," that are every bit as dramatic as those that could be achieved in the legislature.

ANN DUNHAM'S LONG MARCH THROUGH THE INSTITUTIONS

In the world of the foundations, the only ones who really know what they are doing are the finance oligarchs and elitists at the top. The McGeorge Bundy types are the only ones who are getting their money's worth. The local people, the black parents, are dupes who are being used by the financiers as a battering ram to maintain Wall Street's control of society. Many of the community control operatives and many of the middle and lower level foundation personnel are dupes. They are often dupes who think they are fooling the foundation bosses. Obama's mother, Stanley Ann Dunham, the disillusioned late Marxist who went to work for the Ford Foundation, was in all probability a person who thought that she was tricking the McGeorge Bundy types by carrying out programs and projects which she imagined were very radical and very anti-capitalist, according to her somewhat diluted Marxist criteria. She might have thought that she was burrowing from within the institutions to help advance the revolution. By about 1970, there were many radicals who embarked on this same type of long march through the institutions, as the popular phrase of the time described it. What these radicals could not see was that their smattering of Marxism had in reality done little more than make them into useful idiots for the aristocratic financier types, just as Marx himself had ultimately served the British Empire.

McGeorge Bundy doubtless understood all this when he gave all that money to the raving firebrand Floyd McKissick so as to create an artificial opposition to Dr. King. Bundy doubtless knew that Rhody McCoy probably saw himself as a black revolutionary. It was precisely this dimension of self-delusion that made people like this into such useful idiots. Henry Ford II obviously lacked this level of sophistication, and was genuinely shocked at what the Ford Foundation staff had become: a nest of failed radicals and subversives marching through the

institutions. Henry Ford II did not understand that these were exactly the people needed for effective counter-insurgency and divide-and-conquer operations: credible left cover operatives. As Heather MacDonald relates,

> Many foundations had turned against the system that had made them possible, as Henry Ford II recognized when he quit the Ford Foundation board in disgust in 1977. "In effect," he wrote in his resignation letter, "the foundation is a creature of capitalism, a statement that, I'm sure, would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities, that are the beneficiaries of the foundation's grant programs." Did Ford exaggerate? Not according to Robert Schrank, a Ford program officer during the 1970s and early 1980s. Schrank, a former Communist, recalls the "secret anti-capitalist orientation" of his fellow program officers. "People were influenced by the horror stories we Marxists had put out about the capitalist system," he says; "it became their guidance."

This is the world of Obama's mother, a weak, disillusioned late Marxist working for the Ford Foundation. In the case of her son, the magnetic power of Marxism had declined precipitously, and his outlook was based on race in Fanon's sense, not class. This combination suffices to make Obama the most radical subversive ever to seriously contend for the US presidency.

CHAPTER III: FOUNDATION-FUNDED RACISM IN CHICAGO: JEREMIAH WRIGHT AND MICHELLE

> White folks' greed runs a world in need. – Jeremiah Wright, "The Audacity of Hope" sermon
>
> "What we need is the destruction of whiteness, which is the source of human misery in the world." – James Cone.
>
> Well, my pastor is certainly someone who I have an enormous amount of respect for. I have a number of friends who are ministers. Reverend Meeks is a close friend and colleague of mine in the state Senate. Father Michael Pfleger is a dear friend, and somebody I interact with closely. – Obama to Cathleen Falsani, 2004.[18]

The Obama campaign is very fond of pointing to the great personal sacrifice made by their candidate after leaving Harvard Law School. They stress that with his prestigious law degree, Obama could have written his own ticket to any number of lucrative positions in Wall Street, the corporate world, or the top law firms. But this type of propaganda ignores the fact that Obama's career was now being guided, fostered, assisted, and directed by the networks of the Trilateral Commission and its banking allies. Obama was now a young man who was destined for great things thanks to these super-rich and powerful backers. Again and again we will see the marvelous process by which obstacles are removed from Obama's path, and adversaries are eliminated, even as wonderful and unprecedented opportunities open up for him as if by magic. It was clear to Obama's Trilateral case officers that a career solely played out in the elitist world of board rooms and country clubs would not be sufficient to provide him with a left cover required should candidacy for political office be part of his future, as they fully intended that it would. Therefore, Obama had to be sheep-dipped in the world of community organizing during the 1980s to develop his ability to manipulate and con the people he met in the streets. Now, he needed an entrée into the left-leaning Chicago Democratic political machine, where radical black nationalists and veterans of the Weatherman terrorist group were well represented. Obama needed to burnish his resume with activities that would reinforce his image and credentials as a true progressive, while banishing any suggestion that he was in fact an agent of finance capital.

'Interestingly, after his first year in law school Obama returned in the summer of 1989 to work as a summer associate at the prestigious Chicago law firm of Sidley & Austin. This in and of itself is a bit unusual. Very few top tier law students work for big law firms during their first summer. The big law firms discourage it because if you work for them in the first summer you are likely to work for a second firm the following year and then the firms have to compete to get you. So, why or how did Obama - at that point not yet the prominent first black president of the Harvard Law Review (that would happen the following year) - end up at Sidley? Sidley had been longtime outside counsel to Commonwealth Edison. The senior Sidley partner who was Comm Ed's key outside counsel, Howard Trienens, was a member of the board of trustees of Northwestern alongside Tom Ayers (and Sidley partner Newton Minow, too). It turns out that Bernardine Dohrn worked at Sidley also. She was hired there in the late 80s, because of the intervention of her father-in-law Tom Ayers, even though she was (and is) not a member of any state bar. Dohrn was not admitted in either NY or Illinois because of her past jail time for refusing to testify about the murderous 1981 Brinks robbery in which her former Weather Underground (now recast as the "Revolutionary Armed Task Force") "comrades," including Kathy Boudin (biological mother of Chesa Boudin, who was raised by Ayers and Dohrn) participated. She was finally paroled after serving 22 years of a plea-bargained single 20-to-life sentence for her role in the robbery where a

guard was shot and killed and two police officers were killed. … Trienens recently explained his unusual decision to hire Dohrn, who had never practiced law and had graduated from law school (before going on her bombing spree 17 years before in 1967) to *The Chicago Tribune* saying, "[W]e sometimes hire friends." I can only speculate, but it is possible that Tom Ayers introduced Obama to Sidley. That might have happened if Obama had met up with Bill and Tom and John Ayers prior to attending law school when Obama's DCP group was supporting the reform act passed in 1988. Or it might have been Dohrn who introduced Obama to the law firm. Dohrn's CV indicates that she left Sidley sometime in 1988 for public interest work prior to starting a position at Northwestern (again, hired there by some accounts because of the influence of Tom Ayers and his Sidley counsel Howard Trienens). Obama and Dohrn would likely not have been at the firm at the same time, although if Obama and Dohrn met before Obama left to attend Harvard Law School, she might have discussed the firm with him and introduced him to lawyers there. My best guess, though, is that it would have been Tom Ayers who introduced Obama to Sidley and that would have helped him get the attention of someone like Newton Minow. And that would have come in very handy later in Obama's career as Kaufman suggests. (Recently I heard from Nell Minow, daughter of Newton Minow, who tells me her sister Martha, a Harvard law professor, had Obama as a student at HLS and that she called her father to tell him about Obama. While Nell contends on the basis of this anecdote that her family met and supported Obama before he met Bill Ayers, she was unable to provide me any evidence of when in fact Obama met Ayers, either Bill or Tom.) In any case the summer of 1989 was eventful for Obama as he did meet his future wife, Michelle, there, already a lawyer and working as a Sidley associate. Michelle was Obama's first supervisor or mentor there. Obama went back to Harvard in the fall of 1989 where, of course, he became president of the law review in the spring of 1990. After graduation in 1991 he went back to Chicago to run a voter registration campaign (which would turn out to be an important step in his career).' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

AFTER LAW SCHOOL: BUILDING A RESUME FOR A POLITICAL CAREER

After law school, Obama returned to Chicago to work as a civil rights lawyer, joining the firm of Miner, Barnhill & Galland, an unsavory enterprise to which we will return later… He became a modest adjunct lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, while helping to organize a voter registration drive during Bill Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign. Abner Mikva, a five-term congressman from Illinois who was at that time Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. circuit, tried to recruit Obama as his law clerk, a position that might have been a stepping stone to clerking on the Supreme Court, but Obama declined the offer. David B. Wilkins, the Kirkland and Ellis professor of law, said he advised Obama in 1991 to become a Supreme Court Clerk. "Obama knew there was honor in pursuing that post," Wilkins said, but Obama quickly added that it was not for him. "He said that he wanted to write a book about his life and his father, go back to Chicago, get back into the community, and run for office there. He knew exactly what he wanted and went about getting it done," Wilkins said. More accurately, Obama's Trilateral case officers knew what the next steps for their young protégé and asset needed to be.

"He could have gone to the most opulent of law firms," said David Axelrod, the Chicago machine hack who is now Obama's campaign boss gushed. "After Harvard, Obama could have done anything he wanted." Axelrod's specialty has long been to help black candidates get white votes with a utopian litany of messianic platitudes; he also got Deval Patrick elected as Governor of Massachusetts. Obama served as an associate attorney with Miner, Barnhill & Galland from 1993 to 1996. During this time, he says he represented community organizers, discrimination claims, and

voting rights cases. His part-time adjunct work in constitutional law at the University of Chicago Law School lasted from 1993 until his election to the U.S. Senate in 2004.

THE MACHINE PICKS OBAMA TO LEAD PROJECT VOTE, 1992

Obama was now on his way to becoming a Chicago machine pol, but his drooling acolytes seek to portray his choices as reflecting a self-denial worthy of a holy ascetic. One writes: "When Obama returned to Chicago, he turned down big-money firms to take a job with a small civil rights practice, filing housing discrimination suits on behalf of low-income residents and teaching constitutional law on the side. He had thought he might enter politics since before he left for law school, and eventually he did, winning a seat in the state Senate at the age of thirty-seven."(Wallace Wood, *Rolling Stone*)

Obama, clearly not acting alone, but rather helped along by his Trilateral mother ship and by the corrupt Chicago Democratic machine, now became a leader of Illinois Project Vote, which claimed to have registered 150,000 new voters for the 1992 election. Estimates of those registered vary; another acolyte relates: "In 1992, he served as executive director of Illinois Project Vote! a voter-registration drive that added an estimated 125,000 black voters to the rolls and was credited with helping elect Carol Moseley Braun to the U.S. Senate." (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) The real goal of all this may have been the modernization of the traditional Cook County vote fraud machine, which has helped so many cadavers send in absentee ballots over recent years. This activity would become one of Obama's main talking points in his advertisements for himself when he was running for state senate a few years later. Obama, with characteristic megalomania, seems to think that Project Vote was the reason Bill Clinton won the 1992 election. Therefore, when Clinton endorsed Obama's opponent Bobby Rush in the Perfect Master's losing 2000 congressional race, Obama felt betrayed, and his grudge against the Clintons came to the fore in the venom of the 2008 primaries.

OBAMA: A "VACUOUS OPPORTUNIST"

The political scientist Adolph Green of the University of Pennsylvania came into contact with Obama around this time, and later wrote:

> I've never been an Obama supporter. I've known him since the very beginning of his political career, which was his campaign for the seat in my state senate district in Chicago. He struck me then as a vacuous opportunist, a good performer with an ear for how to make white liberals like him. I argued at the time that his fundamental political center of gravity, beneath an empty rhetoric of hope and change and new directions, is neoliberal. ("Obama No," *The Progressive*, May 17, 2008) And there were other layers beneath that.

Obama published his autobiography in 1995; this was *Dreams from My Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance*. During his presidential bid, he would get another wave of adoring publicity when he won a Grammy for the audio version of this book. What kind of a person writes an autobiography before he is 40? Surely one that is self-centered or self-absorbed, or possibly self-obsessed. Such an autobiographer might well be a megalomaniac, with delusions of grandeur on the scale of Nero.

JEREMIAH WRIGHT AND THE THEOLOGY OF HATE

But if Obama was a megalomaniac, we was not the only megalomaniac on the south side of Chicago. There was also the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, the central figure of an affluent congregation that called itself the Trinity United Church of Christ. Even before going to Kenya, Obama had come into contact with Jeremiah Wright. Obama had often been questioned about his religious faith during his years as a community organizer. During this time Obama, who said he "was not raised in a religious household," was asked by pastors and church ladies, "Where do you go to Church, young man?" (*Dreams*) The guess here is that he was not a Moslem during those years, but rather an existentialist like his idol Frantz Fanon, and therefore most likely an atheist on the model of Nietzsche and Heidegger. Obama now realized that membership in a church was a political necessity. He chose Wright's church not merely because it was very large, very influential, and very wealthy, but also because it professed black liberation theology, which Obama certainly would have known by that time to be the brand preferred by his backers in the foundation world, of which the Ford Foundation was the flagship. Another name for Wright's church might have been the Foundation Church of the Counter-insurgency, since those were the doctrines that were taught there. It was a church based on Afrocentrism, on black nationalism, and on the rejection of western civilization. Ironically, it was also a church frequented by some of the most successful practitioners of affirmative action, meaning the small minority of the black community who had benefited immensely from quotas, set-asides, and racial preferences, while the majority of the black inner-city ghetto sank deeper and deeper into poverty and despair. Indeed, Wright's doctrines were designed to soothe the consciences of the upwardly mobile black overclass even as they were co-opted into the financier power structure of the city.

Obama experienced some friction with Wright at their first meeting: '"Some people say that the church is too upwardly mobile." It was in fact the richest black congregation in Chicago. Wright shot back: "That's a lot of bull. People who talk that mess reflect their own confusion. They've bought into the whole business of class that keeps us from working together."' (*Dreams* 283) Wright means that racial unity is everything, and socioeconomic class is nothing. With this, the essence of Wright's method is exposed: he is a follower of the proto-fascist German sociologist Ludwig Gumplowicz, whose main work was *Der Rassenkampf* (The Racial Struggle, 1909). Gumplowicz was a product of the decaying Austro-Hungarian Empire, whose nationalities policy is one of the models for the Ford Foundation's current doctrines of multi-culturalism. Gumplowicz taught that the main clash in human society was the racial one, and not class struggle – not Plato's authentic class struggle, and not Marx's fake version either. It is a tune repeated by many a reactionary, irrationalist, and obscurantist.

Here are some impressions of Trinity United and of Wright personally: 'The Trinity United Church of Christ, the church that Barack Obama attends in Chicago, is at once vast and unprepossessing, a big structure a couple of blocks from the projects, in the long open sore of a ghetto on the city's far South Side. The church is a leftover vision from the Sixties of what a black nationalist future might look like. There's the testifying fervor of the black church, the Afrocentric Bible readings, even the odd dashiki. And there is the Rev. Jeremiah Wright, a sprawling, profane bear of a preacher, a kind of black ministerial institution, with his own radio shows and guest preaching gigs across the country. Wright takes the pulpit here one Sunday…. This is as openly radical a background as any significant American political figure has ever emerged from, as much Malcolm X as Martin Luther King Jr. Wright is not an incidental figure in Obama's life, or his politics. The senator "affirmed" his Christian faith in this church; he uses Wright as a "sounding board" to "make sure I'm not losing myself in the hype and hoopla." Both the title of Obama's

second book, *The Audacity of Hope*, and the theme for his keynote address at the Democratic National Convention in 2004 come from Wright's sermons. "If you want to understand where Barack gets his feeling and rhetoric from," says the Rev. Jim Wallis, a leader of the religious left, "just look at Jeremiah Wright."' (Wallace Wood, *Rolling Stone*) Indeed.

JEREMIAH WRIGHT'S GREATEST HITS

Wright was a racist provocateur operating in the orbit of the Ford Foundation and other counter-insurgency institutions. He was a guardian of a social order dominated by financiers and bankers. But he did this with radical black nationalist or Afrocentric cover, which guaranteed support from guilt-ridden white liberals. Rev. Dr. Jeremiah A. Wright, Jr. became the Pastor of Trinity United Church of Christ (TUCC) on March 1, 1972. The church motto is "Unashamedly Black and Unapologetically Christian," which was a phrase coined by his predecessor, the Reverend Dr. Reuben Sheares, and was officially adopted by Wright. Trinity goes on to say: "Our roots in the Black religious experience and tradition are deep, lasting and permanent. We are an African people, and remain 'true to our native land,' the mother continent, the cradle of civilization…. "Trinity has a non-negotiable commitment to Africa, is committed to the historical education of African people in diaspora and committed to liberation, restoration, and economic parity." Some have seen here a claim to Afrocentric racial superiority, which could only be grounded in irrationalist mysticism.

Trinity United Church of Christ claims to be founded upon the "Black Value System," written by the Manford Byrd Recognition Committee chaired by Vallmer Jordan in 1981. Trinity supports the following 12 precepts and covenantal statements. These Black Ethics, Trinity says, must be taught and exemplified in homes, churches, nurseries and schools, wherever Blacks are gathered. They must reflect on the following concepts:

1. Commitment to God
2. Commitment to the Black Community
3. Commitment to the Black Family
4. Dedication to the Pursuit of Education
5. Dedication to the Pursuit of Excellence
6. Adherence to the Black Work Ethic
7. Commitment to Self-Discipline and Self-Respect
8. Disavowal of the Pursuit of "Middleclassness"
9. Pledge to make the fruits of all developing and acquired skills available to the Black Community
10. Pledge to Allocate Regularly, a Portion of Personal Resources for Strengthening and Supporting Black Institutions
11. Pledge allegiance to all Black leadership who espouse and embrace the Black Value System
12. Personal commitment to embracement of the Black Value System.

Wright was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He did not attend the largely black high school in his neighborhood, but instead took an exam which he passed to be able to attend an elite city-wide high school which was largely white. This is an instance of Wright's failure to practice the racial solidarity which he preaches when his own advantage is concretely at stake. Morton A. Klein, the president of the Zionist Organization of America, happened to have attended the same public

high school from which Wright graduated. Klein noted that Wright had chosen a highly competitive college prep program in a school which was largely white:

> It happens that, as a Philadelphian, I attended Central High School – the same public school Jeremiah Wright attended from 1955 to 1959. He could have gone to an integrated neighborhood school, but he chose to go to Central, a virtually all-white school. Central is the second-oldest public high school in the country, which attracts the most serious academic students in the city. The school then was about 80 percent Jewish and 95 percent white. The African-American students, like all the others, were there on merit. Generally speaking, we came from lower/middle class backgrounds. Many of our parents had not received a formal education, and we tended to live in row houses." (Morton A. Klein, "Obama's pastor: Product of privilege, not poverty," World Net Daily, March 25, 2008)

Wright's choice of an affluent white neighborhood for his retirement was a clear violation of the ban on middle class values contained in his church program. But it did represent a return to Wright's origins.

After high school, Wright entered Virginia Union University. After three and a half years at Virginia Union, Pastor Wright left and entered the United States Marine Corps. He transferred from the USMC into the United States Navy where he served as a cardiopulmonary technician, assisting President Lyndon B. Johnson during the heart attack he suffered in office. After six years in the service, Pastor Wright transferred to Howard University where he completed his undergraduate studies and received his first Master's Degree. His second Master's Degree was from the University of Chicago Divinity School. His Doctorate was received from the United Theological Seminary, the noted smithy of synthetic religions near Columbia on Morningside Heights, under Dr. Samuel DeWitt Proctor. In addition to Pastor Wright's four earned degrees, he has been the recipient of eight honorary doctorates.

Some vintage Wright: "Fact number one: We've got more black men in prison than there are in college," he intones. "Fact number two: Racism is how this country was founded and how this country is still run! We are deeply involved in the importing of drugs, the exporting of guns and the training of professional KILLERS. . . . We believe in white supremacy and black inferiority and believe it more than we believe in God. . . . We conducted radiation experiments on our own people. . . . We care nothing about human life if the ends justify the means! We are selfish, self-centered egotists who are arrogant and ignorant and betray our church and do not try to make the kingdom that Jesus talked about a reality. And — and — and in light of these 10 facts, God has got to be sick of this s**t" Some reports include an additional peroration, in the classical style recommended by Cicero and Quintilian: "And. And. And! GAWD! Has GOT! To be SICK! OF THIS S**T!" (Wallace Wood, *Rolling Stone*, Kyle-Anne Shiver)

When some authentic representatives of the historical black church were allowed on television to respond to Wright's claims that he represented them, at least one of them offered the criticism that many black families would not want to stay in a church where "the pastor was cussing." Wright did more: in one scene from his tapes, he began ranting that "Some argue that blacks should vote for Clinton "because her husband was good to us," he continued. "That's not true," he thundered. "He did the same thing to us that he did to Monica Lewinsky." He turned around and humped his own altar to emphasize that Bill Clinton had been "riding dirty" with Miss Lewinsky.

OBAMA HELPED FUND WRIGHT'S MICROPHONE

Obama did not just listen to this tripe; he financed it and made it possible financially. In 2006, the Obamas gave $22,500 to Wright's church, and this represented the vast majority of their charitable contributions. Wright's church was foundation-funded: for example, in 2001 the Woods Fund, where Obama was a board member, awarded a $6,000 grant to Trinity United. They were paying for an agitational machine disguised as a church. Wright, for his part, needed the money to buy his new Porsche. Worldly asceticism was not a part of the Protestant ethic as interpreted by Wright. He rejected middleclassness in favor of upperclassness, or, more simply, elitism.

Obama has described Wright as his spiritual mentor and his sounding board. A key phrase from one of Wright's sermons is the "audacity of hope," which Obama has affixed as the title of his compendium of observations on his own presidential campaign. Wright is a great admirer of Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam, and traveled with Farrakhan to visit with Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi. Farrakhan has gotten his picture on the cover of Wright's parish magazine several times, sometimes in the company of Obama. Wright's church gave Farrakhan the "Dr. Jeremiah A. Wright, Jr. Lifetime Achievement Trumpeteer" Award at the 2007 Trumpet Gala at the United Church of Christ. According to some reports, Wright himself was for a time a member of Farrakhan's Nation of Islam.

Washington Post columnist Richard Cohen noted that the Trinity United house organ had once named Louis Farrakhan as its person of the year, praising the Nation of Islam leader. Cohen called on Obama to denounce such praise of Farrakhan, known for statements deemed anti-Semitic. In his January 15, 2008 *Washington Post* column, Richard Cohen wrote: "Every year, [*Trumpet*] makes awards in various categories. Last year, it gave the Dr. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr. Trumpeter Award to a man it said 'truly epitomized greatness.' That man is Louis Farrakhan."

Farrakhan was a hero to some, but for others who looked at him from the left, he fell far short of what was needed. There was for example Farrakhan's address to the Million Man March of 1995, when titanic efforts had been marshaled by ordinary black men to demonstrate for the survival of the black family. Farrakhan was the main speaker. He had no legislative program to outline to mobilize and sustain the efforts of the black men who had come so far at such expense to hear him. Instead, he launched into a raving tirade about numerology, babbling about the number of steps leading to various buildings in Washington, or their height as measured in feet. It was an appalling performance. He finished up with a kind of pledge by those present, but there was no mention of a political party or something concrete to express so much need and so much energy. Not surprisingly, the momentum generated by the Million Man March quickly dissipated. Farrakhan had proven once and for all that he was no political leader. He had not been able to point to the next step, to the next link in the chain of meaningful political action.

Many wondered what Farrakhan was about after all, with his idiotic and self-destructive anti-Semitic outbursts. There had been a time after that fabled trip to Libya when he had seemed to suggest that he had become a kind of paymaster for Qaddafi. Some claimed that he had had a role in the assassination of Malcolm X, who had been a rival of sorts to him for the NOI succession. Did Farrakhan have connections to the US intelligence community? If he did, then everything would begin to fall into place, including his indirect association to Obama. Farrakhan has endorsed Obama for the presidency, saying that the Illinois senator "is the hope of the entire world, that America will change and be made better." It was Farrakhan who had been quoted saying, "White people are potential humans — they haven't evolved yet." Was Farrakhan a provocateur for the FBI? When the spotlight was trained on this matter, Obama has run away in the other direction.

In the week ending March 14, 2008, the American public came to know the intemperate rhetorical outbursts of this Reverend Jeremiah Wright, the pastor of the Trinity United Church of Christ which Obama and his family had by then been attending for some 20 years. It turned out that videotapes and audiotapes of Reverend Wright's incendiary sermons had long been available for public sale, but that the controlled corporate media, had pooh-poohed any attempt to dig beneath their favorite candidate's messianic-utopian veneer, had not paid any attention to this mass of damning material until the Obama candidacy had begun to falter after his loss of the Ohio and Texas primaries. Until this time, only a limited number of taped sermons had been presented on television, although some had been widely available on the Internet. During the critical week in question, Brian Ross of ABC news was one of the first to present extensive excerpts from Reverend Wright's ranting performances. He was quickly followed by Hannity, O'Reilly, and Greta Van Susteren, and then by CNN, followed by the diehard Obama hysterics at MSNBC. On March 14 2008, a media firestorm swirled around the increasingly daemonic figure of Reverend Jeremiah Wright, prompting Obama to drop the ranting Reverend from a committee of spiritual advisers to his campaign.

WRIGHT: "GOD DAMN AMERICA"

The culmination of Wright's doctrine was this: "The government gives them the drugs, builds bigger prisons, passes a three-strike law and then wants us to sing 'God Bless America.' No, no, no, God damn America, that's in the Bible for killing innocent people." "God damn America for treating our citizens as less than human. God damn America for as long as she acts like she is God and she is supreme." (2003) "God damn Wall Street" would have been above reproach. "God damn Bush" would have gotten applause on any street. "God damn the CIA" would have been warmly received in many quarters. But "God damn America," is the subjunctive form of a wish that God visit evil upon the American people, and that is quite another matter. "God damn" is considered a form of blasphemy since it amounts to giving orders to God, telling God to hate. It shows that Wright was not a Christian at all, but a purveyor of hate. If Obama says he got to Christ through Wright, then he never got there, since Wright's religion was a satanic cover story for Mammon and Pluto. In this case, Obama never got to Christianity at all, and may well be a Satanist himself.

WRIGHT'S LEFT CIA BLOWBACK THEORY OF 9/11

Wright raved on and on: "We bombed Hiroshima, we bombed Nagasaki, and we nuked far more than the thousands in New York and the Pentagon, and we never batted an eye. We have supported state terrorism against the Palestinians and black South Africans, and now we are indignant because the stuff we have done overseas is now brought right back to our own front yards. America's chickens are coming home to roost." (Sept. 16, 2001)[19]

This is the CIA's favorite blowback theory, most famously embraced by the ex-Weatherman bomb expert and sometime professor at the University of Colorado Ward Churchill. Churchill called the 9/11 victims "little Eichmanns," and argued that those who did not embrace the official myth of 9/11 complete with the 19 hijackers, Mohammed Atta, Osama bin Laden, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, and Ramzi Binalshib were in fact racists who were seeking to deny that the Arabs were after all capable of great things. Ward Churchill taught the pseudo-revolutionary provocateur group the Weathermen how to make bombs and fire weapons, according to a Fox News report citing the Jan. 18, 1987 issue of the *Denver Post*. The revelation is among many reported since Churchill prompted a national furor with publicity over an essay he wrote entitled "Some People

Push Back: On the Justice of Roosting Chickens." ("9-11 professor trained terrorists: Radical group Weathermen assisted by Ward Churchill, *World Net Daily*, February 11, 2005) The parallels to Wright are evident. An entire left CIA, foundation-funded domestic intelligence and counterinsurgency network was primed to spout the "chickens coming home to roost" line right after 9/11.

This blowback theory had broad appeal to morally insane leftists who wanted to see 9/11 as the just punishment and retribution for US imperialist crimes. The problem was that 9/11 had been a cynical provocation staged and manufactured by the CIA and the rest of the US intelligence community to start a unilateral version of the war of civilizations.[20] Blowback was the most insidious defense of the official 9/11 story. In honor of his role, blowback advocate Ward Churchill had been awarded the Arlen Spector Award for 2005. Named in honor of the originator of the "magic bullet" theory of the Kennedy assassination, the Arlen Spector Award goes yearly to the person who offers the most imaginative and demagogic defense of an official big lie. This jest had been mine, but the point was no jest.

The newspaper of record, as usual, attempts to obfuscate this issue: 'On that Sunday after the terrorist attacks of 9/11, Mr. Wright also said the attacks were a consequence of violent American policies. Four years later he wrote that the attacks had proved that "people of color had not gone away, faded into the woodwork or just 'disappeared' as the Great White West went on its merry way of ignoring Black concerns." "The violence of 9/11 was inexcusable and without justification," Obama said in a recent interview. He was not at Trinity the day Mr. Wright delivered his remarks shortly after the attacks, Mr. Obama said, but "it sounds like he was trying to be provocative. … Reverend Wright is a child of the 60s, and he often expresses himself in that language of concern with institutional racism and the struggles the African-American community has gone through," Mr. Obama said. "He analyzes public events in the context of race. I tend to look at them through the context of social justice and inequality."' ("A Candidate, His Minister and the Search for Faith," *New York Times*, April 30, 2007)

Like Wright, Deval Patrick, and Weatherman veteran Ward Churchill, Obama embraced the blowback theory of 9/11. Here are Obama's remarks right after 9/11, which are worth citing because they show his complete alignment with the left wing of the US intelligence establishment:

> Even as I hope for some measure of peace and comfort to the bereaved families, I must also hope that we as a nation draw some measure of wisdom from this tragedy. Certain immediate lessons are clear, and we must act upon those lessons decisively. We need to step up security at our airports. We must reexamine the effectiveness of our intelligence networks. And we must be resolute in identifying the perpetrators of these heinous acts and dismantling their organizations of destruction. We must also engage, however, in the more difficult task of understanding the sources of such madness. The essence of this tragedy, it seems to me, derives from a fundamental absence of empathy on the part of the attackers: an inability to imagine, or connect with, the humanity and suffering of others. Such a failure of empathy, such numbness to the pain of a child or the desperation of a parent, is not innate; nor, history tells us, is it unique to a particular culture, religion, or ethnicity. It may find expression in a particular brand of violence, and may be channeled by particular demagogues or fanatics. **Most often, though, it grows out of a climate of poverty and ignorance, helplessness and despair.** We will have to make sure, despite our rage, that any U.S. military action takes into account the lives of innocent civilians abroad. We will have to be unwavering in opposing bigotry or discrimination directed against neighbors and friends of Middle Eastern descent. Finally, we will have to

> devote far more attention to the monumental task of raising the hopes and prospects of embittered children across the globe—children not just in the Middle East, but also in Africa, Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and within our own shores.[21]

This is terrorism as a purely spontaneous sociological phenomenon, the direct reaction to economic issues, without the intervention of intelligence agencies. I have provided an exhaustive refutation of this point of view in my *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA* (2005 ff.)

WRIGHT: "I'M A BAD MAMMA JAMMA!"

Even the left liberals at the *New Yorker* were uneasy with some of Wright's more incendiary positions, no doubt because they represented a threat that the Perfect Master might be unmasked:

> Wright, who drives a Porsche and references Bernie Mac and Terry McMillan in his unorthodox sermons ("Take what God gave you and say, 'In your face, mediocrity, I'm a bad mamma jamma!'")…. Wright preached. Wright espouses a theology that seeks to reconcile African-American Christianity with, as he has written, "the raw data of our racist existence in this strange land." The historical accuracy of that claim is incontestable. But his message is more confrontational than may be palatable to some white voters. In his book *Africans Who Shaped Our Faith* —an extended refutation of the Western Christianity that gave rise to "the European Jesus . . . the blesser of the slave trade, the defender of racism and apartheid"—he says, "In this country, racism is as natural as motherhood, apple pie, and the fourth of July. Many black people have been deluded into thinking that our BMWs, Lexuses, Porsches, Benzes, titles, heavily mortgaged condos and living environments can influence people who are fundamentally immoral." In portraying America as "a Eurocentric wasteland of lily-white lies and outright distortions," Wright promulgates a theory of congenital separatism that is deeply at odds with Obama's professed belief in the possibilities of unity and change. (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Obama had warned Wright to stay away from his pseudo-Lincolnesque announcement of his campaign in early 2007, but that had not been enough for the egomaniac Wright, it seemed. Asked about the incident almost a year before the Wright scandal blew up in grand style, the Obama campaign stated: '"Senator Obama is proud of his pastor and his church." In March 2007, Wright commented in an interview that his own family and some close associates were angry about the canceled address, for which they blamed Obama's campaign advisers, but that the situation was "not irreparable." The haughty and vindictive Wright added menacingly: "Several things need to happen to fix it." When asked if he and Mr. Wright had settled this quarrel, Obama said: "Those are conversations between me and my pastor." "If Barack gets past the primary, he might have to publicly distance himself from me," Mr. Wright said with a shrug. "I said it to Barack personally, and he said yeah, that might have to happen."' ("A Candidate, His Minister and the Search for Faith," *New York Times*, April 30, 2007)

Wright, in his moments of lucidity, was aware of himself as a violently controversial figure. Wright told *The New York Times* in a March 6, 2007 interview: "When his [Obama's] enemies find out that in 1984 I went to Tripoli," with Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan to visit Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi, "a lot of his Jewish support will dry up quicker than a snowball in hell." Note that for Wright, all political categories are racial and racist categories. Nevertheless, in a March 2008 campaign appearance, Sen. Obama said, "I don't think my church is actually particularly controversial." This argued for very poor judgment indeed, since Wright was about to become a huge obstacle to Obama's presidential power grab.

The ranting sermons of Reverend Jeremiah Wright established beyond doubt that he is a purveyor of racial hatred, and that this hatemongering was a constant, habitual, and structural feature of his pulpit oratory. If Obama were as conciliatory and irenic as he claims to be, why does he associate with such a person? Why not quit this church and find another one more consonant with traditional Christianity? Instead, we find that Reverend Jeremiah Wright officiated at Obama's wedding, at the christenings of his two daughters, and that the title of Obama's second book, *The Audacity of Hope,* the book we have referred to as the postmodern *Mein Kampf*, is a direct citation from one of Reverend Wright's incendiary sermons.

BLACK LIBERATION THEOLOGY: THE CONE-HEADS

In a spring 2007 television interview with Hannity, Reverend Wright stated that he is an exponent of Black liberation theology, with special reference to the works of theologians like James Cone and Dwight Hopkins. These writers, Reverend Wright argued, are the sources of the black and Afrocentric Christianity which is taught in his church. James Cone is a professor at the Union Theological Seminary, located near Columbia University in New York City. Union Theological Seminary is for all practical purposes a factory for new and improved synthetic religions, structured according to the needs of the oligarchical financier elite to manipulate, dominate, and control various target populations.

Cone, the founder of black liberation theology, concocted a synthetic religion combining pork-chop black nationalism, third-world pseudo-Marxism, and primitive Christianity. He describes his own handiwork as "a theology which confronts white society as the racist anti-Christ." In a war against "white values," black pastors, like Wright, must reject "white seminaries with their middle-class white ideas about God, Christ and the church." (Rich Lowry, "The Real Rev. Wright," realclearpolitics.com, April 29, 2008) "What I write is urged out of my blood," writes Cone. A religion of blood means a religion of blood consciousness and race, taking us back to National Socialism. We are close to Fichte's *Volksgeist* and Mazzini's idea that the races are the real actors of history. We are also close to Michelle Obama's advice to her husband to be visceral, to feel and not to think, which will be discussed below.

Cone gives up any notion of supernatural religion and makes religion derive from a contingent historical experience when he writes: "To put it simply, Black Theology knows no authority more binding than the experience of oppression itself. This alone must be the ultimate authority in religious matters." Whites are presented as "madmen sick with their own self-concept." Cone lays particular stress on his contention that Jesus Christ was black: "The 'raceless' American Christ has a light skin, wavy brown hair, and sometimes - wonder of wonders - blue eyes. For whites to find him with big lips and kinky hair is as offensive as it was for the Pharisees to find him partying with tax-collectors. But whether whites want to hear it or not, Christ is black, baby, with all of the features which are so detestable to white society." (In Christianity, by contrast, God is a spirit, and the issue of skin color does not arise.) In Cone's theology, eternal salvation is equated with black people rising up against their white oppressors. As a coherent gnostic, Cone re-interprets the notions of eternity and paradise as rewards that can and should be obtained in this world.

CONE: "IF GOD IS NOT FOR US AND AGAINST WHITE PEOPLE, THEN HE IS A MURDERER"

Cone went much further, attempting to transform Christ from the universal living God to a kind of totemic or animistic tribal god suitable to lead a raiding party in a race war:

> Black theology refuses to accept a God who is not identified totally with the goals of the black community. If God is not for us and against white people, then he is a murderer, and we had better kill him. The task of black theology is to kill Gods who do not belong to the black community ... Black theology will accept only the love of God which participates in the destruction of the white enemy. What we need is the divine love as expressed in Black Power, which is the power of black people to destroy their oppressors here and now by any means at their disposal. Unless God is participating in this holy activity, we must reject his love." And again: "In the New Testament, Jesus is not for all, but for the oppressed, the poor and unwanted of society, and against oppressors ... Either God is for black people in their fight for liberation and against the white oppressors, or he is not." (See William R. Jones, "Divine Racism: The Unacknowledged Threshold Issue for Black Theology," in *African-American Religious Thought: An Anthology*, ed. Cornel West and Eddie Glaube [Westminster John Knox Press]; cited by Spengler, "The peculiar theology of black liberation," *Asia Times*).

Christianity allows and indeed requires class distinctions, with a preferential bias in favor of the poor and the destitute, as expressed in the imperative to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, house the homeless, visit the sick and prisoners, and bury the dead. It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. But the apostles are commanded to preach the gospel to all nations, without exception, and St. Paul is adamant that there can be no difference between Jew and Greek, Jew and Gentile, Syrian, or Samaritan. What Cone is preaching here is a new synthetic religion which can only be described as satanic, since it is most explicitly based on hatred. If Obama claims that he reached Christianity thanks to Reverend Wright, we can only conclude that he never became a Christian, since as a disciple of Cone, Wright himself could never be classified as a Christian. What Cone has elaborated is a religion of hatred which is the opposite of Christianity.

DISTURBING PRECEDENTS FOR ETHNIC RELIGION

Cone's work calls to mind the outlook of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the racist and anti-semitic friend of the German Emperor William II and later a supporter of Hitler. Chamberlain was an Englishman who chose to become a German; he was a relative of Sir Neville Chamberlain, who appeased Hitler at Munich in an attempt to turn him east against Russia. Chamberlain was one of only four persons whom the National Socialists acknowledged as their ideological forebears: the three others were the composer Richard Wagner, the anti-semite Lagarde, and the philodoxer Nietzsche; Chamberlain was the only one who did not come from the German-speaking area of central Europe. Chamberlain's argument was that the Germanic master race was the bearer and originator of all civilization and culture and admirable in all things save one: it did not have its own ethnic religion, and was saddled with an alien Christianity, a religion which Chamberlain rejected for racist reasons since so many of the main figures were Jews, and also because of doctrines like charity, which were incompatible with the way of the Germanic warrior. Chamberlain called for the creation of a specifically and exclusively Germanic ethnic religion, he called this *"eine arteignene Religion"* or *"eine artmäßige Religion."*

Cone's work can be most clearly understood if we view him as a new Houston Stewart Chamberlain, attempting to create a new and synthetic ethnic religion in the service of the oligarchical foundation community, with the same kind of reactionary and anti-human intent which animated Chamberlain. Cone's talk of killing God also puts him in a class with another proto-Nazi, Nietzsche. In modern America, the intent of all this is a transparent strategy of divide and conquer, splitting the population into more or less fictitious subject nationalities, each with its own ethnic

idol, thus guaranteeing that no united front against the preponderance of the financiers can ever emerge.

What is the extent of Cone's influence? Apologists for Obama have argued that two-thirds of black preachers in America sound like Wright, but empirical studies suggest that the real figure is far less, perhaps one-third at the very most. C. Eric Lincoln and Lawrence H. Mamiya carried out a ten-year statistical study of the black church in America, published as *The Black Church in the African-American Experience* (1990). One of the questions asked in this study dealt with black liberation theology: "In our urban questionnaire we asked the pastors of 1,531 urban churches, 'Have you been influenced by any of the authors and thinkers of black liberation theology?'" It turned out that only 34.9 percent of urban black clergy said they had been influenced by black liberation theologians, as opposed to 65.1 percent who said they had not. Lincoln and Mamiya found a class divide in this regard, with more affluent and educated congregations more likely to be influenced by black liberation theology. Pastors with a high school and lower educational background said that they were minimally influenced by liberation theology, while those with a college education had the most positive views of the movement. The majority of the less educated pastors had neither heard of the movement nor of the names of theologians associated with it. Among clergy familiar with the movement, James Cone had the highest name recognition. (Ron Rhodes, "Black Theology, Black Power, and the Black Experience") The implication is clear: black liberation theology is in fact an ideology of the black overclass.

FORD OPERATIVES AT TRINITY UNITED

Dwight N. Hopkins, the other named mentioned by Wright, is a professor of theology at the University of Chicago and an ordained American Baptist minister. He teaches at the Rockefeller-funded, right-wing elitist University of Chicago, and also teaches at Obama's Trinity United Church of Christ, where his students expect to be treated as his university students. During the Reverend Wright crisis of the Obama campaign, Hopkins acted more and more as a spokesman for Wright's church in numerous cable television interviews. Hopkins is the "Communications Coordinator for the International Association of Black Religions and Spiritualities, a Ford Foundation sponsored global project," as we learn from the Trinity United web site. Hopkins is thus an operative of the notorious Ford Foundation, a flagship institution of the US financier oligarchy. He is also an official of Obama's church, and the dominant figure of Wright's Center for African Biblical Studies. Wright says of Hopkins: "His work covers what has transpired over the past 30 years in the area of black theology. The developments he covers are a 'must' for Generation X-ers" – including, therefore, Obama. Hopkins' standpoint is that of a "theological interpretation of black power." It is the attempt to project the privileges and psychological defenses of the black overclass into the heaven of theology, and must thus be classed as a blasphemous abuse of religion for venal and demagogic goals.

In his notorious performance at the National Press Club in April 2008, Wright attempted to camouflage the fact of a new synthetic religion entirely separate from Christianity behind a smoke screen of relativism. Wright's relativism means that all alternatives are axiomatically equal, no matter what their quality or what their consequences for human survival might be. Wright's universe recalls Hegel's description of Schelling in the preface to his *Phenomenology of Mind* — a night in which everything looks the same: "The prophetic theology of the black church in our day is preached to set African-Americans and all other Americans free from the misconceived notion that different means deficient. Being different does not mean one is deficient. It simply means one is different, like snowflakes, like the diversity that God loves. Black music is different from European

and European music. It is not deficient. It is just different. Black worship is different from European and European-American worship. It is not deficient. It is just different. Black preaching is different from European and European-American preaching. It is not deficient. It is just different. It is not bombastic. It is not controversial. It's different."

Using this boundless relativism, Wright can level good and evil, charity and hatred. He can and did mock the "garlic-nosed" Italians, the Irish, and the music of Georg Friedrich Handel. Wright was a great hater of Europe. As well as being the purveyor of a wholly fantastic and utopian vision of Africa and its history, Wright was an obscurantist of the first magnitude. Obama alleged that he had come to Christianity through Wright, but it was clear that Wright was light years distant from Christianity. Wright was a worshipper of Ford Foundation grants, a racist provocateur and merchant of hatred working to preserve Wall Street's domination over American society. The only religion that Obama could have learned at Wright's knee was hate-based Satanism, concocted in the service of Mammon, Pluto, and all the other gods of wealth. To make matters worse, there is no proof that Obama was ever baptized. Chicago-based journalist, broadcaster and critic Andy Martin, when asked about Obama's baptism, wrote, "I have never been able to obtain any evidence that he was baptized, although I asked for those records."

A body of doctrine which claims to be a religion, as distinct from a political ideology, must deal with an eternal truth growing out of the ontological situation of God and humanity in the world. Religion is not the distillation of anybody's specific predicament or historical experience. Cone wants to celebrate the triumph of postmodern "cultures" over any notions of what is universal and eternal. God is either an eternal spirit with no color at all, or is nothing. There cannot be a white god nor a black god nor a Russian god nor a Chinese god – there can be only one universal God, unless we wish to regress to polytheism or totemism. As soon as we have a separate god for every skin color, religion is out the window, replaced by a kind of *deus ex machina* useful mainly for propaganda purposes. If we have a black god who wants to rise up against whites, we should not be surprised if another god appears who recommends white supremacy, soon followed by another god who supports Serbia against Albania, still another one who is mainly concerned with global warming, and yet another one who wants more tax cuts for the rich. God is not a figment of a political perspective nor of a strategy for health and wealth. But Cone's god appears to be precisely something of this order – the embodiment of an ideology of accumulation of wealth under conditions of affirmative action, in late US-UK imperialism.

FORD FOUNDATION THEOLOGY

Where does this pseudo-theology come from? Since the 1960s, the Ford Foundation has been a leading agency for funding black cultural nationalism and separatism (sometimes referred to as "pork chop cultural nationalism") as a strategy for divide-and-conquer counterinsurgency in the black ghetto and among economically disadvantaged inner-city populations more generally. In these efforts, the watchwords of the Ford Foundation have been community control, local control, and self-management. The goal is always to fragment, divide, and Balkanize the oppressed subject populations according to every conceivable fault line of ethnicity, color, religion, national origin, sexual preference, age, gender, and any other splinter factor that the social engineers can devise. In this way, a general political challenge to the rule of the financiers will never emerge.

Martin Luther King, by contrast, was opposed to racial quotas during his entire career, and this view was shared by both Robert Kennedy and by the black civil rights advocate Bayard Rustin. Rustin wrote that "any preferential approach postulated on racial, ethnic, religious, or sexual lines

will only disrupt a multicultural society and lead to backlash. However, special treatment can be provided to those who have been exploited or denied opportunities if solutions are predicated on class lines, precisely because all religious, ethnic, and religious groups have a depressed class who would benefit." The class-based strategy is one that would tend to unite all of the present squabbling and contending oppressed groupings of American society in a united front against their common oppressor, as in the Wall Street financier class and their minions. The Ford Foundation, the left CIA, and the domestic counterinsurgency apparatus have always been mobilized to head off precisely this possibility. Racial quotas were introduced by President Richard Nixon and his secretary of labor George Schultz, who used a quota system called the Philadelphia plan to pit black unemployed against white construction workers, to the detriment of both and to the greater glory of the bosses. Support for racial quotas came from such black activists as Ford Foundation operative Floyd McKissick of the Congress of Racial Equality, CIA provocateur Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the famous FBI provocateur H. Rap Brown, and James Forman. All of these figures performed the precious service of giving black nationalist radical and left cover to what was inherently a divide-and-conquer strategy invented by the ruling class for the purpose of playing one group in the population off against another. Racial preferences and quotas boiled down to a system of somewhat enhanced tokenism, having as an additional purpose the recruitment of the most active and intelligent elements of the oppressed groups as privileged tools of the ruling class, whose characteristic outlook and methods they assimilate and internalize to a large degree as their own.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IMPOSED BY NIXON AND SHULTZ

Most left liberals naively assume that affirmative action is the only conceivable approach to the race problem, despite the fact that it has failed over 40 years to improve the poverty of the black inner city. Most people do not know that affirmative action was born as a counterinsurgency strategy devised by none other than Richard Milhous Nixon and his retainers, most notably the current boss of the neocon establishment, George Shultz. Here are some considerations which I advanced a decade ago in my *Surviving the Cataclysm*.

> Michael Lind correctly notes that post-1968 multiculturalism represents a demagogic and successful form of tokenism applied as a counterinsurgency strategy; for Lind, "identity politics is merely America's version of the oldest oligarchic trick in the book: divide and rule." (Lind, *The Next American Nation: The New Nationalism and the Fourth American Revolution*, 141) The atrophy of class analysis in modern America is partly the fault of the 1960s New Left, which was much more interested in race and gender than in class. The New Left was interested in community control for the black community, which happened to be the main domestic counterinsurgency tactic of the Sargent Shriver Office of Economic Opportunity and the Ford Foundation. This is the classic divide-and-conquer approach to ethnic groups which has been assumed by imperial ruling classes from time immemorial, from the Ottoman *milliyet-bachi* (or ethnark) system to the British Raj in India to the Soviet autonomous republics set up by Stalin.

MARSHALL PLAN FOR THE CITIES, OR RACIAL QUOTAS?

> The basic problems of black ghetto victims by 1970 (or 1997) were in reality largely economic — jobs, wages, health care, education, mass transit, housing, and related issues. The same was true of the black rural poor. To even begin to address these problems would have required a domestic Marshall Plan, a second New Deal on a vast scale. The post-1957 stagnation of productive

employment and industrial investment would have had to be reversed. Such an approach would necessarily have treated the disadvantaged layers of all ethnic groups, and would have required very substantial investments and other expenditures. The US financial elite, fixated on its new runaway shop opportunities in the globaloney economy, was not interested in such a domestic Marshall Plan. The finance oligarchs also had reason to fear a multiracial coalition from below, which had been attempted during the Detroit mass strikes of the 1930s and 1940s, as documented in the section "Black and White, Unite" of Maurice Zeitlin's *Talking Union*. These mass strikes had forced the finance oligarchs to accept the existence of unions. A program of domestic counterinsurgency based on racial tokenism and "shucks" for the oppressed ethnic groups now seemed far more attractive to them. The basic mentality involved is subtly hinted at by Albert Blumrosen, who as a 1970 functionary of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission helped to lay the groundwork for the current system. Blumrosen wrote in his book on *Black Employment and the Law*: "If discrimination is narrowly defined, for example, by requiring an evil intent to injure minorities, then it will be difficult to prove that it exists. If it does not exist, then the plight of racial and ethnic minorities must be attributable to some more generalized failures in society, in the fields of basic education, housing, family relations, and the like. The search for efforts to improve the condition of minorities must then focus in these general and difficult areas, and the answers can come only gradually as basic institutions, attitudes, customs and practices are changed."

This same outlook had been expressed a little earlier by George Shultz. Over the years Shultz has been Secretary of Labor, of the Treasury, and of State, and is said to have a Princeton tiger tattooed on his posterior. During Nixon's first term, Shultz revived the so-called Philadelphia Plan, a system of racial quotas for hiring in the then largely white construction trades which had been developed by Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz of the Johnson administration. John Ehrlichman of Nixon's palace guard later commented in his memoirs that Tricky Dick "thought that Secretary of Labor George Shultz had shown great style constructing a political dilemma for the labor union leaders and civil rights groups....Before long, the AFL-CIO and the NAACP were locked in combat over the passionate issues of the day." (Ehrlichman, 228-229) Later, the McGovern group in the Democratic Party would inscribe racial and gender quotas on their own banner so prominently that Nixon in 1972 could get away with attacking McGovern as "the quota candidate." The Democratic Party and the unions should at this point have adopted a plank calling for expanded production and productive jobs for all Americans, rather than accept the logic of quotas, which amount to quarreling over the distribution of the shrinking pie. The decline of the Democratic Party and of the labor movement over the reactionary quarter century after 1970 is the result of the failure to advocate economic expansion, and not quotas, during Nixon's first term. Quotas and associated practices like school busing have become lightning rods for white backlash and resentment, which in turn made possible the successful Republican southern strategy in the Electoral College and the long night of Reagan, Bush, and Gingrich. [22]

NIXON- SHULTZ PHILADELPHIA PLAN PLAYS BLACKS AGAINST UNIONS

According to one account, in a meeting with Republican Congressional leaders "Nixon emphasized the importance of exploiting the Philadelphia Plan to split the Democratic constituency and drive a wedge between the civil rights groups and organized labor." [Hugh Davis Graham, *The Civil Rights Era* (New York: Oxford, 1990)] Civil rights leader Bayard Rustin told a 1969 AFL-CIO gathering that Nixon's successful playing off of black groups against the unions was "a source of tremendous satisfaction to powerful enemies of the labor movement." To underline the consensus in the ruling elite, the blue-ribbon commission chaired by former Illinois Governor Otto Kerner

> which studied the causes of the ghetto riots of the mid-1960s concluded that "white racism" was the cause of black discontent and of the race problem in America — white racism alone, and not slums, low wages, wretched schools, nonexistent health care, and unemployment. The Kerner Commission report was the voice of the white and inept US ruling elite scapegoating white workers and the white middle class for its own sorry record.

Originally, racial quotas and affirmative action were supposed to represent redress for past discrimination. After a decade or two, that was transformed into the need to enhance diversity among a series of artificial, bureaucratically defined "cultures," including African-Americans, Asians and Pacific islanders, Hispanics, Native Americans, and whites as the five official variants. Race quotas, preferences, set-asides, offsets and the rest of the dismal apparatus of multiculturalism amount to a sophisticated and insidious counterinsurgency strategy which fosters the co-opting of talented black, Hispanic and other organic leaders into an artificial stratum of clients of the ruling elite. Multiculturalism, it must be stressed again, has not led to economic development or to broad-front improvement in the condition of any ethnic group. Multiculturalism is tokenism. Black and Hispanic ghetto victims have not been helped by this approach. Multiculturalism has delivered material advantages for the few, and has betrayed the hopes of the many. In the world of education, the irrationalist attempt to justify quotas and discrimination has debased the quality of intellectual and cultural life, which cannot escape the fact that the hopes of the majority of all ethnic origins have been betrayed. Barack and Michelle Obama are examples of the greedy opportunists who have been the winners under affirmative action.

SALVING THE BAD CONSCIENCE OF THE BLACK OVERCLASS

Forty years later, these policies have resulted in the creation of a black overclass made up to some degree of the beneficiaries of affirmative action, racial quotas, set-asides, preferential treatment in government contracts at all levels for minority-owned businesses, and the like. This black overclass likes to portray itself as the authentic representatives of the black community as a whole, but in reality it looks down on the black underclass caught in the cycle of ghetto inner-city poverty as if it were a completely separate group. More accurately, the affirmative-action portion of the black overclass regards the oppressed black underclass as a useful political commodity which can be exploited for the purposes of obtaining more concessions from the white establishment — concessions which should flow into the pockets of the black overclass, and never reach the sidewalks of the inner-city ghetto. The black overclass thus combines a militant black nationalist or black empowerment ideology with extreme forms of economic individualism, rent-seeking, and personal aggrandizement of all kinds. It is a cynical exercise in duplicity, and is at least one of the contributing factors for a situation in which the inner-city black ghetto is getting poorer, while the income gap between the black overclass and the black underclass is also rapidly expanding.

What then is the psychological consequence of such a situation for the individual member of the black overclass? The black overclass is rapidly accumulating mansions, BMWs, mink coats, diamond jewelry, and the other apparatus of conspicuous consumption. The black ghetto victim, by contrast, is sinking deeper and deeper into abject poverty. In the face of the situation, however, the black overclass continues to demand additional privileges for itself, while continuing to neglect the urgent material needs of the vast majority of the black community. The kind of black liberation theology purveyed by Dwight Hopkins, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, and the Trinity United Church of Christ provides a kind of answer to the resulting psychological tensions. The more BMWs you have in your garage and the more mink coats you have in your closet, the more vehemently you must complain about the Atlantic slave trade, apartheid and the Sharpeville

massacre, the Tuskegee experiment, and similar atrocities, often quite real but all far from your own privileged existence. The more Ivy League degrees you have on your wall, the louder you must chant, "God damn America!" The more government contracts you have obtained, the more you must profess the blowback theory of 9/11, citing the 3,000 deaths of innocent people as God's punishment for the racist crimes of US imperialism. All these points represent nothing but the characteristic outlook of the foundations. The religion preached by the Reverend Jeremiah Wright and the theologian Dwight Hopkins at the Trinity United Church of Christ is demonstrably not Christianity, but rather a gnostic-synthetic *ersatz* belief structure which has been whipped up and concocted for the special emotional needs of a narrow segment of the black overclass under conditions of affirmative action in the late Anglo-American imperialist development. To be more concise, Reverend Wright's church is a foundation-funded cult. It teaches an ethnocentric, synthetic religion.

Some in the black community offered criticisms of Wright; here is one from Jonetta Rose Barras, a well-known radio commentator in the Washington DC area, who was confused about Obama, but not about that fact that Wright was at least obsolete:

I've known preachers like the Rev. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr., former pastor to Sen. Barack Obama. Like many of them, he no doubt sees his congregation as full of victims, and thinks that his words will inspire them to rise out of their victimhood. I understand that. Once upon a time, I saw myself as a victim, too, destined to march in place. In the 1970s and '80s, as a clenched-fist-pumping black nationalist with my head wrapped in an elaborate gele, I reflected that self-concept in my speech. My words were as fiery as the Rev. Wright's. And more than a few times, I, too, damned America, loudly, for its treatment of blacks. But I turned away from such rhetoric. Is it time that Wright and other ministers do, too? But just as spirituals eventually lost their relevance and potency as an organizing tool against discrimination — even as they retained their historical importance in the African-American cultural narrative — so, I believe, has Wright-speak lost its place. It's harmful and ultimately can't provide healing. And it's outdated in the 21st century. I came to this realization gradually. As I expanded my associations and experiences — organizing in places such as San Francisco, Providence, R.I., Patterson, N.J. and Northeast Washington, meeting caring Hispanics, Asians and whites — I came to know that we are all more alike than different. I saw that our dreams sat inside each other. All of us wanted a better America, not so much for ourselves as for our children, and their children. Achieving this meant that we had to get beyond our past segregated lives and work together, inspiring the best in ourselves — not the bitterness and the biases. […]And today, there is an entire generation of young people who know nothing of segregation, who see one another as individuals, not as symbols of a dark past. They do not look into white faces and see, as I once did, a burning cross, a white sheet and a vicious dog on a police officer's leash. This is the coalition pushing for a new America. (Jonetta Rose Barras, "He's Preaching to a Choir I've Left," *Washington Post*, March 23, 2008)

DOROTHY TILLMAN, OBAMA ALLY: "AMERICA OWES US" GRAFT

Another of Obama's Chicago political cronies is Dorothy Tillman, an alderwoman of the city. Tillman's specialty is to try to extort payments from banks and corporations which reportedly go to herself and her clients, based on the accusation that the bank or company in question participated in slavery. Tillman has been quoted as saying her goal is to "repair the damage of 400 years" of slavery. "America owes us," she says. (*Chicago Sun-Times*, March 26, 2007) Again, this is not the demand for broad-based economic development programs for the black underclass. It is often an attempt to extort cash payments to specific individuals to make a public relations problem go away,

leaving the black ghetto in its current predicament. Alderman Tillman's record must be read in connection with her track record for corruption: 'Obama had endorsed …Dorothy Tillman, calling her "a very early supporter of my campaign." Tillman was then under fire for her stewardship of the scandal-plagued Harold Washington Cultural Center, where contracts benefited members of her family. Obama rejected the notion that such endorsements conflict with his promotion of ethics reform in government.' (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

Reverend Wright argued in his sermon on Christmas Day 2007 that resistance against the Obama presidential candidacy was predicated on the fact that Obama did not "fit the mold." "He ain't white!" exclaimed the Reverend. A half truth at best, since Obama is half white. "He ain't rich!" Manifestly false, since the Obamas reported a 2005 income of about $1.6 million, with Michelle pulling down $325,000 as gatekeeper to push black ghetto victims out of the University of Chicago Hospital, plus $101,083 in 2006 for serving on the board of the wage-gouging, union-busting Tree House (a Walmart supplier). Obama got almost $70,000 per year as a mere lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, a very good deal for a mere adjunct. They live in a mansion with a wine cellar containing a thousand bottles of the finest vintage wine – as many bottles of wine as Imelda Marcos had pairs of shoes. By mid-2008, it was estimated that the Obamas were worth about $7 million overall. They were rich by anybody's measure. "He ain't privileged!" Another lie, as Michelle's Princeton and Harvard degrees, made possible by affirmative action, sufficiently document.

In a cynical attempt at deceiving voters, Obama has tried to pretend that sermons with incendiary contents were the exception rather than the rule at Trinity United. This is obviously disingenuous. Obama was not just listening to Reverend Wright, he was also subsidizing the oratory of hatred with his generous financial contributions to the church. Obama was helping to pay for Reverend Wright's microphone! Hatred was obviously Reverend Wright's weekly stock in trade. Did Obama ever walk out of a sermon? Did he ever tell Reverend Wright to tone it down — before he began running for president at the end of 2006? Did he ever threaten to quit the congregation? Evidently, he did not.

By mid-March 2008, the Reverend Wright affair had placed Obama in a bind. Would he remain a member of the Trinity United Church of Christ under Reverend Wright's hand-picked successor, reportedly a worthy disciple in his apostolate of hatred? If he did, you could be sure that Reverend Wright's taped outbursts would continue to knock him off message. If he tried to cut his losses by exiting from the congregation, he could be sure that an entire phalanx of Reverend Wright's co-religionists of the black theology school would condemn him as a sellout who was capitulating under the pressure of the white man. All Obama could do was to attempt to paper over the entire question with his mellifluous and ambiguous rhetoric of reconciliation, which was sounding increasingly hollow in this new context. Even when he later pretended to repudiate Wright, it was done with qualifiers – he said that his relationship with Wright had changed, not that it was over. He also remained an active member of Trinity United, which now passed under the leadership of Ford Foundation grantee Otis Moss III. Obama left Trinity United only when the primaries were over and he was beginning his hard right turn.

THE CASE OF FATHER PFLEGER, RENEGADE THEOLIB PRIEST

The new Otis Moss regime brought new problems for Obama. On Easter Sunday, Moss preached that Wright had been subjected to a crucifixion, thus returning to the rhetorical tropes of victimization and persecution so favored by affirmative-action race-mongers when they get into

trouble. Moss also had a policy of inviting incendiary racist provocateurs to join him during divine services at Trinity United. One of these firebrands was a certain Father Michael Pfleger, a fiery liberal social activist of the liberation theology school and a white reverend at an African-American church, St. Sabina's Catholic Church on the South Side of Chicago. Pfleger, an expert in racial pandering, is a longtime friend and associate of Obama, having known him since the Perfect Master was a community activist poverty pimp. In September, the Obama campaign had brought Pfleger to Iowa to host one of several interfaith forums for the campaign. So here we have yet another close personal friend of Obama over more than two decades who turns out to be a race-baiting provocateur.

Pfleger's appearance at the post-Wright Trinity United was introduced by Rev. Otis Moss personally with much praise for the visiting priest. Pfleger then launched into a tirade about the importance of taking on "white entitlement and supremacy wherever it raises its head." This goes back directly to the classic Weatherman line of "white skin privilege" still embraced by Dohrn and Ayers. Pfleger then turned his attention to those who have the temerity to oppose the ascendancy of the Perfect Master: "Rev. Moss, when Hillary was crying, and people said that was put on, I really don't believe it was put on," Pfleger raved from the pulpit. "I really believe that she just always thought, 'This is mine! I'm Bill's wife, I'm white, and this is mine! I just gotta get up and step into the plate.' And then out of nowhere came, 'Hey, I'm Barack Obama,' and she said, 'Oh, damn! Where did you come from? I'm white! I'm entitled! There's a black man stealing my show!' Pfleger then mocks Hillary weeping, much to delight of the crowd, many of whom stand up and applaud. "She wasn't the only one crying, there was a whole lot of white people crying!" Pfleger says to laughter. The tape, which shows only this one controversial part of Pfleger's "sermon," then cuts to Moss thanking Pfleger: "We thank God for the message, we thank God for the messenger, we thank God for Father Michael Pfleger," Moss says.' (Aaron Klein, *World Net Daily*, June 1, 2008)

PFLEGER: "AMERICA IS THE GREATEST SIN AGAINST GOD"

"Racism is still America's greatest addiction," Pfleger says. "I also believe that America is the greatest sin against God." There seems to be a mixed reaction to that from the pews. But Pfleger explains: "If the greatest command is to love, than the sin against love must be the greatest sin against God who IS love and who calls us to love one another. So that this greatest sin against God, racism, it's as natural as the air we breathe." (Taylor Marsh, June 1, 2008) The *New York Times* recently reported that Father Pfleger had "long worked with South Side political leaders to reduce crime and improve the community" — so being a racist provocateur is only a sideline. "But he has drawn fire from some quarters for defending the Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan and inviting him to speak at his church." (Jake Tapper, "Priest and Obama Ally Mocks Clinton's Tears from Obama's Church's Pulpit," ABC New, May 29, 2008)

There could now be absolutely no doubt that Obama's church represents an incendiary beacon and clearing house of racist provocation, is the atmosphere of race-baiting and scurrilous insults which Obama chose and embraced, not just for himself but for his entire family. Obama long remained a member of this cesspool of hatred, thus guaranteeing that the entire issue will live on all the way to the November election. 'Sen. Barack Obama's chief political strategist sits on the finance committee of the Chicago church led by controversial pastor Michael Pfleger, who claimed in a sermon last weekend Sen. Hillary Clinton cried in public because she thought being white entitled her to the Democratic presidential nomination.' (Aaron Klein, *World Net Daily*, June 1, 2008)

WRIGHT'S $1.6 MILLION MANSION IN A RICH WHITE GATED COMMUNITY

Wright himself was apparently taken underground by the Obama campaign, who did not want this racist provocateur doing any media interviews. Speculation was rife on right-wing talk radio that the racist reverend had been sequestered by Axelrod, and that he now slept with the fishes. In reality, he was ensconced at a luxury resort hotel in the Caribbean. Then it became known that Wright was about to move into a newly constructed $1.6 million mansion in the Chicago suburbs in a gated community where the black population was less than 2%. He was reported to enjoy a $10 million line of credit provided by Trinity United. His Porsche was in the garage. Wright was not an ascetic.

Wright is also a highly political reverend, who gets around to the Gamaliel Foundation's schedule of conferences. On June 21-22, 2007, for example, Gamaliel held its "African-American Leadership Conference" in Pittsburgh under the theme of "Uniting for Power." The keynote speaker was none other than Jeremiah Wright. At this conference, Reverend John C. Welch of Pittsburgh made a thinly veiled call to mobilize politically for Obama: "I hope that when you leave you will also have a plan for your cities so that collectively we can make sure that this country will undergo an unprecedented cosmetic surgery in the 2008 presidential election," said Welch. Welch was right: an Obama presidency, as is argued in this book, would constitute nothing more than a cosmetic makeover or facelift for a moribund empire. The goal needs to be to turn away from the path of empire and return to the ways of the constitutional republic. But Obama is too much of a puppet to be able to contemplate that route.

When Otis Moss III, who replaced Wright at Trinity United, took advantage of the national attention focused on Trinity United to devote his Easter Sunday sermon to defending Wright from what he termed a "crucifixion." The point was that the affirmative action beneficiary needed above all things to cultivate the metaphysical pose of the eternal victim – in order to get more grants. One was reminded of a right-wing reactionary who had benefited from affirmative action (even if he proposed to remove it for others). This was Clarence Thomas, who told his 1992 Senate confirmation hearings that he had been the victim of a "high-tech lynching." Otis Moss III had gone to college at Morehouse College thanks to a grant from the Ford Foundation.

NATIONAL SOCIALISM: THE CYNICAL USES OF IDENTITY POLITICS

The activities of the Ford Foundation and the other foundations for which it serves as a flagship do not represent the first time that racial issues have been cynically used for the pursuit of political ends. The leader of the National Socialist movement will always be associated with the most virulent exploitation of crackpot race doctrines which furnished the staples of his demagogy. But it is also interesting to note that even this greatest racist of the 20th century was fully aware that the concept of race was a fraud and a sham. Here is Hitler in an unguarded moment speaking to Hermann Rauschning, the leader of the Nazi movement in Gdansk or Danzig, sometime in the autumn 1934:

> The conception of the nation has become meaningless. The conditions of the time compelled me to begin on the basis of that conception. But I realized from the first that it could have only transient validity. The 'nation' is a political expedient of democracy and liberalism. We have to get rid of this false conception and set in its place the conception of race, which has not yet been politically used up. The new order cannot be conceived in terms of national boundaries of the peoples with an historic past, but in terms of race which transcends those boundaries. All

> the adjustments and corrections of frontiers, and in regions of colonization, are a plowing of the sands… I know perfectly well, just as well as all these tremendously clever intellectuals, that in the scientific sense there is no such thing as race. But you, as a farmer and cattle breeder, cannot get your breeding successfully achieved without the conception of race. And I as a politician need a conception which enables the order which has hitherto existed on historic bases to be abolished and an entirely new anti-historic order enforced and given an intellectual basis. Understand what I mean… I have to liberate the world from dependence on its historic past. Nations are the outward and visible forms of our history. So I have to fuse these nations into a higher order if I want to get rid of the chaos of an historic past which has become an absurdity. And for this purpose the conception of race serves me well. It disposes of the old order and makes possible new associations. France carried her great revolution beyond her borders with the conception of the nation. With the conception of race, National Socialism will carry its revolution abroad and remake the world. (Hermann Rauschning, *Voice of Destruction* [New York: Putnam, 1940], 231-232)

It is worth underlining that a racist outlook and the outlook of the modern state are antithetical. The US financier elites may have found that playing the race card has functioned as an effective form of counterinsurgency over the last four decades, but they also need to recognize that the politically correct and multicultural cult of racial diversity is a highly corrosive factor weakening the American state and polity.

OBAMA'S RACE SPEECH: A HYPOCRITE WITH A TELEPROMPTER

Obama's speech on race, delivered with much fanfare in Philadelphia on March 18 in response to the initial explosion of the Jeremiah Wright controversy, was a microcosm of the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of his presidential campaign. Prior to any content, the setting and method deserve attention. Obama as a candidate is as controlled and scripted as, say, Elizabeth Dole most of the time. He avoids answering questions and does not like unstructured repartee or give and take. His typical formats often offer no opportunity for questions and answers, only soaring rhetoric and platitudes. He is no debater; he is a pontificator. His favorite approach is the Nuremberg rally, with the speech read off the glass panes of a teleprompter to his left and right, an apparatus not noticed by so many of his fawning disciples and dupes. This was the method used in his Iowa victory speech, and this was the method in Philadelphia. Obama appeared with his head thrown back, literally looking down his nose at the audience: he was literally talking down to them. The tone was self-righteous, lecturing, even hectoring. His approach was condescending, patronizing, belittling his audience. Voters have complained that Obama simply lacks any credible credentials for talking down to them in this way.

Obama had been caught consorting with the racist provocateur, Jeremiah Wright. But he did not apologize. He turned the actual moral situation on its head by portraying Wright as a reflection of American racism, and blaming the American people and their inveterate racism. This method of blaming the public for one's own blunders and incompetence has been a staple of the Trilateral political faction going back to Carter's infamous *malaise* speech of July 1979. Obama has never sincerely apologized for anything. Those who were shocked in 2004 when Bush was unable to think of any error or mistake that he had made should be more concerned about Obama, who also lacks the moral courage to admit a mistake or a failing. The sole exceptions are his attempt to get off the hook for shady and unethical transactions that may have crossed the line into actual felonies: thus, his stock line for responding to questions about his smelly house-flipping deal with underworld kingpin Tony Rezko is to say that this was a "boneheaded" mistake. In the case of Wright, Obama

had been imbibing racist hatred in the pews for 20 years, and exposing his wife and children to the foul-mouthed tirades of the raving reverend. But he never apologized, never uttered a self-critical word. Obama is like Bush: structurally incapable of self-criticism. This may in turn be rooted in the mental defect we find in both of them: megalomania.

A plausible defense for Obama would have gone like this: "I ask the American people to forgive me for my terrible political opportunism. I came to Chicago and needed to build a political base. Wright was a popular preacher, and he had a following among the upwardly mobile black opinion leaders I wanted to meet and to cultivate. He also had a program of church social work which gave him a veneer of credibility among poorer blacks. I joined the church and brought my wife and children there. We sat through the "God damn America" two-minute hate tirades and gave Wright as much as we could afford, over twenty-five grand last year, to get his support and endorsement. He was mobilizing his national network of black liberation theology ministers for me, and nobody else could do that for me. Wright drives a Porsche and is about to move into a $1.6 million house, so he always wanted money. But now Wright has become a colossal political liability, so I am dumping him. I condemn him and repudiate him, I am quitting his church, and I will never speak to him again as long as I live. I will never give him another penny as long as I live, and neither will anyone in my family. I will not allow him anywhere near the White House, and I will not steer government patronage money his way. This is a clean break, irrevocable and unalterable. No more Jeremiah Wright. I sincerely apologize to the American people and ask for their forgiveness. I am guilty of political opportunism, and I will work to win redemption. God bless America."

This would have been the best possible damage control in regard to Wright, but Obama was structurally incapable of giving a speech like this, even if he had not meant it and fully intended to keep Wright in a secret priest hole in the White House to serve as his confessor and spiritual director for all four years and beyond. This would have involved the three steps of penitence – the contrition of the heart, the confession of the mouth, and the restitution and satisfaction of works. Obama could never be a penitent. Instead, Obama reached back to the Carter *malaise* speech of July 1979.[23]

From this speech Obama abstracted the characteristic method of a Trilateral-Ford puppet who is caught in malfeasance: blame the American people, especially the working class. Backed by a row of American flags, with his head thrown back (partly in arrogance and partly to facilitate reading off the glass plates of the teleprompter) Obama attempted to turn reality on its head, and especially to turn the tables on the critics of Wright. He tried to contort himself from a sleazy Chicago ward-heeling pol who had been caught in the company of a widely hated extremist, to a moralistic social critic sagaciously diagnosing the pathologies of the American body politic. The words flickered across the glass plates of the teleprompter and out of Obama's yap, rife with Harvardian modulations. Obama morphed from the defendant that he was into the divine state prosecutor of the judgment day, reading the American people the list of their sins, original, mortal, and venal: racism, racism, racism.

It turned out that Reverend Wright was not a satanic huckster projecting the Ford Foundation's divide-and-conquer strategy of financier oligarch domination into the realm of pseudo-Christian theology, oh no. Reverend Wright was a microcosm who reflected the conflicts of American society, and the chief of these was once again racism. Wright's specific comments could always be rejected, but Wright could not be rejected, because he had become part and parcel of Obama's hard-won race identity, his *völkische Identität*. And Wright was not the only one to be tainted by racism: there was also Obama's grandmother Toot, who had once been frightened by a potential mugger

who had happened to be black. Obama droned on mercilessly, reading the words off his trusty glass plates.

At the end, it turned out that the country needed a new dialogue about race. Not about foreclosures that were hitting the black community harder than any other sector of the population. Not about mass layoffs, that were hitting blacks hardest, since they were the last hired and the first fired in such industries as remained. Not about food price inflation, which was undermining the living standards of blacks along with everyone else. Not about the black high school dropout rate, nor the incarceration rate of young black men. Not about banking panic. Not even about soaring college tuition costs. Just about race, understood as an attitude, as an autonomous force in history, divorced from its material basis, and divorced from any class analysis that might account for social tensions in some other way.

OBAMA: NO SPECIFIC PROPOSALS TO HELP THE BLACK UNDERCLASS

It was worth noting that Obama labored very hard to create the appearance of a campaign that studiously avoided all racial issues, at least as far as the candidate himself was concerned. He had not proposed anything to help Harlem, Anacostia, Watts-South Central, or the Cabrini Greens. Up to this point, Obama had made zero proposals specifically designed to help poor inner city blacks, nor did he make any such proposals now. The Obama campaign ethos was on the surface post-racial, trans-racial, globalized. But beneath the surface, the Obama campaign was a brutal racist slander machine, capable of generating the absurd myth that Bill Clinton was a racist (a myth which Sean Wilentz has dismantled and exposed). This was a trick which the political thug David Axelrod had learned in Chicago, where he had sometimes managed the campaigns of black candidates who wanted to attract the votes of upper-middle class white voters. The trick was to project an image of trans-racial and post-racial beatitude on the part of the candidate, but to have surrogates and campaign spokespersons ruthlessly slime the opponent as a racist any time he dared to raise the most minute criticism. The classic stance of the Obama campaign was, in a nutshell, that if you dare criticize our man, you are revealing yourself as a racist. It was a masterpiece of self-righteous duplicity.

Needless to say, the controlled corporate media and their media whores swooned in ecstasy. Obama's speech joined the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address among the foundational documents of the United States, raved quite a few. It should be printed by the million and made required reading in every school, raved others. For the left liberals, the speech had the unique merit of expressing their own class-based race-dominated world view through the mouth of someone who claimed to be black, but using the jargon of the academic oligarch. The left liberals crowed that Obama had turned the tables on his critics and opponents, and that the Reverend Wright issue had now been successfully neutralized; no longer would the South Side Savonarola be a mill-stone around the neck of the Perfect Master as he strove towards the seizure of power.

Ordinary working people, American voters, had other ideas. The racist provocations of Wright were a permanent guarantee that Obama could not be elected president in the normal way, that is, without the destruction of his competition by Gestapo methods through the FBI and Department of Justice, in the way that Governor Spitzer had been taken down. The danger was that Obama had so many ogres and monsters in his left CIA-Ford Foundation base of support and in his past in general that, if he were at the top of the Democratic ticket, he would drag the entire party down to defeat with him. Obama had no coat-tails. He had reverse coat-tails; he was a burden for Democratic candidates down the ticket. The burden was composed of Jeremiah Wright the racist provocateur,

Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn the Weatherman terrorist bombers and butchers, Tony Rezko and Auchi the gangsters, Michelle Obama the fascist ideologue, and most of all of Obama's own secret persona as the Marx-Fanon-Rousseau anthropologist and theoretician of bitterness. This was a crushing, intolerable, unsustainable burden for any Democratic candidate who wanted to win an election anywhere other than Berkeley, Big Sur, Jackson Hole, Hyde Park, the Upper West Side, or Takoma Park.

MICHELLE ROBINSON, QUOTA QUEEN AND ETERNAL VICTIM

Obama's future wife Michelle now enters our narrative as Michelle Robinson. She was born into what she always claims was a working-class family of modest means from the South Side of Chicago in 1964. She graduated from Whitney Young High School in Chicago in 1981 and majored in sociology at Princeton University, graduating *cum laude* with the Class of 1985. She received her Juris Doctor degree from Harvard Law School in 1988.

Michelle needs very much for the public to believe that she came from a very humble background. Why should this be so? It is because Michelle's stance is metaphysically that of the eternal victim. Part of this pose must be related to bad conscience, assuming that she has a conscience. She has been the recipient of privileged treatment. She constantly repeats that her Scholastic Aptitude Test scores were not good enough to get into Princeton. But she was admitted, with a scholarship. The only explanation is that she benefited from a preferential racial quota. Michelle is thus in reality what Lani Guinier was called in the press 15 years ago: she is a Quota Queen. She then went to Harvard Law School. In the meantime, the black underclass has been left to its own devices in festering inner-city ghettos. How does this brutal class reality impact the mentality of someone like Michelle? She needs to reject class, and embrace race with a vengeance. Above all, she must assume the pose of a victim, of a person with an overwhelming grievance. This sense of victimhood is an indispensable component in the mentality of fascism. The Italians and Germans of the 1920s and 1930s felt that they had been treated very badly, humiliated, betrayed, stabbed in the back, and the fruits of their sacrifices mutilated. Michelle Obama has this basic prerequisite to be a fascist ideologue; as we will see, she has realized that potential.

Michelle Obama's illusory account of a grim and disadvantaged youth on the edge of poverty has not withstood examination. The distinguished University of Pennsylvania political scientist Adolph Reed has pointed out the essential inaccuracy of what has been alleged about Michelle by her backers. Reed observes:

> The Obama campaign has even put out a misleading bio of Michelle Obama, representing her as having grown up in poverty on the South Side, when, in fact, her parents were city workers, and her father was a Daley machine precinct captain. This fabrication, along with those embroideries of the candidate's own biography, may be standard fare, the typical log cabin narrative. However, in Obama's case, the license taken not only underscores Obama's more complex relationship to insider politics in Daley's Chicago; it also underscores how much this campaign depends on selling an image rather than substance. (Adolph Reed, "Obama No," *The Progressive*, May 17, 2008)

NEWTON MINOW OF SIDLEY, AUSTIN, FRIEND OF BARKY

Barry encountered Michelle for the first time thanks to the efforts a top establishment fixer, the venerable Newton Minow, who still wraps himself in the banner of Camelot. Minow has been one

of Obama's key backers. Minow is still widely known today for belaboring the obvious: it was Minow who popularized the phrase "vast wasteland" for American broadcast television in 1961, when he was the head of the Federal Communications Commission under Kennedy. Minow spoke as an elitist, perhaps preparing the way for the foundation-funded PBS system, a Rockefeller idea which expresses the view of the foundation oligarchy. Now in advanced age, Minow can be seen as a patriarch of the Chicago oligarchy, a leading grandee of the Chicago establishment. Minow may be one of the case officers working Obama on behalf of the Trilaterals, Bilderbergers, and the banking establishment in general. Minow's political judgment is very much open to question: he was a prominent backer of Adlai E. Stevenson, the liberal Illinois governor and supercilious elitist who lost the presidency to Eisenhower not once but twice, in 1952 and 1956 as well. Minow's fortunes improved when he battened on to the Kennedy bandwagon. We read in a recent account:

> At 81, sitting in his law office at Sidley Austin, in the Loop, above a stretch of street christened Honorary Newton N. Minow Way, Minow is talking about the young man his daughter Martha, a professor at Harvard Law School, recommended for a summer associate's job two decades ago. At Minow's firm Obama fell in love with a young lawyer, Michelle Robinson, who would become his wife. "I adored Jack Kennedy," Minow explains, "and I saw the 21st-century version of Jack Kennedy in my mind. He is astonishing. I think the fundamental point is the country wants a different kind of politics." He adds, "I also believe the race issue and the gender issue are yesterday, particularly with young people." One-upping Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes's famous summary of Franklin D. Roosevelt's gifts, Minow, a former Supreme Court clerk, says, "I believe as the country sees Barack, gets to know him, they will see the same thing I see: really a combination of a first-class mind and a first-class temperament, all in the same person." (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

For our present purposes, the point is that Barry met Michelle thanks to the mediation of old Newt Minow in the Sidley Austin law firm one summer.

MICHELLE OBAMA REVEALED

Sharon Churcher, writing for the right-wing London paper *The Daily Mail*, provides a penetrating look at Michelle Obama as she really is as a person and as a life story. The emphasis is on Michelle's attempt to deceive the public, always for the purpose of painting herself as a victim. Churcher observes that

> Michelle's pitch is far from sophisticated, playing heavily on her humble beginnings and traditional values: "I was raised in a working-class family on the south Side of Chicago. That's how I identify myself, a working-class girl," she has told the voters, time after time. It helps that she cuts a fine figure on the stump, tall and slender with a hair 'flip' reminiscent of Jackie Kennedy. And it does no harm that, while Barack, 46, comes from mixed Kenyan and white parentage, Michelle, 44, is authentically African-American, giving the Obamas an unmatched breadth of appeal. Last week it seemed the mask had slipped when, speaking unscripted for once, a sharper, less emollient Michelle emerged. "For the first time in my adult life I feel really proud of my country," she said, an apparent lack of patriotism immediately seized on by her Republican opponents. When *The Mail on Sunday* went back to the gritty district of Chicago where Michelle LaVaughn Robinson was raised, we found a rather different picture from the one so single-mindedly promoted by Camp Obama. Instead of the one-room tenement that now appears in most accounts of her upbringing, we found a well-kept neighbourhood of red-brick Arts and Craft-style houses which have long been home to respectable black families.' (Sharon

Churcher, "Mrs O.: The truth about Michelle Obama's 'working class' credentials, London *Daily Mail,* February 23, 2008)

So Michelle was from a very comfortable family, after all. In fact, some of Michelle's early advantages came from her father's status as a ward heeler for the Chicago Democratic machine, long associated with the Daley family:

> "Michelle was from a middle-class family," confirmed one of her long-time friends, Angela Acree. "She came from a regular family. They had a nice home. It wasn't a mansion, but it was just fine. It was a decent neighbourhood."
>
> The Robinsons grew up on the upper floor of a house built in the Twenties. Number 7436 South Euclid Avenue - a classical reference to the Greek mathematician which found an appropriate echo in Michelle's subsequent respect for traditional learning - even has a small garden, shaded by a large elm tree, and an ornate stone bench.
>
> The South Side of Chicago has long had its share of gang-infested housing 'projects' but with the University of Chicago hospital close by, there were plenty of white professionals in the area as well as hard-working families in the Robinsons' own image.
>
> No one could pretend they were rich and it is true that her father, Frasier Robinson, spent some time as a maintenance worker for Chicago's Department of Water Management.
>
> However, he was a good deal more than the labourer that many seem to imagine.
>
> Indeed, according to family friends, Michelle's father was a volunteer organiser for the city's Democratic Party, a by-word for machine politics in America, and his loyalty was rewarded with a well-paid engineering job at Chicago's water plant. Even before overtime, he earned $42,686 – 25 per cent more than High School teachers at the time.
>
> Michelle's mother stayed at home and devoted her energies to her and her older brother Craig. Marian Robinson nurtured great ambitions for both her children, along with the traditional values which are now serving Michelle so well.
>
> Television was all but banned in favour of homework, debates about the issues of the day and improving games of chess.
>
> Bright and determined, Michelle was awarded a place at one of Chicago's first 'magnet' schools, which offered special programmes for gifted children. By the time she was 13, she was taking a college-level biology course.
>
> Even as a child, she was not to be underestimated, says Craig, now 45, who works as the head basketball coach at high-flying Brown University. There was no doubt who was in charge.
>
> "We had this game where we set up two rooms and played 'Office'," he recalled. "She was the secretary, and I was the boss. But she did everything. It was her game, and I kind of had nothing to do. My sister is a poor sport. She didn't like to lose."
>
> She rarely did. Michelle beat huge competition to win a place studying sociology at Princeton, one of America's most venerable and expensive universities.
>
> Once she had arrived amid the fauxgothic precincts, however, she found herself surrounded by spoilt white students from wealthy families. She, in contrast, was obliged to take out loans to pay her way and this rankled, as she revealed in a 1985 thesis. (Sharon Churcher, "Mrs O.: The truth about Michelle Obama's 'working class' credentials, London *Daily Mail,* February 23, 2008)

This is the domineering Michelle Obama we have come to know; a supermarket tabloid story claims that she controls everything that husband Barack does.

MICHELLE OBAMA AND CHERIE BLAIR: VULGAR, GRASPING *ARRIVISTES*

The British author compares Michelle to Cherie Blair, the wife of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair. The suggestion is that Michelle is the same kind of grasping, greedy, striving, social-climbing, vulgar *arriviste* or *nouveau riche* which the British public had learned to hold in contempt. Turning to Michelle's thesis, she writes:

The document …betrays an angry, campaigning brand of politics which in no way fits with the mild-mannered advocate of common sense now winning hearts and minds from coast to coast…

There are those who, in any case, suggest that her ideological roots have always remained rather shallow and that, for the most part of her life, politics have been overshadowed by the straightforward business of 'getting on'.

Even at university, Michelle was well aware that there was more to life than politics, admitting in that same thesis that a 'high-paying position' could prove more attractive than a life of placards and late-night meetings.

It was little surprise to those who knew her at the time that it was commerce not campaigning that claimed her when she graduated with a law degree from Harvard, taking a post with Sidley Austin, an eminent Chicago law firm. Her specialist area was not human rights or family law, but the lucrative detail of copyright and trademark cases.

An acquaintance of Obama's family compares her with another political wife, another lawyer as it happens, with a keen interest in making money.

"Michelle is very much like Cherie Blair. She is a middle-class girl who has discovered that money is nice and doesn't see that as a contradiction with having radical beliefs," he said. Chicago's veteran political consultant and pundit Joe Novak agrees, saying: "She [Michelle] is now motivated more by personal gain than by social consciousness. She saw her opportunities, and she took them." (Sharon Churcher, "Mrs O.: The truth about Michelle Obama's 'working class' credentials, London *Daily Mail,* February 23, 2008)

Sharon Churcher focuses on the affluent, opulent life style now affected by the arriviste Michelle, who is now thoroughly addicted to the finer things in life:

> The rewards have been significant. Despite the image she projects on the Newsweek cover, Michelle owns an impressive collection of diamond jewelry, designer outfits and £400-a-pair Jimmy Choo shoes.
>
> When she is wooing working-class voters, however, she favours austere black skirts and white blouses. "Our lives are so close to normal, if there is such a thing when you're running for president," she declared during a campaign stop in Delaware, shortly before her husband's latest victories were announced.
>
> "When I'm off the road, I'm going to Target to get the toilet paper."
>
> She did not bother to mention, however, that the paper, like the rest of the family shopping, is taken to an £825,000 three-storey [c. $1.6 million] red-brick Georgian revival mansion, set amid beautifully manicured lawns in one of Chicago's most affluent districts.

> Even the house became a source of controversy when it emerged that the wife of a Chicago slum landlord, Tony Rezko, helped them buy land to enlarge its grounds.
>
> More contentious still was Michelle's appointment as the £150,000-a-year vice-president of external affairs at the University of Chicago hospital in 2005.
>
> It came only two months after Barack was sworn in as a U.S. senator, and was attacked by critics as a blatant attempt by the hospital's hierarchy to curry favour with her husband, in an era when some politicians want to rein in the vast profits of America's medical system.
>
> They questioned why the wife of a committed Democrat would work for a hospital that has been accused of ruthless greed.
>
> Michelle's image was further tarnished in May 2006, when it was revealed that the centre - despite earning some £50 million a year – had refused to treat a man who could not afford to pay his bill. He died.
>
> All of which has led some political veterans to accuse Michelle of the very lack of compassion and moral scruples that her husband has lambasted in his Republican rivals for the White House. (Sharon Churcher, "Mrs O.: The truth about Michelle Obama's 'working class' credentials, London *Daily Mail,* February 23, 2008)

Michelle is thus a gatekeeper against the black community, and her activity has already claimed victims.[24]

Some sources reached by Sharon Churcher have been able to draw the necessary conclusions about Michelle Obama's substandard moral and political qualities. Unlike Hillary Clinton, they point out, neither Obama has endorsed far-reaching healthcare reforms.

Michelle also is under attack for joining the board of a food company where she allegedly took part in a 2005 decision to close a pickle and relish plant in La Junta, Colorado, putting 150 mostly Hispanic labourers out of work. The small town was devastated. "It totally amazed me when they closed it," said La Junta mayor Don Rizzuto, who had believed that Michelle and her husband were "the champions of the little guy."

In their most recently publicised tax returns, for 2005, the Obamas earned £800,000. This included royalties from the senator's autobiography *Dreams from My Father*, and his £82,600 Senate salary. Under a three-book deal which he subsequently signed, he stands to earn at least £1 million.

To Joe Novak, this only goes to prove that Michelle is distorting reality when she attempts to depict herself as a champion of the masses. "For the past year (she and Barack) have jetted around the country with Oprah Winfrey and Robert De Niro, enjoying penthouse parties and living the high life," he said.

Perhaps, when she contrasts her current red-carpet lifestyle with the unassuming world of South Euclid Avenue, she genuinely may think that her childhood was impoverished. And the one thing that is certain about the incredible Mrs O. is that she never intends to have to live that way again.' (Sharon Churcher, "Mrs O.: The truth about Michelle Obama's 'working class' credentials, London *Daily Mail,* February 23, 2008)

Barack Obama has the mental structures of a fatherless boy, and he knows it. "The truth is that none of the men in my life were that successful or that stable," [Michelle] Obama told me. "They made an awful lot of mistakes." (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008) Later, when it came time to marry Michelle, he hesitated; Barack had a more bohemian attitude toward romance. "We would

have this running debate throughout our relationship about whether marriage was necessary," Obama told me. "It was sort of a bone of contention, because I was, like, 'Look, buddy, I'm not one of these who'll just hang out forever.' You know, that's just not who I am. He was, like"—she broke into a wishy-washy voice — 'Marriage, it doesn't mean anything, it's really how you feel.' And I was, like, 'Yeah, right.'" (Jim Geraghty, "The Campaign Spot," March 5, 2008)

At Obama's wedding, his new brother-in-law, Craig Robinson, who had been an athlete at Princeton, pulled him aside and inquired about his plans. Obama "'…said, 'I think I'd like to teach at some point in time, and maybe run for public office," recalls Robinson, who assumed Obama meant he'd like to run for city alderman. "He said no — at some point he'd like to run for the U.S. Senate. And then he said, 'Possibly even run for President at some point.' And I was like, 'Okay, but don't say that to my Aunt Gracie.' I was protecting him from saying something that might embarrass him."'[25] Obama did not tell his brother in law that his self and his career were controlled assets of the Trilateral Commission, his sponsors.

MICHELLE OBAMA AS A CREATURE OF THE CORRUPT DALEY MACHINE

Michelle had made her way in the world as an asset of the corrupt Chicago Democratic machine, the Daley family machine. She was in her own way a ward heeler and wheel horse for Daley's city hall apparatus, with one key contact being Valerie Jarrett, a political fixer on the make. 'Obama went straight from Princeton to Harvard Law School. After graduating, she became a junior associate, specializing in intellectual property law, at the Chicago firm of Sidley & Austin. She worked there for three years, eventually becoming, as she says in her stump speech, disenchanted with "corporate America." Valerie Jarrett hired her as an assistant to the mayor, Richard Daley. "In the planning department, part of her job was to help businesses solve problems," Jarrett told me. Sort of like a one-woman 311? "No, a 911," Jarrett responded. "She made problems go away just that fast."

In 1993, she was appointed the founding director of the Chicago office of a public-service program called Public Allies, which places young adults from diverse backgrounds in paid internships with nonprofit organizations. An early appearance in the Chicago *Tribune* was in an article about Gen X-ers. Obama told the reporter, "I wear jeans, and I'm the director." Michelle and Barack met at Sidley & Austin, when she was assigned to advise him during a summer job. Michelle's co-workers warned her that the summer associate was cute. "I figured that they were just impressed with any black man with a suit and a job," she later told Barack.' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008) We see that Michelle, too, has a record of serving the foundations. Among other things, Michelle embodies the fascist potential of generation X, which is an echo of the Lost Generation born between 1885 and 1905 – the generation that gave the world Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin even as it founded fascism.

THE BLACK OVERCLASS RAGE OF MICHELLE OBAMA

Reporters, even the drooling acolyte types, have observed that inordinate rage of the wealthy elitist lawyer Michelle Obama. Early in 2008, she said that she wanted to assault and maim former President Clinton: 'In Wisconsin, I asked her if she was offended by Bill Clinton's use of the phrase "fairy tale" to describe her husband's characterization of his position on the Iraq War. At first, Obama responded with a curt "No." But, after a few seconds, she affected a funny voice. "I want to rip his eyes out!" she said, clawing at the air with her fingernails. One of her advisers gave her a

nervous look. "Kidding!" Obama said. "See, this is what gets me into trouble."' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008) For Michelle, Bill was obviously a monster.

Michelle is famous for her diagnosis that America is a mean country, which appeared for the first time in the *New Yorker*: 'Obama begins with a broad assessment of life in America in 2008, and life is not good: we're a divided country, we're a country that is "just downright mean," we are "guided by fear," we're a nation of cynics, sloths, and complacents. "We have become a nation of struggling folks who are barely making it every day," she said, as heads bobbed in the pews. "Folks are just jammed up, and it's gotten worse over my lifetime. And, doggone it, I'm young. Forty-four!"' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008) It is of course true that the US standard of living has been cut by about two thirds over the last four decades, so Michelle is doubtless correct in that abstract sense. It is the part about "cynics, sloths, and complacents" that needs examination. If you want to attack the causes for the immiseration of America, then you should get busy attacking Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, and their political puppets. But Michelle does not do this at all. She attacks the supposed moral inferiority of the American people, while letting Wall Street off the hook along with all the other power centers. The decline of the country becomes a matter of purely individual responsibility, setting the stage, one senses, for a demand of austerity and sacrifice so as to make expiation.

Spengler of the *Asia Times* argues that the real nature of Obama's emotional makeup can be seen most readily by looking at Michelle. Obama has learned to dissemble, but could not hide the criteria that he used when choosing a wife. Michelle is a bubbling cauldron of racial hatred, and this pot has boiled over from time to time during the campaign. This is the most important evidence that Obama himself is also a compulsive hater. Obama, says Spengler, tries to hide this,

> but Michelle Obama is a living witness. Her February 18 comment that she felt proud of her country for the first time caused a minor scandal, and was hastily qualified. But she meant it, and more. The video footage of her remarks shows eyes hooded with rage as she declares:
>
> "For the first time in my adult lifetime, I am really proud of my country and not just because Barack has done well, but because I think people are hungry for change. And I have been desperate to see our country moving in that direction and just not feeling so alone in my frustration and disappointment."
>
> The desperation, frustration and disappointment visible on Michelle Obama's face are not new to the candidate's wife; as Steve Sailer, Rod Dreher and other commentators have noted, they were the theme of her undergraduate thesis, on the subject of "blackness" at Princeton University. No matter what the good intentions of Princeton, which founded her fortunes as a well-paid corporate lawyer, she wrote,
>
> "My experiences at Princeton have made me far more aware of my 'Blackness' than ever before. I have found that at Princeton no matter how liberal and open-minded some of my White professors and classmates try to be toward me, I sometimes feel like a visitor on campus; as if I really don't belong." (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008)

OBAMA BITCH-SLAPPED IN PUBLIC BY MICHELLE

Michelle has also been prodigal in her public abuse of Obama – a jarring note which was extremely incongruous during the earlier, more seraphic phase of Obama's campaign, before the scandals and dossiers began to emerge. For the cynical central European Spengler, an experienced man of the world, this is an index of Michelle's vast power. Spengler observes:

> Never underestimate the influence of a wife who bitch-slaps her husband in public. Early in Obama's campaign, Michelle Obama could not restrain herself from belittling the senator.
>
> "I have some difficulty reconciling the two images I have of Barack Obama. There's Barack Obama the phenomenon. He's an amazing orator, Harvard Law Review, or whatever it was, law professor, best-selling author, Grammy winner. Pretty amazing, right? And then there's the Barack Obama that lives with me in my house, and that guy's a little less impressive," she told a fundraiser in February 2007.
>
> "For some reason this guy still can't manage to put the butter up when he makes toast, secure the bread so that it doesn't get stale, and his five-year-old is still better at making the bed than he is." *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd reported at the time, "She added that the TV version of Barack Obama sounded really interesting and that she'd like to meet him sometime." Her handlers have convinced her to be more tactful since then.
>
> "Frustration" and "disappointment" have dogged Michelle Obama these past 20 years, despite her US$300,000 a year salary and corporate board memberships…. Obama's choice of wife is a failsafe indicator of his own sentiments. Spouses do not necessarily share their likes, but they must have their hatreds in common. Obama imbibed this hatred with his mother's milk.' (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008)

MICHELLE OBAMA: THE THESIS OF SELF-ABSORPTION

In 1985, in order to graduate from Princeton with her AB in sociology, Michelle had to submit a senior thesis, which was entitled "Princeton-Educated Blacks and the Black Community." It is filed under her maiden name, Michelle LaVaughn Robinson. It is 96 pages long, and reposes in the Mudd Library on campus. This thesis attracted much attention when it was "temporarily withdrawn" from Princeton's library until after the November 2008 election. Some extracts had appeared previously in the *Newark Star Ledger*. Because of Obama's standard vapid rhetoric about hope, change, and the new politics, the attempt to suppress Michelle's thesis appeared at once as a cynical act of stonewalling. Michelle looked very much like the super-secretive George Bush. Jonah Goldberg reported on National Review Online, "A reader in the know informs me that Michelle Obama's thesis ... is unavailable until Nov. 5, 2008, at the Princeton library. I wonder why." "Why a restricted thesis?" chimed in Louis Lapides on his site, Thinking Outside the Blog. "Is the concern based on what's in the thesis? Will Michelle Obama appear to be too black for white America or not black enough for black America?" Princeton librarians were so pestered by those wanting to see the infamous thesis that they started reading their refusal from a script. Princeton media officers joined in the stonewall claiming it is "not unusual" for a thesis to be restricted and refusing to discuss "the academic work of alumni." The embarrassment for Obama became so great that he decided to release the thesis to the *Politico*, which is controlled by the reactionary Allbritton interests.[26]

The thesis deals mainly with Michelle's own *cahier de doléances* of racist slights and her race-based world outlook. "My experiences at Princeton have made me far more aware of my 'blackness' than ever before," she states in the introduction. "I have found that at Princeton, no matter how liberal and open-minded some of my white professors and classmates try to be toward me, I sometimes feel like a visitor on campus; as if I really don't belong. Regardless of the circumstances under which I interact with whites at Princeton, it often seems as if, to them, I will always be black first and a student second." "I feel" is her pole star and compass as she goes through life. She is an extreme example of the radical subjectivist world view of late Anglo-

American imperialism. She offers no analysis of conditions in the ghetto, or ideas for recovery, reconstruction, and reform. Her axiomatic standpoint is her own greedy and infantile ego.

At that point in her life, Michelle thought that her future career after Princeton would bring her towards "further integration and/or assimilation into a white cultural and social structure that will only allow me to remain on the periphery of society; never becoming a full participant." "In defining the concept of identification or the ability to identify with the black community," Michelle elaborates, "I based my definition on the premise that there is a distinctive black culture very different from white culture." This is of course the central tenet of the pork-chop nationalist position. It is not a scientific analysis of culture. It is rather a rhetorical strategy and political pose for extracting more and better concessions from the affirmative action system, which has left two thirds to three quarters of the black community in poverty for the last 40 years, since the system was put in place by Nixon and George Shultz, his Secretary of Labor.

MICHELLE SHOCKED TO FIND WEALTHY SNOBS AT PRINCETON!

For this affirmative action method to work, it is indispensable that grievances be kept alive and at the center of attention; if one is to be a beneficiary, one must always be a victim. Michelle writes, with dubious orthography: "Predominately white universities like Princeton are socially and academically designed to cater to the needs of the white students comprising the bulk of their enrollments." Warming to the victimhood that this analysis offers, she goes on to complain that Princeton in 1985 had only five black tenured professors on its faculty. The Afro-American studies program "is one of the smallest and most understaffed departments in the university." There was only one campus group "designed specifically for the intellectual and social interests of blacks and other third world students." Today her pose is that she is a typical home girl of the south side Chicago 'hood; before that, she was from the third world, as we see here. The stance is determined by the object she is seeking at that moment. She strove mightily to get into Princeton, but she now finds the place "infamous for being racially the most conservative of the Ivy League universities." If she had wanted to avoid wealthy snobs, why then did she choose Princeton in the first place? Was she a complete fool? If she wanted third-world students, she could have headed for a dozen ultra-left campuses. What Michelle is evidently seeking here is the pose of going to Princeton and scorning the place at the same time, the better to enhance her status as a person who has secured the invidious best, but rejected it as not good enough.

At this time Michelle was interested in the work of sociologists James Conyers and Walter Wallace, who delved into white-black community relations. These two discussed the "integration of black official(s) into various aspects of politics" and notes "problems which face these black officials who must persuade the white community that they are above issues of race and that they are representing all people and not just black people," instead of seeking to build up "two separate social structures." This is the delicate question of how to make the transition from the affirmative action black nationalist stance necessary to secure grants and set-asides, to the more inclusive posture that would be necessary to run for office in any constituency not dominated by blacks. Michelle had no solution for this problem then; the solution has been supplied by Axelrod, who discovered that messianic platitudes and vapid utopian sloganeering about non-partisanship, hope, and change would allow this shift to be carried out while duping the gullible and guilt-ridden white liberals, who, after all, were eager to be fooled.

Michelle mailed out an 18-question survey to a sample of 400 black Princeton graduates, asking them to estimate the amount of time and "comfort" level spent interacting with blacks and whites

before they went to Princeton, while they were on campus, and after graduation. Michelle also asked about their religious beliefs, living arrangements, careers, role models, economic status, and attitudes towards the black underclass. She asked the respondents to specify whether they agreed more with a "separationist and/or pluralist" viewpoint or an "integrationist and/or assimilationist" ideology. About 90 alumni sent back the questionnaires, yielding a response rate of about 22 percent. Michelle wrote that she was disappointed with the answers, since they indicated a weakening of the race-based or *Völkische Identität* of the black Princetonians surveyed. Michelle complained: "I hoped that these findings would help me conclude that despite the high degree of identification with whites as a result of the educational and occupational path that black Princeton alumni follow, the alumni would still maintain a certain level of identification with the black community. However, these findings do not support this possibility..." (Politico.com, February 23, 2008)[27]

With this, Michelle had discovered that social reality was not in conformity with the race-based view of life she had assumed as part of her quest for upward mobility under conditions of affirmative action. Even her small sample suggested that race was an empty construct, that racial solidarity could not function as the organizing principle of life, and that racialist or racist thinking was above all alien to lived social reality. She was not pleased. Concerning the abysmal quality of her work in the strict academic sense, the less said the better.

Michelle Obama is thus revealed to have been a self-absorbed, self-centered, self-obsessed, self-serving, and self-righteous undergraduate. We can perhaps detect here an egomania or megalomania which is evidently the psychological basis of her marriage with Obama: they both imagine themselves as the centers of the world. The questionnaire was of course a mere formality, serving to mask Michelle's intense preoccupation with her own radically subjective feeling states. She was interesting in delving into herself, and the forms she sent out and compiled were but a fig leaf in that obsessively introspective process. She lacks any sense of reality, since she forgets that she is in a position where she is envied by the vast majority of college youth; she needs to portray herself as a victim of something, be it slights real or imagined. She also has no gratitude for the special privileges that have been given her through no merit of her own.

Michelle Obama's odious personality may well emerge as a telling argument in any future debate about the viability of affirmative action as against color-blind, class-based programs that recognize class, poverty, and exclusion, and no longer racial discrimination, as the critical problem of US society. Michelle will become the poster child for abolishing quotas, preferences, set asides, and the entire affirmative action apparatus. The argument will be that no system which has produced such a person deserves to be perpetuated, while 60% or 70% of black America remains in the despair of the inner city ghetto. Michelle can thus safely be said to constitute a huge vulnerability among the many huge vulnerabilities of the Obama campaign. If we look back to Jimmy Carter, we can perhaps see how dangerous a person like Michelle can become when she is unleashed on the national stage, as she necessarily will be.

MICHELLE OBAMA: HATING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Speaking at a rally in Wisconsin on February 18, 2008 Michelle delivered the lines which have made her infamous: "For the first time in my adult lifetime, I am really proud of my country, and not just because Barack has done well, but because I think people are hungry for change." This was an element in her standard stump tirade on several subsequent occasions, leaving no doubt that she really meant it and meant to say it. If nothing else, it was a catastrophic failure of deception and

concealment: Michelle cannot contain her own assiduously cultivated rage, even when the expression of that rage becomes destructive to her and a threat to her consuming ambition.

National pride and national honor are not a bad thing. Honor, in fact, is the one ything that humans cannot live without. Like everything else, much depends on how it is used. The American New Deal state created by Franklin D. Roosevelt with the help of the sit-down strikers and the trade union organizers represented the most advanced form of human organization ever seen. The New Deal state battled the Great Depression, defeated Hitler, Tojo, Mussolini, and fascism, kept the UK and USSR on their feet through Lend-Lease, contained and frustrated Stalin and Mao, unlocked the secrets of the atom, and put humans on the moon. Abraham Lincoln was the greatest man of the nineteenth century, and, together with Russia and Prussia, saved the world from the uncontested universal despotism of the British Empire under Lord Palmerston. There was a dark side – generally the handiwork of the finance oligarchs, north and south, yet there was much to be proud of. But not for the racist Michelle Obama, partly because Michelle is also a postmodernist and multiculturalist. Postmodernism holds that any conception of human greatness is an illusion, an obscene distortion of human pettiness, fecklessness, and mediocrity. Nobody is a hero to a postmodernist – not because there are no heroes and heroines, but because the postmodernist is too crabbed, deformed, and envious to admit the category of human greatness in any form. Michelle has a perfect right to her wretched opinions, but she has no right to take them to the White House and make it into the bordello of world history.

Why does the super-privileged wealthy elitist Michelle hate the United States and the American people? Partly, one thinks, because she forgets the largesse and holds fast to the memory of the adversities. On February 29, 2008 Michelle visited Zanesville, Ohio, where she greeted some local women at a local day care center. Michelle launched into sententious nostrums sharply contradicted by her own greedy, rapacious, and social-climbing lifestyle: "We left corporate America, which is a lot of what we're asking young people to do," she tells the women, not mentioning that she works for the ultra-reactionary, Rockefeller-founded University of Chicago, and sits on the boards of job-destroying corporations. "Don't go into corporate America. You know, become teachers. Work for the community. Be social workers. Be a nurse. Those are the careers that we need, and we're encouraging our young people to do that. But if you make that choice, as we did, to move out of the money-making industry into the helping industry, then your salaries respond."

During this same appearance, Michelle demonstrated how out-of-touch she is, by bemoaning the amount of money she has to spend on piano, dance, and other lessons for her two daughters. The sum she cited came to nearly one-third of the median household income in Zanesville, which was $37,192 in 2004, which is below both the Ohio and national averages. Just 12.2 percent of adults in that county have a bachelor's degree or higher, also well below the state and national averages. About 20 percent don't have a high school degree. Michelle was a multi-millionairess; she was indeed out of touch. And she wanted to stay that way. She expects the group of women, whom she could buy many times over, to sympathize with her. '"Everywhere I go, no matter what, the women in the audience, their first question for me is, 'How on earth are you managing it, how are you keeping it all together?'" she pontificated to the women of modest means in Zanesville.[28]

One of Michelle's favorite themes is that she had had to take out student loans to get through Princeton and Harvard. She complains about how long it has taken her and Barry to pay off these loans. She talks about how it has taken them years and years, well into middle age, to pay off their debts. "The salaries don't keep up with the cost of paying off the debt, so you're in your 40s, still paying off your debt at a time when you have to save for your kids," Michelle laments. "Barack and

I were in that position. The only reason we're not in that position is that Barack wrote two best-selling books… It was like Jack and his magic beans. But up until a few years ago, we were struggling to figure out how we would save for our kids." "We left corporate America, which is a lot of what we're asking young people to do," Michelle typically says, adding that "many of our bright stars are going into corporate law or hedge-fund management."

Michelle talks a good rap about hard times in America, but she makes it all turn on what has to be done for her personally, not for the voters; For Michelle, the axiomatic point of view is always but always herself: 'Her frame of reference can seem narrow. When she talks about wanting "my girls to travel the world with pride" and the decline of America "over my lifetime," you wonder why her default pronoun is singular if the message is meant to be concern for others and inclusiveness.' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008) For obvious demagogic reasons, Michelle also fails to distinguish between the relative stabilization of falling real wages under Clinton, and the precipitous decline that resumed under Bush the younger: 'In Cheraw, Obama belittled the idea that the Clinton years were ones of opportunity and prosperity: "The life that I'm talking about that most people are living has gotten progressively worse since I was a little girl. . . . So if you want to pretend like there was some point over the last couple of decades when your lives were easy, I want to meet you!"' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

MICHELLE OBAMA: BOUNCER FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO HOSPITAL

Michelle's job is that of a bouncer or gatekeeper for the University of Chicago Hospital, which is located close to the edge of the black ghetto. The problem faced by the University of Chicago managers is that too many sick and dying indigent black people come to their emergency room in a desperate attempt to get some kind of treatment. Michelle's job is to push these poverty-stricken black people back into the ghetto to die in nondescript waiting rooms in poorly-equipped doctors' offices or dingy substandard clinics there. Her qualifications of this job were that she had to be black, and she had to be cruel, with no hint of the racial solidarity that she has hypocritically paraded in public for most of her life. Michelle has made out like a bandit in this cruel and inhuman line of work. In 2006, the *Chicago Tribune* reported that Mrs. Obama's compensation at the University of Chicago Hospital, where her title is vice president for community affairs, jumped from $121,910 in 2004 (just before Barry was installed in the Senate), to $316,962 in 2005, just after he took office. This does not include the honoraria Michelle takes in from serving on corporate boards. [29]

Michelle's rapidly expanding personal income has raised more than eyebrows: '"Mrs. Obama is extremely overpaid," one citizen wrote in a letter to the editor of the *Tribune*, after the paper published a story questioning the timing of the award. "Now, what is the real reason behind such an inflated salary?" Her bosses at the University of Chicago Hospitals vigorously defended the raise, pointing out that it put her salary on a par with that of other vice-presidents at the hospital. (As it happens, Obama has spent most of her life working within the two institutions for which she most frequently claims a populist disdain: government and the health-care system.)' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Michelle's role in excluding indigent patients from the University of Chicago Hospital where she works has also drawn attention from congressional investigators. One such instance: 'The ranking minority member on the Senate Finance Committee is seeking information from the non-profit University of Chicago Medical Center about jobs held by Sen. Barack Obama's wife and one of his best friends,' reported Joe Stephens of the

Washington Post. 'Sen. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) on Friday sent the center a letter saying he was "troubled" by recent news reports about the hospital's efforts to steer patients with non-urgent complaints away from the center' emergency room to local clinics. Michelle Obama was a key figure behind the initiative. The letter, which Grassley released to the public September 2, 2008, does not directly mention the Democratic presidential nominee, his wife or his campaign. Grassley also asked for financial data, board minutes and other documents related to hiring, job promotion, business contracting and care for the poor.' 'For years, Grassley has argued that non-profit hospitals should spend more resources on the poor and be more financially accountable, in return for the millions of dollars they keep each year as a result of their tax-exempt status. Grassley has periodically demanded financial data from selected hospitals and issued reports detailing perceived shortcomings. He has also chaired a Senate hearing on the topic.' Grassley also wanted information on the hospital's conflict of interest policy, and also wanted to probe hiring practices, evidently including the public relations contract which went to Obama spinmeister David Axelrod, and a computer contract that was awarded to Obama moneybags Robert Blackwell. (http://voices.washingtonpost.com/washingtonpostinvestigations/2008/09/sen_grassley_seeks_university.html) Here is how the hospital itself advertised a fall 2005 community forum, complete with free dinner, chaired by Michelle Obama: 'Michelle Obama, vice president for community affairs at the University of Chicago Hospitals, will serve as moderator. The South Side Health Collaborative is a partnership, supported by the federal Health Resources and Services Administration, which is devoted to improving access to quality healthcare for the uninsured, underserved, and special needs populations. The Collaborative pulls together 13 Federally Qualified Health Clinics, two social service organizations, private physicians, and the University of Chicago Hospitals. Its goal is to help patients find a medical home, enabling them to build a lasting relationship with a primary care physician in their neighborhoods. Since the program began in January 2005, members of the Collaborative have interviewed more than 12,000 patients who came to the emergency room at the University of Chicago Hospitals for care because they did not have a regular physician. They have helped more than 1,000 patients connect with a primary care provider, often making an appointment for follow-up care before the patient leaves the ER.' (http://www.uchospitals.edu/news/2005/20051108-collaborative.html) The big question was of course whether Barky's political clout as a newly minted US Senator had been used to procure the federal grant for Michelle's exclusion operation, raising Obama's signature problems of dirty politics, influence peddling, and graft.

The dividing line between the elite and the mass in modern America comes down to one question: do you have servants? Bush did, and the Obamas emphatically do. As the New Yorker reported, "The Obamas employ a full-time housekeeper, and Michelle tries to see a personal trainer four times a week," but they claim that they do not also have a nanny. In 2005, "the Obamas moved to a $1.65-million Georgian Revival mansion in Hyde Park, which features a thousand-bottle wine cellar and bookcases made of Honduran mahogany**."**

TYPICAL *PARVENU* STYLE

The Obamas, in short, are typical parvenu arrivistes, and they revel in it: 'The Obamas are fixtures of Chicago's philanthro-social scene: there they are, waving from a silver Mustang at the annual Bud Billiken Parade and Picnic; there's Michelle delivering remarks at the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority's Seventy-second Central Regional Conference; there she is arriving at the Black Creativity Gala with a shopping bag full of "Obama for Senator" buttons. Cindy Moelis recalls being shocked, after agreeing to host Obama's baby shower, that the guest list included fifty people. "Hmmm," Michael Sneed, the *Sun-Times* columnist, reported in 2006. "Sneed hears rumbles a mink coat reportedly belonging to Michelle Obama, wife of Sen. Barack Obama, may have gone missing following the Rev. Jesse Jackson's birthday bash at the South Shore Cultural Center."'(*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Is Michelle being criticized unfairly? 'Some observers have detected in Obama an air of entitlement. Her defenders attribute these charges of arrogance to racist fears about uppity black women. While it's a stretch to call the suggestion that Obama projects an air of self-satisfaction bigoted, it may at least reflect a culture gap: last April, after Maureen Dowd wrote a column criticizing Obama for undermining her husband's mystique, a blog riposte, circulated widely on the Internet, was titled "The White Lady Just Doesn't Get It." The sentiment—that America was in a mess, and Mrs. Obama was not happy about it—was not a new one, but her unfortunate formulation instantly drew charges that she was unpatriotic. Bill O'Reilly spawned his own scandalette, remarking, "I don't want to go on a lynching party against Michelle Obama unless there's evidence, hard facts, that say this is how the woman really feels." Victor Maltsev, of Rego Park, wrote to the *Post*, "Obama wants to be our next first lady? Watch out, America!" Cindy McCain seized the opportunity to draw a sniffy contrast between the Obamas and her and her war-hero husband, telling a cheering crowd, "I don't know about you—if you heard those words earlier—I'm very proud of my country."' (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Michelle embodies the condescending, patronizing attitude of the entire Obama operation: it is a mission to the benighted denizens of Middle America, viewed as ethnographic material. Michelle has to ask for votes, and she finds that this is beneath her new-found opulence and social prestige: 'Perhaps Obama's high-handedness is preëmptive, her way of "claiming a seat at the table"—as she is fond of calling enfranchisement in the power-brokering structure—rather than waiting to be offered one. It's as though she figures she might as well say that she and her husband are all that before someone can say that they aren't. And there's a sort of strategic genius to her presentation of campaigning as grinding work that takes her away from her family, rather than a glorious tour of the world's greatest country that she would be thrilled to be undertaking even if she didn't have to. She frequently tells her audiences, "I don't care where I am, the first question is 'How are you managing it all? How are you holding up?' "The effect, of course, is to set up an expectation of tribute, like those hairdressers who display all their gifts in the days leading up to Christmas. By loudly voicing her distaste for retail politicking, Obama makes people feel as though, by showing up, she were doing *them* a favor." (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Michelle may well be more devoted to Jeremiah Wright than Barry is. At a recent campaign stop, her exordium went as follows: "You all got up bright and early just for me?" she asked the mostly elderly, almost all-black crowd. "Yes!" they roared. Obama continued, "On behalf of my church home and my pastor, Reverend Wright, I bring greetings." After warming up the crowd, Obama launched into her stump speech, a forty-five-minute monologue that she composed herself and delivers without notes. (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

The *New Yorker*, a bastion of pro-Obama devotion, provides some clues to the ultimate sources of Michelle's rage, hatred, and hauteur. She is tormented by feelings of inferiority, low self-worth and self-esteem, and the sense of impending doom. One is reminded of Napoleon's mother, who kept repeating "longo mai," meaning, in her Corsican dialect: Let's hope all this lasts. People like this generally try to sock away a stash of money in case it doesn't last, and Michelle will likely be no exception.

When the *New Yorker* began asking about this obvious internal stress, Michelle replied:

> "What minority communities go through still represents the challenges, the legacies, of oppression and racism. You know, when you have cultures who feel like second-class citizens at some level . . . there's this natural feeling within the community that we're not good enough . . . we can't be as smart as or as prepared—and it's that internal struggle that is always the

> battle." She talked about her first trip to Africa—Barack took her to Kenya to meet his father's family—and the realization that, as much as white society fails to account for the African-American experience, so does any conception of pan-blackness. In *The Audacity of Hope*, Barack Obama perceives a vulnerability in his wife, one so closely guarded that even her brother professed to me never to have noticed it. There was "a glimmer that danced across her round, dark eyes whenever I looked at her," he writes, "the slightest hint of uncertainty, as if, deep inside, she knew how fragile things really were, and that if she ever let go, even for a moment, all her plans might quickly unravel." (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

Napoleon's mother again. Could Michelle be a candidate for a nervous breakdown, or else for uncontrollable transports of rage – likely to be couched in racist terms – out on the campaign trail? We may be close to finding out.

OBAMA JOINS MINER, BARNHILL, AND GALLAND, REZKO'S LAWYERS

Obama went to work for the Chicago law firm of Miner, Barnhill, and Galland. The firm presents itself on its current web site in these terms: "Miner, Barnhill, & Galland was founded in 1971 and today consists of fourteen lawyers in two offices. Ten lawyers are resident in the Chicago Office and four lawyers office [sic] in Madison, Wisconsin. The firm has acquired a national reputation in civil rights litigation and neighborhood economic development work. In addition to its practice in these areas, the firm represents a broad range of individual and corporate clients, providing a wide variety of legal services." On the surface it was a mix of socially conscious left-of-center causes, therefore, with a good dose of lucrative corporate work, meshing well with Obama's neoliberal camouflage profile. But note the "economic development work," since here lies the rub.

According to at least one account, Obama already knew that he wanted to get elected in the Hyde Park neighborhood, a region of great sensitivity to the University of Chicago, and thus to the Rockefeller family and to the US intelligence community in general:

> When Judson H. Miner invited a third-year Harvard Law School student named Barack Obama to lunch at the Thai Star Cafe in Chicago before his 1991 graduation, Mr. Miner thought he was recruiting the 29-year-old to work for his boutique civil rights law firm. Instead, Mr. Obama recruited him.
>
> Mr. Obama made it clear that he was less interested in a job than in learning the political lay of the land from a man who had served at the right hand of the city's first black mayor, Harold Washington. Mr. Miner, who had helped with the historic 1983 election of Mr. Washington and served as his corporation counsel, proved a willing tutor.
>
> The confident younger man "cross-examined" Mr. Miner about how Mr. Washington had managed to emerge from an election riven by bigotry to form a governing coalition in which he "got along with all these different types of folks," Mr. Miner recalled.
>
> "During the course of our talking, it came out that people who knew he was having lunch with me were trying to convince him that this was the worst place for him to go. He shared this with me — he was amused," Mr. Miner said, laughing. "This isn't where you land if you want to curry favor with the Democratic power structure."
>
> It was, however, exactly where an aspiring politician might land if he happened to want to run for office from Hyde Park, a neighborhood with a long history of electing reform-minded politicians independent of the city's legendary Democratic machine. Mr. Obama chose to put

> down roots in the neighborhood after graduating law school and marrying Michelle Robinson, a Chicago native and fellow lawyer. […]
>
> Mr. Miner was "enormously helpful" in introducing Mr. Obama to the liberal coalition of blacks and whites that had helped elect Mr. Washington, said Valerie Jarrett, a longtime friend and close adviser. "It brought in a whole new circle of people." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

At this critical point in his career, Obama once again seemed to have a guardian angel or familiar spirit hovering overhead, this time in the form of Thomas Ayers, the august father of Barky's terrorist friend Bill Ayers, the aging Weatherman of whom we will have much to recount. The solicitude of Thomas Ayers and his family, including Bernardine Dohrn, for Obama's upward mobility, we stress again, is part of a pattern of foundation and intelligence community intervention in favor of Obama which started when his mother joined the Ford Foundation, and which became intense during the years when Obama and Zbigniew Brzezinski were at Columbia in 1981-1983. Steve Diamond suggested how Obama was hired:

> The partner who hired him was Judson Miner. Miner was a well-known left wing lawyer in Chicago who had been counsel to the progressive black mayor in the 80s, Harold Washington. But Miner possibly also had ties to the Ayers family. He was law school classmates with Bernardine Dohrn at the University of Chicago (both Class of 1967). He formed a lawyers group against the war after graduation and organized a left wing alternative to the local Chicago bar association.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

Obama also taught in an adjunct teaching position at the University of Chicago, and he has consistently tried to upgrade this into the claim that he was a law "professor," a title to which he never had any right. If he were to go to Germany, he could be prosecuted for *Titelmißbrauch*, the abusive faking of academic titles. On March 27, 2007 Obama told a fundraiser, "I was a constitutional law professor, which means unlike the current president I actually respect the Constitution." But Obama is an imposter. He has never been a professor, except in the most generic sense. Obama has been a "Senior Lecturer (on leave of absence)" at the University of Chicago Law School, which is controlled by his backers and controllers. He has taught courses in Constitutional Law III: Equal Protection and Substantive Due Process, Current Issues in Racism and the Law, and Voting Rights and the Democratic Process.

THE CHICAGO CESSPOOL OF CORRUPTION: OBAMA'S HEART OF DARKNESS

But there was much more than meets the eye at the modest Chicago left-wing law firm now called Davis, Miner, and Barnhill law firm. Evelyn Pringle has gone back to the time after Obama's graduation from Harvard Law School, when he was hired by what then was Miner, Barnhill, and Galland. Even at that time, Allison Davis was the dominant personality at the firm. And the secret of Miner, Barnhill, and Galland was that it was Tony Rezko's law firm:

> After turning down the surprise job offer from Rezko, Obama expects voters to believe that he just happened to get hired at the small 12-attorney Davis law firm, which just happened to represent Rezmar in development deals. And then a couple years later, Rezko's companies just happened to appear on the very first contributions made to the "Friends of Obama" committee to launch his political career as a state senator.' (Evelyn Pringle, op-ed news)[30]

Another Chicago analyst reminds us that it was Rezko who made Allison Davis a big man through his patronage:

> Rezko got Allison S. Davis appointed to the Illinois State Board of Investment, in control of billions in state retirement funds. Although Davis has not been charged with wrongdoing, the feds are reportedly pressing a probe of that agency. Davis is currently the president of that State Board. Barack Obama was a Harvard Law student in 1990 when he interviewed for a job with Tony Rezko's slum-redevelopment firm. He didn't go directly into the Rezko company. But in 1993 Obama was hired by Allison S. Davis, whose law firm (Davis Miner Barnhill & Galland) represented Rezko's operations over the years, while Rezko raised cash for Obama's electoral campaigns. Davis became Rezko's personal financial partner in slum-redevelopment deals, which were then backed by State Senator Obama. (John Desiderio, Working Life, January 27, 2008)

"Operation Board Games" is the code name for the prosecution of Rezko, joined potentially by Chicago Mayor Richard Daley, Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich, and other Democratic and Republican pols, ward-heelers, and fixers. One of the central points of this probe is the Davis, Miner, and Barnhill law firm, where Obama was employed. Pringle outlines the case as follows:

> The investigation dubbed "Operation Board Games," into the influence peddling within the cesspool of corruption that encompasses Illinois politicians from both major parties, has developed into multiple subplots, many of which feature Barack Obama. They also give the details of Obama's involvement in a slumlord business largely operating out of the Chicago-based Davis, Miner & Barnhill law firm, which hired Obama in 1993, with his boss, Allison Davis, reaping in the profits with Rezko's development company, Rezmar. [Pringle's] "Board Games for Slumlord" article gives in-depth details of the federal investigation along with the names of people who are listed as "Co-Schemers" and "Individuals" in the indictments issued thus far. Therefore for the most part, this article will refer to all the scams collectively as what prosecutors refer to as "pay-to-play" schemes. The Davis Miner Barnhill & Galland law firm, where Obama worked for nearly a decade, served as a hub for a slew of slumlord deals, many that benefited the firm's founder, Allison Davis, and Obama's claims that he knew nothing about the inner workings of this small firm, represent an insult to the intelligence of the American public…. Allison Davis, Obama's boss at the law firm, is also listed in legal documents as playing a part in setting up a major extortion attempt in the Board Games case. (Pringle, oped news)

A recent expose published in the *Boston Globe* also points directly to Obama's choice of law firms to work for not as a selfless gesture of idealistic commitment, but rather as an entrée into the sleazy world of Chicago graft:

> Allison Davis, Obama's former law firm boss, dabbled in development for years while he worked primarily as a lawyer. He participated in the development of Grove Parc Plaza. And in 1996, Davis left his law firm to pursue a full-time career as an affordable housing developer, fueled by the subsidies from the Daley administration and aided, on occasion, by Obama himself. Over roughly the past decade, Davis's companies have received more than $100 million in subsidies to renovate and build more than 1,500 apartments in Chicago, according to a Chicago Sun-Times tally. In several cases, Davis partnered with Tony Rezko. In 1998 the two men created a limited partnership to build an apartment building for seniors on Chicago's South Side. Obama wrote letters on state Senate stationery supporting city and state loans for the project. In 2000 Davis asked the nonprofit Woods Fund of Chicago for a $1 million investment

> in a new development partnership, Neighborhood Rejuvenation Partners. Obama, a member of the board, voted in favor, helping Davis secure the investment. (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

OBAMA: THE MOST CORRUPT SINCE HARDING? OR SINCE GRANT?

It was a form of corruption which siphoned off immense quantities of public resources in order to slake the greed of a very small group of insiders, wheel horses, and fixers. In Pringle's evaluation, Barack Obama has a long history of working with Chicago Mayor Richard Daley and governors of Illinois, including the current Governor Rod Blagojevich, in doling out government funding for housing development in Chicago. His history is hardly a model of success, except for the hundreds of millions in profits made by the chosen few slumlords. Less than a year ago, in the April 26, 2007, *Chicago Sun-Times,* Fran Spielman reported that Chicago aldermen were accusing the Daley administration "of being asleep at the switch while low-income housing projects developed by the now-indicted Tony Rezko collapsed into disrepair…The spigot of loans, grants and tax credits should have been cut off when the first of 30 taxpayer-supported Rezko buildings in Chicago fell into disrepair, the aldermen said," according to the report.' Obama's resume is notoriously thin, but it already contains an ample dossier of graft, corruption, and malfeasance in office.

Obama's corruption, starting with the beginning of his law practice in Chicago, also has implications for the future of US housing policy for lower income groups, sure to be a key item in the wake of the mortgage crisis, and the collapse of the housing industry as it had existed since the Carter years. According to Pringle, there are already signs that Obama wants to bring the discredited, scandalous, and failed Chicago model to Washington, where he can launch a new phase of gangsters and racketeers of the Rezko-Auchi stripe feeding at the public trough. Pringle foresees that

> Obama now wants to bring this dog and pony show to Washington. I can see it now. His former boss, Allison Davis, at the Davis, Miner & Barnhill law firm, that served as a hub for Rezko's thriving slumlord business for a decade before Davis quit and became partners with Rezko, will be appointed to head the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Davis and his partners, which include his sons Jared and Cullen, have received more than $100 million in taxpayer subsidies to build and rehab apartments and homes over the past 10 years and have made at least $4 million in development fees, according to the Times. "Davis has gotten deal after deal from the mayor, helping to make Davis one of the city's top developers," Tim Novak noted in the November 7, 2007 *Sun-Times*. There's already a plan in place to guarantee that the Chicago model of "community development" is carried out in the White House. In his "Plan to Fight Poverty in America," Obama says, "we should create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund to develop affordable housing in mixed-income neighborhoods." The Plan will create a "White House Office of Urban Policy" to develop a strategy for metropolitan America, and Obama will appoint a Director of Urban Policy who will report directly to him, as president, to "coordinate all federal urban programs," the Plan states. Mayor Daley will probably be hired for this gig. The Plan explains that Obama will task his new Director "to work across federal agencies and with community and business leaders to identify and address the unique economic development barriers of every major metropolitan area in the country." (Pringle, oped news)

The last big scandal at HUD goes back to the tenure of "Silent Sam" Pierce, an African-American who was appointed by Reagan. In this case, HUD official Deborah Gore Dean, a cousin

of later Vice President Al Gore, was convicted of conspiracy to defraud the federal government, plus perjury, and did some jail time. Sam Pierce was manifestly involved in mismanagement, abuse and political favoritism, but an independent counsel was unable to get the goods on him. This gives us the merest inkling of what an Obama administration may have in store. It may prove to be the most corrupt administration since Warren Gamaliel Harding, almost a century ago.

Obama will doubtless seek to portray any abuses as the inevitable by-products of his valiant attempt to redress the balance of minority oppression. Indeed, his legal colleagues appear to be consummate masters in the gaming of the system of quotas, set-asides, preferences, and other mechanisms of discrimination which have grown up under the aeges of the post-Nixon affirmative action policies. As Pringle points out,

> An example of the Chicago version of a minority-owned business is DV Urban Realty Partners, where Allison Davis, who is amillionaire many times over, owns 51%, and Robert Vanecko, Mayor Daley's nephew, owns 49%. First of all, "Barack Obama you are no Robert Kennedy," and we're still asking the question because the careers of politicians like Obama are funded by a political mafia which has turned helping the poor into a cottage industry. Cursory review of Illinois campaign records shows Allison Davis and his family members giving close to $16,000 to Obama's presidential campaign. The *Sun-Times* reports that Davis has donated more than $400,000 to dozens of political campaigns, and the top beneficiaries include Mayor Daley, Blagojevich and Obama." (Pringle, op-ed news)

It was also thanks to the Davis, Miner & Barnhill law firm that Obama was able to forge an additional set of links with the Chicago foundation community, starting with the Woods Fund. Pringle shows that Obama began serving on the board of Woods Fund, a Chicago charity foundation, in 1993, the same year he was hired by Davis' law firm. In 2000, Davis went to the foundation to help fund his plans to build low income housing. Obama voted to invest $1 million with Neighborhood Rejuvenation Partners, a $17 million partnership that Davis still operates, according to a report by Novak in the November 29, 2007 *Sun-Times*. [Daley hack Martin] Nesbitt is also vice president of the Pritzker Realty Group, where he procures new real estate investment opportunities, retail investments and developments for the Pritzker Group….' This is Martin Nesbitt, a top official of the Chicago Housing Authority, where the slogan on the logo reads "Change" – no doubt to comfort Rezko's victims.[31] A quick trip to the Huffington Post site showed tens of thousands of dollars donated to Obama from people with the last name Pritzker in the Chicago area,' with many from the Pritzker clan. Penny Pritzker, whose family controls Hyatt Hotels, is the National Finance Chair for the Obama campaign, and presides over Obama's equivalents of the Bush Pioneers or Rangers. The party label may change, but the plutocracy remains. As for Nesbitt, he has been showing up in television profiles of Obama as a distinguished commentator on issues like Barky's anguish when he was forced to part company with Jeremiah Wright, and so forth; Nesbitt is never asked about shady dealings in Chicago.

CHAPTER IV: **APPRENTICESHIP WITH FOUNDATION-FUNDED TERRORISTS: AYERS AND DOHRN**

> "We must be alert to the CIA agents who would promote the polarization of our society. We must examine the evidence which indicates that fake revolutionaries, who are inciting insurrection in our cities, have had their pockets and minds stuffed by the CIA." – Vincent Salandria, 1971.
>
> "How could we have done the FBI's work better for them?" –Mark Rudd, Weatherman leader.
>
> "You don't have to be a cop to do a cop's work." – Ward Churchill, ex-Weatherman
> "God, what a great country. It makes me want to puke." – Bill Ayers, Weather Underground

Public opinion is now broadly aware of the close personal relationship and friendly affinity which has existed for two decades between the candidate Obama and the rehabilitated but unrepentant and defiant Weatherman terrorist bombers, William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn. As David Axelrod told the *Politico*, "Bill Ayers lives in his neighborhood. Their kids attend the same school … They're certainly friendly, they know each other, as anyone whose kids go to school together."[32] Ayers has written about his involvement with the group's bombings of the New York City Police headquarters in 1970, the U.S. Capitol in 1971 and the Pentagon in 1972. Obama's quest for elective office started in 1995 with a fund-raising meeting held at the home of Ayers and Dohrn. A $200 campaign contribution from Ayers is listed on April 2, 2001 by the "Friends of Barack Obama" campaign fund. The two appeared speaking together at several public events, including a 1997 University of Chicago panel entitled, "Should a child ever be called a 'super predator?'" and another panel for the University of Illinois in April 2002, entitled, "Intellectuals: Who Needs Them?" Ayers and Obama are friends. Ayers was the key man in giving Obama his first big visible and public break in the foundation world, his job as the chairman of the board of the Annenberg Chicago Challenge.

The basic facts of the meeting at the Ayers-Dohrn abode are these: 'In 1995, State Senator Alice Palmer introduced her chosen successor, Barack Obama, to a few of the district's influential liberals at the home of two well-known figures on the local left: William Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn. While Ayers and Dohrn may be thought of in Hyde Park as local activists, they're better known nationally as two of the most notorious — and unrepentant — figures from the violent fringe of the 1960s anti-war movement. Now, as Obama runs for president, what two guests recall as an unremarkable gathering on the road to a minor elected office stands as a symbol of how swiftly he has risen from a man in the Hyde Park left to one closing in fast on the Democratic nomination for president. "I can remember being one of a small group of people who came to Bill Ayers' house to learn that Alice Palmer was stepping down from the senate and running for Congress," said Dr. Quentin Young, a prominent Chicago physician and advocate for single-payer health care, of the informal gathering at the home of Ayers and his wife, Dohrn. "[Palmer] identified [Obama] as her successor." Obama and Palmer "were both there," he said. Obama's connections to Ayers and Dohrn have been noted in some fleeting news coverage in the past. But the visit by Obama to their home — part of a campaign courtship — reflects more extensive interaction than has been previously reported.'[33]

The period between 1991 and 1995 is the time when Obama assembles his network with its various components – the politically connected lawyer Allison Davis, the mafioso slumlord Tony Rezko, and the terrorists turned education operatives in the service of the foundations, Bill Ayers

and Bernardine Dohrn. It is a group redolent of the foundations and thus of the left wing of the intelligence community, and it will remain in place around Obama until the present day. Obama was now preparing for his first run at elective political office. To do this, he needed a base of activists, supporters, and donors. Obama's pedigree will be clearly exhibited by the method by which he chose to go about addressing this task. As we have already seen, Obama can be considered as a product of the Ford Foundation and its associated satellite foundations. Obama's mother worked directly for the Ford Foundation. Obama himself worked for the Gamaliel Foundation, a satellite of the Ford mother ship. This is his time as a "community organizer." Obama's church was fully stocked with theologians whose careers had been promoted by the Ford Foundation. Thus, we may say that Obama's hardware configuration was largely due to the efforts of the Ford Foundation and its satellites.

The software, as we have stressed, came largely from Zbigniew Brzezinski and his associates in the Trilateral Commission-Bilderberger-New York Council on Foreign Relations orbit, who had been training and indoctrinating Obama for almost one and a half decades at this point. Since many traditional functions of the US intelligence community had been privatized into the world of front companies and especially the foundations and nongovernmental organizations, we can for purposes of brevity and clarity label the matrix of Obama's software as the left wing of the intelligence community, or the left CIA. This is the network to which Obama quite naturally and indeed inevitably turned when the time came for him to run for the Illinois State Senate. Over time, intelligence networks cannot be hidden, since the same persons often appear in radically different roles. This means that their momentarily announced loyalties and purposes were spurious and fictitious: what counted all along was their loyalty to the intelligence network to which they belong.

Obama wanted to represent that part of Southside Chicago which is called Hyde Park, a neighborhood which is split between the comfortable homes of professors at the University of Chicago on the one hand, and a brutal and impoverished black inner-city ghetto on the other. Hyde Park is a neighborhood split by fault lines of racial tension. The political importance of the University of Chicago for the US intelligence community can hardly be overestimated. The University of Chicago's troubled frontier with the black ghetto has been something of a concern to the US ruling financier oligarchy for some time, since relations there have been so bad that the university might have to move away, a colossally expensive project. A whole cottage industry of academic-grade poverty pimps and foundation operatives has grown up to provide border guards for the line of demarcation between the university and the ghetto. Those who succeed as border guards and gatekeepers along this line are marked for preferment; the striving Obama power couple are one example.

Another is Danielle Allen, who (like Bernardine Dohrn) has been the recipient of the largesse of the MacArthur Foundation – in Allen's case via a coveted genius grant, which is a program used to promote philistine mediocrities to help dumb down the academic world, according to the general program of the foundations. Allen has just become UPS Foundation Professor in the School of Social Sciences at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey – she is the first black fellow of that elite think tank, where the arch-oligarchical operative Bernard Lewis (a key apostle of the Iraq war) also resides. Lately, Allen has been going on the radio, voicing shrill indignation over internet attacks on the Redeemer. A recent puff piece on the postmodern Allen stresses her role as a gatekeeper active in 'the University of Chicago's surrounding Hyde Park neighborhood, where town and gown have a long history of … "interracial distrust."' Allen, the article goes on to say, learned in Hyde Park that 'it was impossible to ignore the poor and often violent world not far from campus. Hyde Park today is a racially mixed, mostly middle-class neighborhood, but you don't

have to walk far to find real urban blight. In the '50s and '60s, as the South Side of Chicago was getting poorer and blacker, the university administration grew increasingly concerned that parents would refuse to send their children to such a place. There were rumors that the university was considering moving its campus out of Hyde Park. Instead, it launched an aggressive policy of urban renewal, relying heavily on draconian eminent domain laws that said that if a private developer owned 60 percent of a block, it could claim the remaining 40 percent through eminent domain. Those losing their houses were mostly black, while the university was mostly white. One consequence of this was a feeling of bitterness and suspicion toward the university that has lingered for decades. All of this was troubling.…' (Merrell Noden, "At home in two worlds," *Princeton Alumni Weekly*, March 5, 2008) So this is the area where Obama decided to pursue his political career, obviously as a black-faced gatekeeper and protector of the University of Chicago's interest against the black poor.

As the veteran public servant Larry Johnson showed on his noquarterusa.net blog, the truth was that Obama WAS an employee of a Bill Ayers enterprise for about eight years. In reality, the terrorist Ayers had been Obama's boss: "Barack also was essentially an employee of Bill Ayers for eight years. In 1995, the Chicago Annenberg Challenge was created to raise funds to help reform the Chicago public schools. One of the architects of the Challenge was none other than Professor Bill Ayers. Ayers co-wrote the initial grant proposal and proudly lists himself on his own website as the co-founder of the Challenge. And who did William Ayers, co-creator of the Challenge, help select as the new director of the board for this program? Barack Obama. Barack Obama was the first Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. This appointment came at a crucial time in Barack's life. He was on the verge of challenging longtime state Senator Alice Palmer for her job. When Barack decided to run, it is no surprise that he turned to William Ayers and his wife, Bernardine Dohrn, for help in organizing the campaign and in hosting his first fundraiser in the district. Obama served on the board for eight years until the Challenge ended in 2003. Bill Ayers was intimately involved in the Challenge over this same time period." (Noquarterusa.net, April 26, 2008) This was in addition to Ayers' well-documented role in organizing the fundraiser that kicked off Obama's first run for elective office in 1995. The old provocateurs of the left CIA were now serving as a support network for the next generation of domestic counterinsurgency operatives.

THE WEATHERMEN'S LONG MARCH THROUGH THE INSTITUTIONS HAS PRODUCED OBAMA

The University of Chicago is of course the home of the Milton Friedman Chicago boys, the arch-reactionary or quasi-fascist economists who dictated the fascist austerity program imposed by the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile in the middle 1970s, and who have helped destroy or impoverish many other countries around the world from Bolivia to Poland to Russia. One of them is the infamous Skull and Bones member Austan Goolsbee, a top economic controller of the Obama campaign. But the intelligence community also has a left wing face. Here we find the Black liberation theologian and Ford Foundation operative Dwight Hopkins, who shuttles back and forth to Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ. Here also we find the residue of many intelligence community operations of previous decades, and in this context one group stands out above all others: the veterans of the more extreme factions of Students for a Democratic Society, the most important left wing organization of the 1960s and indeed the largest left-wing political formation in all of American history. Here we find, in other words, a group of left-wing radicals who are well

advanced in the long march through the institutions, working within the system and achieving remarkable positions of institutional authority in the process:

'Today one of the approaches used by these types is the "long march" through the (presumably "bourgeois") institutions. (See [a] discussion of it by "Progressives for Obama" supporter, Fidelista and former SDS leader Carl Davidson.) Of course, the "long march" referred to is that taken by Mao and the People's Liberation Army in 1934. Now, Davidson et al. apply the concept to the tactics of the "left" inside various "reform movements" such as the anti-war movement. Davidson was one of the organizers of the 2002 anti war rally at which Obama first spoke out against the war.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

Diamond also notes: 'Bill Ayers appears to be attempting to lead a similar "long march" in the education world. Ayers is a vigorous advocate of local control along with a related concept called "small schools," most likely because he believes it gives him the potential to build a political base from which to operate. He has discussed these ideas in speeches and writings on his blog. As he said in a speech he gave in front of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela in late 2006: "Teaching invites transformations, it urges revolutions small and large. *La educación es revolución!*" (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

Some of Obama's friends were openly terrorists and bombers from the incendiary Weatherman faction, like Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn. Others did not join the Weathermen in their long years of underground urban guerrilla struggle: here we find such figures as Carl Davidson and Marilyn Katz. Assorted leaders of various successor organizations to the Black Panthers and/or the Black Liberation Army will also appear. The common denominator of many of these figures is that they were seldom the spontaneous radicalized student militants that they pretended to be, but were generally elements of pollution: police agents, provocateurs, wreckers, sent in to the radical student left to do a job of sabotage, discrediting, and crippling.

If Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn had been the authentic left-wing proto-fascist anarchists and bombers they have always claimed to be, they might well have faced an appointment with the gas chamber or the electric chair, given their implication in criminal conspiracies which led to the deaths of a significant number of persons, including police officers. Instead, Ayers and Dohrn have been rewarded and taken care of by some mysterious force through their receipt of prestigious endowed professorships in which they now have tenure. Was the hand that rewarded Ayers and Dohrn the same hand which has promoted and fostered the career of Obama? All indications are that it was, and that it was a hand attached to the left side of the US intelligence establishment.

Right-wing commentators will rail that Ayers and Dohrn, Wright and Obama are authentic communists seeking to carry out the revolutionary program of Karl Marx. The argument here, by contrast, is that all of these figures are synthetic frauds who have been deployed to carry out the program of finance capital, as articulated through certain key parts of the US intelligence community who have never concealed their close relations with Wall Street. The difference is highly important. It is the difference between an ignorant right-wing hallucination which deserves to be mocked and laughed at, and an actual historical philosophical analysis of the systematic deformation and manipulation of social life by the immense power of an intelligence community that boasts a legal budget in the neighborhood of $100 billion, which is supplemented by hundreds of billions more coming from drug-running, gun-running, slave trading, and other nefarious activities, plus what the foundation endowments contribute. Only if they are understood in this way

can figures like Wright, Ayers, Dohrn, and the rest open a window into the process which has dished up the Manchurian candidacy of Obama.

OBAMA'S NEST OF RACIST AND TERRORIST PROVOCATEURS

The fact that Obama emerges from such a nest of racist and terrorist provocateurs has begun to dawn on a number of researchers. Steve Diamond writes: 'The people linked to Senator Obama grew to political maturity in the extreme wings of the late 60s student and antiwar movements. They adopted some of the worst forms of sectarian and authoritarian politics. They helped undermine the emergence of a healthy relationship between students and others in American society who were becoming interested in alternative views of social, political and economic organization. In fact, at the time, some far more constructive activists had a hard time comprehending groups like the Weather Underground. Their tactics were so damaging that some on the left thought that government or right-wing elements helped create them. There is some evidence, in fact, that that was true (for example, the Cointelpro effort of the federal government.)' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008) Correct. The Weathermen were spooks, provocateurs who knew what they were doing, on some level.

THOMAS AYERS OF THE BOARD OF GENERAL DYNAMICS, TOP PENTAGON CONTRACTOR AND SPOOK

If we try to identify Obama's personal patron during the Chicago years, we must conclude that Obama owed everything to the Ayers family – to ruling class patriarch Thomas Ayers, his son Bill Ayers the terrorist, to his daughter-in-law Bernardine Dohrn (another terrorist), and to Bill's brother John. This is also the finding of Steve Diamond. So, who did "send" Obama? The key I think is his ties not to well-connected über lawyer Newton Minow … but more likely to the family of (in)famous former Weather Underground leader Bill Ayers.

Obama was a community organizer from about 1985 to 1988, when he left Chicago for Harvard Law School. During that time a critical issue in Chicago politics was the ongoing crisis in the public schools. A movement was underway from two angles: from below in black, Latino and other communities for more local control of schools, and from above by business interests who wanted to cut costs. For a fascinating account and analysis see Dorothy Shipps, "The Invisible Hand: Big Business and Chicago School Reform," *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 99, #1, Fall 1997, pp. 73-116 or her later excellent book on the subject: *School Reform, Corporate Style: Chicago, 1880-2000* (Kansas 2006.)

A 1987 teachers' strike brought those two sides together to push for a reform act passed by the Illinois legislature in 1988 that created "Local School Councils" (LSC) to be elected by residents in a particular school area. According to Shipps, the strike "enrag[ed] parents and provid[ed] the catalyst for a coalition between community groups and Chicago United [the business lobby] that was forged in the ensuing year." (The full story of this complicated process is provided by Shipps in her book; see Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

The central figure, establishment godfather, and *spiritus rector* of this entire network is Thomas Ayers, the recently deceased father and protector of Bill Ayers. Thomas Ayers headed Commonwealth Edison for seven years, ending in 1980. Before reaching the top job, he helped negotiate the first labor contract between the energy giant and the International Brotherhood of

Electrical Workers. He served on many boards, including that of G.D. Searle, Chicago Pacific Corp., Zenith Corp., Northwest Industries, First National Bank of Chicago and Tribune Co., owner of the *Chicago Tribune*. He worked with many nonprofits, serving as the chair of the Chicago Urban League, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, the Chicago Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Chicago United, Community Renewal Society and the Chicago Community Trust. Extremely important is Ayers' status as a member of the board of General Dynamics Corp. of St. Louis, one of the largest US defense contractors.[34] This role by itself is enough to certify that Thomas Ayers was a high-level member of the US intelligence community. Thomas Ayers can be regarded as a civic leader and trend setter of the upper crust of Chicago society, a high-level political fixer who was comfortable hob-nobbing with bankers, top executives, trade union bureaucrats, gangsters, and finally with terrorists like his son.

One of the remarkable things about the Weatherman faction was that so many of its leaders were the sons and daughters of the US ruling class, and especially of those with obvious links into the intelligence community, be it through the OSS, the CIA, or the foundations. One always wondered: were these protofascist anarchists simply acting out their own personal Oedipal rebellions against mommy and daddy? There is ample evidence of this in Ayers hyper-Oedipal "kill your parents" outburst. But, at the same time there was always the suspicion that there might be something more going on: were these spoiled little elitists being sent into the student movement to do a stage before they moved on to some cushier form of employment, perhaps in the family business? A few of them ended up dead or serving life terms in prison, but a military career would be no less risky. So there is always the lingering suspicion that such an internship might have been what some of their parents had in mind at the beginning.

Believe it or not, the foundation-funded left CIA (or left FBI, as the case may be) has taken care of Bill Ayers so well that he is now a tenured professor of education at Northern Illinois University. He may have gone from throwing bombs to tampering with the minds of defenseless young students, but his program remains the same: to provoke an all-out race war in the United States. As Steve Diamond has commented on noquarterusa.net, 'Since the days of Weather Underground, Ayers has advocated a viewpoint that argues that the fundamental issue in American life is "white skin privilege" – that white Americans benefit from being white at the expense of blacks. As Ayers' wife Bernardine Dohrn wrote in the introduction to a 2002 book she co-authored with Ayers and their fellow Weather Underground veteran Jeff Jones: "One cannot talk separately about class, gender, culture, immigration, ethnicity, or biology without being intertwined with race, as Katrina and the systematic destruction of a major black U.S. city re-informs us. We were waking up [in the late 1960s]. What to do once we had knowledge of the dimensions of white skin privilege? How to destroy white supremacy? Well, that is another matter. And as burning today as it was then."' Bernardine Dohrn, Bill Ayers, Jeff Jones, *Sing a Battle Song: The Revolutionary Poetry, Statements, and Communiqués of the Weather Underground 1970 – 1974* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2006).

AYERS: "I DON'T REGRET SETTING BOMBS. I FEEL WE DIDN'T DO ENOUGH"

"'I don't regret setting bombs," Bill Ayers said [to the *New York Times*]. "I feel we didn't do enough." Mr. Ayers, who spent the 1970s as a fugitive in the Weather Underground, was sitting in the kitchen of his big turn-of-the-19th-century stone house in the Hyde Park district of Chicago. The long curly locks in his Wanted poster are shorn, though he wears earrings. He still has tattooed on

his neck the rainbow-and-lightning Weathermen logo that appeared on letters taking responsibility for bombings. And he still has the ebullient, ingratiating manner, the apparently intense interest in other people that made him a charismatic figure in the radical student movement." Does Ayers plan to kill again? "I don't want to discount the possibility. I don't think you can understand a single thing we did without understanding the violence of the Vietnam War," he said, and the fact that "the enduring scar of racism was fully in flower." Ayers admits that he finds "a certain eloquence to bombs, a poetry and a pattern from a safe distance."' (Dinita Smith, "No Regrets for a Love of Explosives; In a Memoir of Sorts, a War Protester Talks of Life with the Weathermen,"' *New York Times*, September 11, 2001) Ayers later claimed that his threats to go back to terrorism were "a joke." Ayers describes the Weathermen descending into a "whirlpool of violence' – and, we might add, criminal insanity. What Ayers is saying is that, from the point of view of his terrorist controllers and ruling class case officers, it was well worth a few dead cops to be able to break the back of the protest movements of the 1960s, which is after all the only thing that Ayers and Dohrn have ever accomplished, apart from some narcissistic preening.

The Weatherman symbol which Ayers bears, depending on how it is depicted, has something in common with the semi-circle which stands out from the logo of the Obama campaign. According to his own 2001 memoir, *Fugitive Days*, Ayers bears on his back the Weatherman logo, a rainbow with a superimposed lightning bolt. The basic form of this logo was a semi-circle; it can be seen on the dust jacket of the 2001 hardcover edition of Ayers' book. It has curiously disappeared from the later paperback edition. The Obama campaign logo was a blue O, with the lower half filled with red and white stripes. When seen from certain angles and distances, the Obama logo bore a distinct resemblance to the older Weatherman coat of arms, especially when it was the all-blue version rather than the full-color one. In heraldry, one would have said that Obama's escutcheon contained a reference to the Weatherman crest. One can imagine Obama, Ayers, and Dohrn meeting in 2005 or 2006 and wickedly chortling about the new design, meant to symbolize the final revenge of the Weather Underground terrorist killers and butchers in the form of the seizure of power in Washington by a secret disciple of their left CIA belief structure. It was a risky gesture, since it risked being recognized, denounced, and exposed. Would Americans ever vote to put a crypto-Weatherman into the White House? Given the importance of emblems in fascism, this should not be taken lightly.

At the time he was interviewed, Ayers was 56, and was flogging his self-serving autobiographical cover story entitled *Fugitive Days* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001). Ayers recounted how he participated in the bombings of New York City Police Headquarters in 1970, of the Capitol building in 1971, the Pentagon in 1972. Is this a confession? No, because Ayers by now has embraced post-modernism with its categorical denial that any such things as reality and truth exist or can ever exist: "'Is this, then, the truth?" he writes. "Not exactly. Although it feels entirely honest to me…. 'Obviously, the point is it's a reflection on memory," he answered. "It's true as I remember it." Ayers remembers much, and then disremembers it: "'Everything was absolutely ideal on the day I bombed the Pentagon," he writes. But then comes a disclaimer: "Even though I didn't actually bomb the Pentagon — we bombed it, in the sense that Weathermen organized it and claimed it." He goes on to provide details about the manufacture of the bomb and how a woman he calls Anna placed the bomb in a restroom. No one was killed or injured, though damage was extensive.' There is no doubt: Ayers is a post-modernist, a liar. (Dinita Smith, "No Regrets for a Love of Explosives; In a Memoir of Sorts, a War Protester Talks of Life with the Weathermen,"' *New York Times*, September 11, 2001)

The terrorist is now a suitably blasé and laid-back professor of education (not a professor of English, as Obama evasively described him in the Philadelphia debate with Hillary when George Stephanopoulos asked him about Ayers), and a very influential professor at that. According to the review in the *New York Times*, 'Mr. Ayers is probably safe from prosecution anyway. A spokeswoman for the Justice Department said there was a five-year statute of limitations on Federal crimes except in cases of murder or when a person has been indicted." Ayers might still be vulnerable on the murder technicality, some might argue. Ayers' transitional program to the Weatherman communist utopia was summed up in classically Oedipal terms as follows: "Kill all the rich people. Break up their cars and apartments. Bring the revolution home, kill your parents, that's where it's really at." He is today distinguished professor of education at the University of Illinois at Chicago. When questioned about his exhortation to homicide and terrorism, Ayers again retreats into the postmodern briar patch: if I say terrorism, it's just a metaphor, a piece of irony! Ayers comments: "it's been quoted so many times I'm beginning to think I did [say it],' he sighed. "It was a joke about the distribution of wealth." (Dinita Smith, "No Regrets for a Love of Explosives; In a Memoir of Sorts, a War Protester Talks of Life with the Weathermen," *New York Times*, September 11, 2001) Too bad if you died.

Ayers' consort is Bernardine Dohrn, the sado-masochistic heroine of new left Weatherman terrorism who strutted as an elitist dominatrix in a leather mini-skirt on the stage of the SDS split convention on Wabash in Chicago in June 1969, ready to rumble with the downscale pro-working class nerds and Maoists of Milton Rosen's Progressive Labor Party, a split-off from the CPUSA. Bernardine was the MI-6 leather lady Diana Rigg of *The Avengers* – with a whip, she could have started a brilliant career at such establishments as Dominique's House of Pain. But Bernardine had come from the left-communist circles around the National Lawyers' Guild, deployed into SDS to turn the organization towards lunatic purgative violence, the advocacy of race war in the US, and speedy doom.

Ayers lived underground as a fugitive from the FBI from 1970 on. He disappeared from view after his then wealthy elitist/terrorist girlfriend, Diana Oughton, along with Ted Gold from the Mad Dog faction and the ultra-violent Terry Robbins, all died when their bomb factory, located in a posh Greenwich Village townhouse, blew up because of their incompetent handling of explosives.[35] Between 1970 and 1974 the Weathermen took responsibility for 12 bombings, according to Ayers' count, and also helped spring narcotics guru Timothy Leary from jail where he was serving time. This last caper was a piece of crude political theater, and showed anybody with a brain that the Weathermen were in fact police agents and that the CIA wanted Leary freed to further inundate the world with LSD under the auspices of Project MK Ultra. Dohrn is now the director of the Legal Clinic's Children and Family Justice Center of Northwestern University. Their old friends Kathy Boudin and David Gilbert, whose child they have raised, are serving prison terms for a 1981 robbery of a Brinks truck in Rockland County, N.Y., in which the Weathermen murdered four people, including two policemen and two armed guards.[36] Gilbert is clearly hoping that a President Obama would pardon him.

TERRORIST MÉNAGE À TROIS: AYERS, BERNARDINE, WARD CHURCHILL

Ayers, as the *New York Times* review concedes, was always suspect in SDS because he was the son of a rich and powerful executive, and was suspected of having intelligence community links. His father, Thomas Ayers, was, as we have seen, chairman and chief executive officer of Commonwealth Edison of Chicago, chairman of Northwestern University and of the Chicago Symphony. The little rich boy Bill Ayers attended Lake Forest Academy in Lake Forest, Ill., then

the University of Michigan, but dropped out to join Students for a Democratic Society. "In 1967 he met Ms. Dohrn in Ann Arbor, Mich. She had a law degree from the University of Chicago and was a magnetic speaker who often wore thigh-high boots and miniskirts," wrote the *Times*. In 1970, after the explosion of the Greenwich Village townhouse, Dohrn jumped bail and failed to appear for her trial in connection with the Weatherman Days of Rage caper, a piece of absurd political tragicomedy in which a few hundred Weathermen wearing football helmets proposed to start the revolution by doing battle with the Chicago cops in the middle of the Loop. The Weathermen had expected a massive turnout that would have allowed them to rule the streets and sweep the forces of order aside. The whole lunatic exercise was predictably a tactical failure, and an even bigger strategic political failure, since it marks the end of the student movement and of the Students for a Democratic Society. Despite all of its problems, SDS had been by some measures the largest left-wing membership organizations in the history of this country, and with reasonable leadership it could have acted as a pressure group to the left of the Democratic Party for many years to come. But that meant nothing to the Weatherman provocateurs, police agents, and wreckers, who seemed determined to destroy SDS with all the tools at their disposal.

Later in the spring of 1970, Ayers and Dohrn were both indicted along with other Weathermen in Federal Court under the Rap Brown law for crossing state lines to incite a riot during the Days of Rage, and then for "conspiracy to bomb police stations and government buildings." Those charges were dropped in 1974, allegedly because of prosecutorial misconduct, including illegal surveillance, but, some said, because the individuals in question were evidently assets of interest to the US intelligence community.

FOUNDATIONS ALLEGED TO HAVE FUNDED THE WEATHERMEN

The now obscure but highly detailed survey entitled *Carter and the Party of International Terrorism,*[37] issued in the summer of 1976 by the long-defunct US Labor Party, alleged the involvement of a number of foundations in the origins and development of the Weathermen. This study expresses a heterodox view of the Weathermen which may nevertheless prove heuristic:

> … The Weathermen were created as a joint project of the Ford Foundation, IPS, and the Institute for Social Research (ISR) [at the University of Michigan].[38] The group was spawned in May, 1968 at a "secret meeting" in the midst of the Columbia University student strike. Weatherman founder Mark Rudd constituted the initial cell around a Ford Foundation grant under which the group agreed to bust the strike through anarchist provocations. The Ford Foundation "blank check" was conduited through Tom Neumann, the [step-son] of OSS ideologue Herbert Marcuse and the head of a New York City IPS anarchist project, "Up Against the Wall Motherf****r." Weathermen were constituted as a national faction within the IPS-dominated Students for a Democratic Society by means of the selection process conducted during 1968-1969 through a series of position papers published in the *Radical Education Project*, run by Marcus Raskin and Arthur Waskow. In fact, the position papers (including the infamous "You Don't Need a Weatherman…" were synthetic belief structures drafted by psychological warfare experts at ISR and published under the bylines of SDS leaders like Bill Ayers and Jim Mellen – both [Ann Arbor] ISR graduate students. SDSers attracted to the anarcho-syndicalist Weatherman credo were put through a series of well-financed "military maneuvers" during this period to refine the selection. The Democratic Convention riots in Chicago: Led by IPS operatives Hayden and Waskow and heavily financed by the Carnegie Fund ($85,000), the Office of Economic Opportunity ($194,000 conduited through IPS), plus

> similar sums from the J.M. Kaplan Fund, the New World Foundation, and the Roger Baldwin Foundation of the ACLU. […]
>
> The Fall 1969 "Days of Rage" in Chicago [was] a Weatherman riot financed through a "war chest" bankrolled by Raskin, Waskow, et al.; also funded through an IPS front called "American Playground," through the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE) and through the IPS media project, Liberation News Service. By this point, the Weatherman belief structure was psychotically fascistic, as demonstrated in the Dec. 1969 'War Council' speech by IPS controller Bernardine Dohrn referring to the recent Manson family murders' [cited elsewhere in this book]. (*Carter and the PIT*, 121)

The USLP authors explicitly accused the Ford Foundation of helping to call forth violent radical groups:

> The entire Ford operation took on an upgraded character in 1966 with the appointment of McGeorge Bundy as the president of the Ford Foundation. Bundy's experience as the special National Security Adviser to President Kennedy provided for an upgraded interface between the Foundation's activities and the overall global warfare policies of the Rockefeller family empire. Ford virtually orchestrated - along with the subsumed Institute for Policy Studies field operations - the creation of the black nationalist "radical" apartheid operation, the domestic race war prospectus, the building up of a nationwide network of urban brainwashing centers and the creation of a nationwide Gestapo in the form of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. By 1968, the Ford Foundation was openly funding domestic terrorism. The Weatherman organization represents the most open case, although during the 1968 New York City teachers' strike, the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party and the Communist Party USA, all by that point under Institute for Policy Studies control, were bankrolled by Ford." (*Carter and the PIT*, 19)

It has proven impossible to corroborate these charges using other sources, and the historical record remains fragmentary and incomplete. The accuracy of some of these allegations cannot be determined without access to the relevant government and foundation archives, which will hardly be forthcoming in time to help vet Obama's closest associates. If the charges made by the USLP three decades ago are accurate, then the leading Weathermen, including Obama's friends Ayers and Dohrn, started working for the foundations more than forty years ago, and continue to receive grants from many of these same foundations today.

THE WAR AGAINST MONOGAMY: AYERS GOES BISEXUAL

Ayers also figures as yet another homosexual or bisexual in Obama's life, beyond Frank, Donald Young, Larry Sinclair, and others. Ayers in *Fugitive Days* 'also writes about the Weathermen's sexual experimentation as they tried to "smash monogamy." The Weathermen were "an army of lovers," he says, and describes having had different sexual partners, including his best male friend."'[39] If Ayers became bisexual, he may still be bisexual, and this would place another bisexual or homosexual partner in Obama's immediate circle, in addition to Wright (accused of closet homosexuality by Rev. James David Manning of Harlem), Larry Sinclair, and the late Donald Young, the gay choirmaster of Wright's church who was found murdered on Christmas morning 2007. When Dohrn was asked about the revolutionary orthodoxy of settling into marriage after efforts to smash monogamy, Ms. Dohrn said, "You're always trying to balance your understanding of who you are and what you need, and your longing and imaginings of freedom." Ayers chimed in

that he shared the same conflicts about marriage. "We have to learn how to be committed," he said, "and hold out the possibility of endless reinventions."

Indeed, a good agent provocateur should be able to re-invent himself or herself several times in a career. A champion in this was Arthur Koestler, who went from being a Zionist in Palestine to a KPD communist to a Cold War hardline anti-communist, to a Jungian dealer in paranormal and psychic phenomena, ending up as a voluntary euthanasia advocate. He also changed nationalities several times, from Hungarian to proto-Israeli to German to British. The best guess is that he was a British agent from the very early stages on. Ayers, by contrast, still has a ways to go if he wants to get into the Spy Museum.

WARD CHURCHILL, WEATHERMAN AND PARALLEL LIFE TO AYERS AND DOHRN

Another key Weatherman supporter who figures in the life of Ayers and Dohrn is Ward Churchill, who was up to the end of 2007 probably the best known former Weatherman still active in politics, largely because of his statement noted earlier that the office workers who died in the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001 were "little Eichmanns," servants of imperialism who deserved what they got. Churchill also became infamous as a supporter of the CIA's blowback theory of 9/11, which he saw not as a false flag operation by the Anglo-American intelligence community, but rather as just retribution for the crimes of US imperialism. This tirade had made Ward Churchill a favorite target of Fox News Channel personalities like O'Reilly and Hannity. Churchill stated that anyone who doubted the official US version of 9/11 – the 19 Arab hijackers, Osama Bin Laden, al Qaeda, etc.- was really a racist who did not believe that Arabs were capable of great things – a very imaginative defense of the US government line. Especially in 2005-2007, Churchill was repeatedly attacked by the reactionary Fox News Channel personalities O'Reilly and Hannity, and was ousted from his tenured post at the University of Colorado with much fanfare.

Back around 1970, Ward Churchill had been a Weatherman, just like Ayers and Dohrn. Today he poses as an American Indian activist. A recent critical account of Ward Churchill by Bob Black alleges that c. 1970,

> Ex-Weathermen were even less popular than Vietnam veterans. It took Churchill awhile to find his way from the warpath to the career path. He became a staff writer for *Soldier of Fortune* magazine. Finally he discovered, or invented, his Indian heritage. In 1978 he took on the new role of professional Indian. By 1983, he was "director of Planning, Research and Development for Educational Opportunity Programs at the University of Colorado/Boulder." In plain English, he was an affirmative-action bureaucrat, a paid race-monger. He made the most of the gig, and very possibly wrote himself a job description to jump into academia. So he is now, without even possessing a doctorate, a tenured ethnic-studies professor at the university in the posh resort town of Boulder. Tom Giago, an enrolled Oglala Sioux born and raised on the Pine Ridge reservation, the publisher of *Indian Country Today*, considers Churchill a "white profiteer, a police agent and a terrorist."… If Churchill's indigenism is the radical threat he says it is, why does the government pay him to propagate it? When Churchill first surfaces, he is killing indigenous people for the U.S. Government. Next he is a member of the agent-ridden Weatherman SDS; then a staff writer for *Soldier of Fortune*; and then a sachem in the agent-riddled American Indian Movement. Next, notwithstanding this unsavory background, he works as a bureaucrat for a state university, from which gig he is bootstrapped into a tenure-track faculty position for which he has no qualifications, and soon he is tenured. His noisy presence

> in the Amerindian nationalist movement helps to splinter it. For Churchill, the test of indigenist orthodoxy is simple: you pass it if – but only for so long as – you promote Churchill's career. Is Churchill, as many suspect, a police agent? Nobody's said it better than Churchill himself: "You don't have to be a cop to do a cop's work." Indian identity, in Churchill's windy words, "is determined by cultural/intellectual/political attributes," but he is careful not to identify what these attributes are, for if he did, it would be obvious that he doesn't possess them.'[40]

We have seen the race-based divide-and-conquer policies of the foundations at work against the black and Hispanic communities; Ward Churchill's operations remind us that similar policies have been used against the American Indian or Native American parts of the population as well.

Back in 1969, Ward Churchill worked together with Weatherman leader Bernardine Dohrn at the Chicago SDS National Office: '"I had my little medals, I went back to my tractor factory" - and started hanging out in Chicago at the national office of the leftist Students for a Democratic Society, where he ran into Bernardine Dohrn, an attractive leader of the Weather Underground, a radical group that favored the bombings of buildings and confrontations with police in their fight against racism, the Vietnam War and the ruling class. But the Weather Underground knew more about Marxism than about bombs. Churchill briefly taught the Weathermen and Weatherwomen how to make bombs and how to fire weapons - "which end does the bullet go, what are the ingredients, how do you time the damned thing."' Ward Churchill's instruction may have been faulty, however: 'Thenthree of the radicals accidentally blew themselves up in a New York brownstone, and Churchill decided that he had had enough. He became involved with Native American and Black Panther causes - "I was identifying more with people of color than the white left" - and started working for AIM in 1972, the year before the Wounded Knee, S.D., shootout between activists who had seized the village and FBI men who joined the violent confrontation.' (*Denver Post*, January 18, 1987)[41] One of those who perished in the explosion of the Weatherman bomb factory in New York's Greenwich Village was, as we have seen, Bill Ayers' then girlfriend, the wealthy heiress Diana Oughton.

This was precisely the time when pro-terrorist professor Ward Churchill was teaching bomb-making to the Weatherman, as he himself boasted in a 1987 *Denver Post* interview. The old Weatherman ideology burns brightly in Ward Churchill, a veteran provocateur and wrecker. Ward Churchill speaks with much greater frankness about the Weatherman world view than do Ayers, Dohrn, and the rest of their circle, who need to be more careful of what they say in public. Ward Churchill lets it all hang out – he is the Weatherman who tells you what the others are thinking today. And this is what Ward Churchill is thinking these days: "One of the things I've suggested is that it may be that more 9/11s are necessary," Churchill said in a 2004 interview to *Satya* magazine.[42] Churchill specifies that he does not want a revolution; things are too far gone for that. He does not want a new regime to take power in the U.S. Instead, he explained, he wants the state destroyed. Like Wolfowitz after 9/11, he wants to "end states" – specifically this one. "I want the state gone: transform the situation to U.S. out of North America. U.S. off the planet. Out of existence altogether," he concluded. This is indeed the hard line of the academic, foundation-funded, and intelligence-community linked ultra-left provocateurs. These are the sorts of people who will triumph in an Obama administration.[43] Ward Churchill thus wants to annihilate and to obliterate the United States. This is a proposal for genocide. One of the central ideas of this book is that the old Weatherman program of destroying the American people in the service of the intelligence community, the foundations, and the Wall Street finance oligarchy, expressed more or less openly by Wright and with special violence and cynicism by Ward Churchill, is in fact the only possible program of a future Obama administration.

We stress again that there are not many degrees of separation between Ward Churchill and Obama. When Ward wanted to join SDS, he went straight to Obama's friend, neighbor, and co-thinker, Bernardine Dohrn. It was also Ward Churchill who, just back from his tour of duty in Vietnam in what looks like a branch of Army Intelligence (Long-Range Reconnaissance, the equivalent of a multi-state killing spree. taught bomb-making to the aspiring terrorist Weatherpeople in that posh Greenwish Village townhouse. When the townhouse blew up, one of the dead was Diana Oughton, who was the girlfriend of Obama's sponsor, benefactor, and friend, Bill Ayers.(One-degree of separation: Obama's ultra-leftist backers, Rezkowatch, Monday, April 28, 2008)[44]

HUMAN WRECKAGE

The years have done nothing to diminish the radical subjectivism of the Weatherman clique. "Ms. Dohrn and Mr. Ayers had a son, Zayd, in 1977. After the birth of Malik, in 1980, they decided to surface." These names may reflect the influence of a general turn in spook circles towards Islamic, rather than communist cover, which became evident at the end of the 1970s. "Ms. Dohrn pleaded guilty to the original Days of Rage charge, received three years probation and was fined $1,500. The Federal charges against Mr. Ayers and Ms. Dohrn had already been dropped." This happy ending was doubtless thanks to the efforts of the CIA Office of Security, which interfaces with most domestic police agencies and courts. When Kathy Boudin was arrested and given a life sentence for the New York Brinks robbery and the accompanying murders of policemen, Dohrn and Ayers volunteered to care for Boudin and Dave Gilbert's son Chesa, then 14 months old, and became his legal guardians. Dohrn was called to testify about the robbery. When she refused to give a handwriting sample, she was jailed for seven months. Chesa was without a mother during that time. Ayers told the *New York Times* that Chesa was "a very damaged kid." Given the criminal irresponsibility of both his biological parents and his adoptive parents, this is no surprise. "He had real serious emotional problems," Ayers added. But after extensive therapy, "became a brilliant and wonderful human being." (Dinita Smith, "No Regrets for a Love Of Explosives; In a Memoir of Sorts, a War Protester Talks of Life With the Weathermen," *New York Times*, September 11, 2001)

Smith recounts: 'As Mr. Ayers mellows into middle age, he finds himself thinking about truth and reconciliation, he said. He would like to see a Truth and Reconciliation Commission about Vietnam, he said, like South Africa's. He can imagine Mr. Kerrey and Ms. Boudin taking part." Perhaps this is something we will see under a future Obama administration. And if there were another Vietnam, he is asked, would he participate again in the Weathermen bombings? By way of an answer, Mr. Ayers quoted from "The Cure at Troy," Seamus Heaney's retelling of Sophocles' *Philoctetes*: "Human beings suffer,/ They torture one another./ They get hurt and get hard."

He continued to recite:

> History says, Don't hope
> On this side of the grave.
> But then, once in a lifetime
> The longed-for tidal wave
> Of justice can rise up
> And hope and history rhyme.'

Is this Ayers' dark prophecy of a future America ruled by his protégé Obama? The *New York Times* review moves towards its conclusion. Reflecting on his varied life in a mellow epiphany of self-indulgence, Ayers added: "I was a child of privilege and I woke up to a world on fire. And hope and history rhymed." (Dinita Smith, "No Regrets for a Love Of Explosives; In a Memoir of Sorts, a War Protester Talks of Life With the Weathermen," *New York Times*, September 11, 2001) Too bad for the dead and maimed cops and innocent bystanders whose blood purchased these epiphanies for the privileged elitist Ayers, a gravedigger of protest politics in the US all his life.

The question of the continuing close friendship among Ayers, Dohrn, and Obama began to emerge in February, thanks to the efforts of certain blogs such as noquarterusa.net, and to a campaign on this issue conducted by the right-wing radio talk show host and television personality, Sean Hannity.[45] Gradually, the Ayers question began to seep into the controlled corporate media: Joe Klein wrote 'There are other guilt-by-association problems floating out there: the occasional over-the-top racial statements by Obama's pastor Jeremiah Wright; the fact that Obama has been described as "friendly" with 1960s dilettante-terrorist William Ayers."' (Joe Klein, *Time*, March 6, 2008) The "friendly" was from arch-mindbender David Axelrod. But Bill Burton, Obama's spokesman, said Ayers "does not have a role on the campaign." Ayers said he had no comment on his relationship with Obama.

A brief look at the final phase of the Weatherman faction before it disappeared into clandestine safe houses for a decade or more will permit us to understand the ideology of Ayers and Dohrn, which is important because these ideas live on today most emphatically in the Obama campaign, and are in danger of being accomplished under a future Obama regime. The atmosphere that prevailed in the last days of the legal, aboveground existence of the Weatherman faction is conveyed in an extraordinary article from Liberation News Service written in the final days of 1969.

WEATHERMAN: AN AGENCY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD WILL RULE THE USA

We can start with an old article from Liberation News Service about one of the last legal public events the Weathermen ever held, a kind of Christmas and New Years' party for *agents provocateurs* as the student movement entered its death agony: 'The Weatherman controlling faction of SDS held a national "war council" here Dec. 27-30. [1969] About 400 young people showed up at the gathering—nominally SDS's quarterly national council meeting—to practice karate, rap in regional and collective meetings, dig a little music and hear the "Weather Bureau" lay down its political line for revolution in America. The meeting hall was decked with large banners of revolutionary leaders—Che, Ho, Fidel, Malcolm X, Eldridge Cleaver—hanging from the ceiling. One entire wall of the ballroom was covered with alternating black and red posters of murdered Illinois Panther leader Fred Hampton. An enormous cardboard machine gun hung from the ceiling. Violence was the keynote of the long hours of talk that began Dec. 27. The distinction between revolutionary armed struggle and violence for its own sake is a major point of contention between Weatherman and its numerous critics. The strongest debate centered on the question of who is going to make the American revolution. Weatherman, along with many others in the movement, recognizes that the American revolution is part of the world struggle against U.S. imperialism, a struggle for liberation from both colonial and capitalist oppression. Weatherman's critics maintain, however, that Weatherman's internationalism is based on an analysis that ignores capitalist oppression in America. Weatherman sees revolutionary change in America as happening almost solely, if at all, as a belated reaction to a successful world revolution including a successful revolt

by the black colony inside the U.S.' ("Weatherman Conducts a 'War Council,'" Liberation News Service, Flint, Michigan, Dec. 31, 1969)[46]

WEATHERMAN: 'IF IT WILL TAKE FASCISM, WE'LL HAVE TO HAVE FASCISM'

For our purposes today, the most interesting remarks made that day are probably those of Weatherman extremist leader Ted Gold, who talked about what the US government and economy would be like if the race war desired by the Weathermen ever came about. We need to pay careful attention here, since we are learning something about the way a future Obama regime may treat the US population:

> The logic of that view was expressed in a statement by Ted Gold, a top Weatherman, who said that "an agency of the people of the world" would be set up to run the U.S. economy and society after the defeat of the U.S. imperialism abroad. A critic spoke up: "In short, if the people of the world succeed in liberating themselves before American radicals have made the American revolution, then the Vietnamese and Africans and the Chinese are gonna move in and run things for white America. It sounds like a John Bircher's worst dream. There will have to be more repression than ever against white people, but by refusing to organize people, Weatherman isn't even giving them half a chance." "Well," replied Gold, "If it will take fascism, we'll have to have fascism." Weatherman—virtually all white—continues to promote the notion that white working people in America are inherently counter-revolutionary, impossible to organize, or just plain evil — "honky -------," as many Weathermen put it. Weatherman's bleak view of the post-revolutionary world comes from an analysis of American society that says that "class doesn't count, race does." White workers are in fact fighting for their survival, insisted people doing organizing of factory workers in California. They claim that strikes for wage increases and job security can fairly easily be linked to the anti-imperialist analysis. But Weatherman denies that survival is an issue for white workers. Weatherman leader Howie Machtinger derided white workers for desiring better homes, better food and essentially better lives. Machtinger [argued]: "When you try to defend honky workers who just want more privilege from imperialism, that shows your race origins." The Weatherman position boiled down to inevitable race war in America, with very few "honkies"—except perhaps the 400 people in the room and the few street kids or gang members who might run with them—surviving the holocaust. That notion is linked to Weatherman's concept of initiating armed struggle now and not waiting to build mass white support—that is, a small but courageous white fighting force will do material damage that will weaken imperialism while the black liberation movement smashes "the imperialist ___" by itself. Machtinger talked a lot about how the black liberation movement is so far advanced at this point that the only thing left for white revolutionaries is to support blacks by fighting cops as a diversionary tactic. Weatherman is adamant in saying that whites cannot be organized into a mass revolutionary movement. To say that they can or should, according to Weatherleaders, is "national chauvinism."… A new Weatherman catchword was "barbarism." The Weathermen see themselves as playing a role similar to that of the barbarian tribes, such as the Vandals and the Visigoths, who invaded and destroyed the decadent, corrupt Rome.'

BERNARDINE DOHRN DEMANDS TERRORISM AND ARMED STRUGGLE

A central figure in these monstrous proceedings was Obama's close friend Bernardine Dohrn, who found a way to bring the conference to a new low of despicable anti-human barbarism, but always under left cover:

> Bernardine Dohrn, former inter-organizational secretary of SDS for 1968-69, gave the opening speech.[47] She began by admitting that a lot of Weatherman's actions have been motivated by "a white guilt trip." "But we ------ up a lot anyway. We didn't fight around Bobby Seale when he was shackled at the Conspiracy Trial. We should have torn the courtroom apart. We didn't smash them when Move peace creeps hissed David Hilliard on Moratorium Day in San Francisco. We didn't burn Chicago down when Fred was killed." Dohrn characterized violent, militant response in the streets as "armed struggle" against imperialism. "Since Oct. 11 [the last day of the SDS national window-breaking action in Chicago], we've been wimpy on armed struggle... We're about being a fighting force alongside the blacks, but a lot of us are still honkies, and we're still scared of fighting. We have to get into armed struggle." Part of armed struggle, as Dohrn and others laid it down, is terrorism. Political assassination—openly joked about by some Weathermen—and literally any kind of violence that is considered anti-social were put forward as legitimate forms of armed struggle. "We're in an airplane," Dohrn related, "and we went up and down the aisle 'borrowing' food from people's plates. They didn't know we were Weathermen; they just knew we were crazy. That's what we're talking about, being crazy --------- and scaring the ----- out of honky America."' ("Weatherman Conducts a 'War Council,'" Liberation News Service, Flint, Michigan, Dec. 31, 1969)[48]

BERNARDINE DOHRN: MANSON MURDERS AS THE ESSENCE OF THE REVOLUTION SHE WANTED

And what kind of revolution did top Weathergirl Bernardine Dohrn want? It was a revolution in the spirit of Charles Manson, the demonic protagonist of that year's grisly Tate-LaBianca murders in Hollywood:

> A 20-foot long poster adorned another wall of the ballroom. It was covered with drawings of bullets, each with a name. Along with the understandable targets like Chicago's Mayor Daley, the Weathermen deemed as legitimate enemies to be offed, among others, the Guardian (which has criticized Weatherman) and Sharon Tate, one of several victims in the recent mass murder in California. She was eight months pregnant. "Honkies are going to be afraid of us," Dohrn insisted. She went on to tell the war council about Charlie Manson, accused leader of the gang which allegedly murdered the movie star and several others on their Beverly Hills estate. Manson has been portrayed in the media as a Satanic, magnetic personality who held near-hypnotic sway over several women whom he lent out to friends as favors and brought along for the murder scene. The press also mentioned Manson's supposed fear of blacks—he reportedly moved into rural California to escape the violence of a race war. Weatherman, the "Bureau" says, digs Manson, not only for his understanding of white America—the killer purportedly wrote "pig" in blood on the wall after the murder—but also a "bad --------." (At least one press report explained the "pig" on the wall by saying that Manson wrote that in order to throw suspicion on black people.) [Dohrn gave a three-fingered "fork salute" to mass murderer Charles Manson. Calling Manson's victims the "Tate Eight," Dohrn gloated over the fact that actress Sharon Tate, who was pregnant at the time, had been stabbed with a fork in her womb.]

> "Dig it, first they killed those pigs, then they ate dinner in the same room with them, then they even shoved a fork into a victim's stomach! Wild!" said Bernardine Dohrn.

This statement by Bernardine marks the maximum in subhuman degradation and degeneracy, a level of despicable anti-human animus which can match the decadence of any World War II fascist. Bernardine has lamely attempted to explain that this was all a metaphor, a joke. The Liberation News correspondent of 1969 took it quite seriously, and so must we today as we look forward to Bernardine Dohrn's possible role in a future Obama administration.

WEATHERMAN: THE 'WHITE DEVIL' THEORY OF WORLD HISTORY

Bernardine functioned to all intents and purposes as the keynote speaker who set the exalted moral tone for the rest of the speeches.

> Women members of Weatherman held a panel discussion on women's liberation. The fighting women, "the women who can carry bombs under their dresses like in "The Battle of Algiers," were put forward as the only valid model for women's liberation. Women's liberation comes not only with taking leadership roles and with asserting yourself politically, they said, but also with overcoming hang-ups about violence.
>
> In between the women's raps, the people sang a medley of Weatherman songs, high camp numbers such as, "I'm Dreaming of a White Riot," "Communism Is What We Do," and "We Need a Red Party." Spirited chants broke out, too: "Women power!" "Struggling power!" "Red Army power!" "Sirhan Sirhan power!" "Charlie Manson power!" "Power to the People!" "Off the pig!" […]
>
> Another speaker referred to the white women's role as reproduced and characterized white women who bring up children in white America as "pig mothers."
>
> The "crazy violent ----------" theme was picked up in a long address by "Weather Bureau" member John Jacobs, who laid out the "White Devil" theory of all world history and traced the history of today's youth from the Beat Generation of the 1950s. [Here Jeremiah Wright, Father Pfleger, Dwight Hopkins, and Otis Moss III might have felt at home.]
>
> "We're against everything that's 'good and decent,'" Jacobs declared. That notion, coupled with the White Devil theory, formed the basis of what they call "Serve the People --------." Serving the people, relating to people's needs, is a crucial factor in many people's minds of organizing white working people in America, so that the revolution will come as class war and end in socialism, rather than come as race war and end in fascism. ("Weatherman Conducts a 'War Council,'" Liberation News Service, Flint, Michigan, Dec. 31, 1969)[49]

But the Weatherman perspective was precisely that there was no hope of revolution against the financier ruling class, and that in any case race war against white blue collar workers was the thing that was to be desired and provoked.

OBAMA'S WEATHERMAN CONNECTION: HARBINGER OF SWIFT BOATING

By spring 2008, it has been obvious for months that Obama's close affinity with and friendship for some of the most celebrated terrorists and murderers of recent US history was going to cause him political problems, to say the least. As former CIA and State Department official Larry Johnson commented, Obama was damaged goods from the moment that the average American heard about his penchant for associating with known criminals:

> There is now undeniable proof of a longstanding relationship between Barack Obama and William Ayers. We are not talking about two guys who just happened to bump into one another on the street. We are not talking about a secret admirer (Ayers) who quietly sent $200 to an aspiring politician. No, we are talking about William Ayers hosting a fundraiser for Barack Obama and actively working with him to secure Barack's first electoral victory in Illinois. But wait, there is more. Barack and Ayers also served on the board of the Woods Fund. And they worked together to give money to some other folks, including a group with ties to the PLO. […]
>
> Look at the beating that John Kerry took for tossing his medals over the White House fence. Ayers did not toss medals, he threw bombs. Real ones. Bombs that exploded. Do you think that Republicans will ignore Obama's ties to Ayers? The two were serving on the same board in 2002. We are talking less than six years ago and the record will come out showing some questionable grants by these two characters. William Ayers, in the age of terrorism, will be Barack Obama's Willie Horton.' (noquarterusa.net, April 16, 2008)

THE SDS MENAGERIE AROUND OBAMA

The problem goes way beyond just Ayers and his fork-saluting spouse. The Obama campaign presents the aspect of a storm cellar or assisted-living facility for the burned-out wreckage of the intelligence community operations of yesteryear. Some of these figures were Weatherman terrorists, some were simply SDS extremists, some flirted with Stalinism. In July 1996, the *New York Times* reported that Marilyn Katz, a former aide to Chicago Mayor Harold Washington and now a wheel horse of the Daley machine and a supporter of Obama, "oversaw security for Students for a Democratic Society, a radical group at the eye of the Chicago protests" during the 1968 Democratic National Convention. There was no "security" in the SDS contingent on that occasion. Ms. Katz was presumably occupied with organizing provocations to provide cover for the police riot that ensued.

On October 2, 2002, when Barack Obama delivered his obscure, unrecorded, and poorly attended but now famous speech at a Chicago antiwar rally, Katz was one of the key organizers of the rally. On the event's fifth anniversary, Marilyn Katz, now a member of Obama's national finance committee, posted the following statement on the blog of Chicagoans Against the War and Injustice (CAWI), which she had "put together," relying upon "some of her old contacts she met organizing anti-war demonstrations for Students for a Democratic Society in the 1960s." Katz described how the rally in Chicago on October 2, 2002, was "not organized by a politician or a recognized political force. It was organized by a loose group of friends, mostly SDS veterans. Katz was thus key to providing Obama's only foreign policy credential and proof of his alleged good judgment – his lame anti-war speech of October 2002, the horse that he mercilessly rode to death during the 2008 primaries. What would Barky ever have done without his SDS friends?

MARILYN KATZ, SDS VET AND ORGANIZER OF OBAMA'S OCTOBER 2002 ANTI-WAR SPEECH

Marilyn Katz later recounted: 'Meeting in a living room in Chicago just ten days earlier, we chose to act, agreeing that on October 2, 2002, we would assemble in Chicago's Federal Plaza to stand against the war. With a gut feeling that other Americans also thought the invasion of Iraq was foolhardy, if not immoral and absurd, but with no assurance than anyone would come to a demonstration we agreed that "If we were five, we would be five." "If we were without any elected officials, we would be an involved citizenry. But we would take a stand." But we were not alone. In

fact nearly 3,000 people assembled in Federal Plaza on that day responding to the flurry of emails (a new organizing technology for us) that seemingly liberated people from their sense of isolation and offered them the opportunity of collective action - of community. Black, Latino, White, veterans of the peace and women's movements, the 60s, high school and college youth, community activist—a mosaic of the City. Long-time leaders like Jesse Jackson, Juan Andrade and Julie Hamos and a new voice.... not yet known to the crowd, to the media or to the nation.... the voice of State Senator Barack Obama."[50]

Katz was joined in the organizing by former SDS president Carl Davidson, like Klonsky reputedly once upon a time close to the Communist Party USA line, so that Obama was getting help from "two perennially engaged '60s veterans and ex-SDS members," Jeff Epton wrote December 15, 2003, for *In These Times*. Katz and Davidson were "key organizers" of the October 2, 2002, anti-war demonstration. Originating as Chicagoans Against War with Iraq (CAWI), by December 2003 CAWI had shifted into Chicagoans Against War and Injustice. Davidson later commented, "as the war transformed from invasion to occupation, CAWI activists managed to avoid splits over sectarian and strategic differences, and committed to stay together and move from 'protest to politics.'" In 2005, Katz and Davidson co-wrote a documented entitled "Stopping War, Seeking Justice." Davidson is "now a figure in the Committees of Correspondence for Democracy and Socialism, an offshoot of the old Moscow-controlled CPUSA," Cliff Kincaid wrote on February 18, 2008, for Accuracy in Media.

Davidson is also an Obama supporter, now leading Progressives for Obama. On his blog *Keep On Keepin' On*, Davidson recently endorsed Obama's comments about small town people being bitter. Katz is attempting to minimize her role in the old SDS. On April 18, 2008, the *Chicago Sun-Times* quoted Katz as saying that she "met Ayers when he was 17 and they were members of Students for a Democratic Society, a peaceful group from which the Weather Underground splintered." Katz also demanded that Obama's relationship with former domestic terrorist William Ayers and his wife, Bernardine Dohrn—with whom Obama launched his political career in 1995 at the Ayers-Dohrn Hyde Park home— "should not be a campaign issue." Katz is now the head of MK Communications and a registered lobbyist with the City of Chicago; she has personally contributed $1,000 to Obama for America, Obama's presidential campaign fund. Marilyn Katz and her husband Allan J. Katz, a shareholder and chairman of the Policy Practice Group at Akerman Senterfitt of Tallahassee, Florida and a Tallahassee City Commissioner, as well as a Member of the Florida Democratic Committee and Democratic National Committee, are joint bundlers committed to raising a minimum of $200,000 for Obama's campaign.'[51]

MIKE KLONSKY, FOUNDATION STALINIST

Another Katz and Ayers associate—and Obama supporter—is Mike Klonsky. In 1968, he was the last pre-Weatherman SDS national chairman and a "demonstration organizer." Klonsky "'would go on in post-SDS years to form the October League (Marxist-Leninist) and Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist), part of the new communist movement that emerged [born dead] in the 1970s." Klonsky was named by Ayers in the 1990s to head the Small Schools Workshop. In 1996, Klonsky, like William Ayers, was a consultant for Mayor Richard M. Daley's "agenda for public schools." Until June 25, 2008, when he was jettisoned for purposes of damage control and window dressing in the course of Obama's hard right turn after the primaries, Klonsky maintained a community blog subtitled Freedom Teachers at MyBarackObama.com.

During the engineered breakup of SDS, Klonsky was a leader of the tendency called Revolutionary Youth Movement I (RYM-I), a less extreme competitor of the Ayers-Dohrn-Mark Rudd-Jeff Jones-John Jacobs-Ted Gold Revolutionary Youth Movement II (RYM-II), which became the Weathermen and later the Weather Underground, otherwise known as Weatherpeople, Weather Bureau, etc. Klonsky and Ayers appeared for a time as bitter factional opponents, but at bottom this was simply role-playing, with Klonsky picking up the radicals who were only half-demented, and thus not crazy enough to join the kamikazes of the Ayers-Dohrn clique. If Ayers was known in SDS as a likely spook and provocateur for the intelligence community, Klonsky was regarded as a submarine for the Communist Party, USA, whose leaders were then in turn controlled by the FBI. During the lean years that followed, Klonsky tried Maoism.

The cooperation of Ayers and Klonsky in favor of Obama's seizure of power reproduces the old CP-anarchist alliance, which was a common wrecking plan for SDS chapters in 1969-1970. When Klonsky's role in the Obama campaign's internet effort became widely known, the Illinois Messiah was quick to cut his losses so as to avoid the specter of yet another explosive flare-up of negative publicity on the models of Rezko, Wright and Ayers. 'No sooner than Global Labor blogged … about the role in the Obama campaign of Mike Klonsky, former Weather Underground leader Bill Ayers' longtime comrade-in-arms from their days in SDS to the Chicago School Wars they fought in the 80s and 90s alongside Barack Obama, and presto he's gone. As of this evening, Klonsky is no longer blogging on the Barack Obama for President website.' (Steve Diamond, http://globallabor.blogspot.com/, June 25, 2008)

Another fanatical Obama backer with SDS connections is Tom Hayden, the SDS co-founder who helped promote the 1968 Democratic National Convention riots in Chicago. Hayden, a former California state senator and ex-husband of radical chic Jane Fonda, has endorsed Sen. Obama. So has Jane Fonda. Hayden authored the SDS political manifesto, known as the Port Huron Statement, which the group's founding members adopted in 1962. This document condemned the American political system as the cause of international conflict and a variety of social ills — including racism, materialism, militarism, and poverty. Instead, it offered the vacuous petty-bourgeois slogan of "participatory democracy," while offering no analysis and making no demands for labor rights, rebuilding the inner cities, third-world economic development, or other urgent economic issues of the day.

SDS derived from a group called the League for Industrial Democracy (LID), a transparent cold war anti-Soviet CIA front group made up of right-wing social democrats. LID has a student and youth branch called Student League for Industrial Democracy (SLID). SLID was running out of steam in the early 1960s, so the intelligence community decided to re-invent it in the trendier format of SDS. The name may have been taken from German SDS (*Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund*), the successful pseudo-radical student group of Willy Brandt's German Social Democratic Party (SPD), which many CIA officers had been able to observe first-hand during their frequent postings in West Germany, the hub of the cold war.

During the course of the 1960s, large parts of the SDS membership would escape ruling-class ideological control, which is what gave SDS the potential that had to be destroyed. But the SDS leadership was confined to narrow cliques with strong intelligence community input, who were easily able to defeat challengers and insurgents in conformity with Roberto Michels' Iron Law of Oligarchy.

Todd Gitlin, the SDS president from 1963 to 1964, has also been well taken care of, and now serves as a tenured professor of journalism and sociology at Columbia University. Giltin is a regular

contributor to Josh Marshall's *TPM Cafe*. He also blogs at ToddGitlin.com. In a new low for tendentious, pro-Obama pseudo-journalism, Gitlin was contacted April 18, 2008, by *The New Republic* to respond to Sen. Obama's Philadelphia cover-up speech about his hate-spewing pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright. Gitlin had endorsed Obama on February 4, 2008.

Paul Booth is yet another founder and former National Secretary of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and former President of Chicago's Citizen Action Program (CAP), formed in 1969 by trainees from counterinsurgent Saul Alinsky's Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), according to *Discover the Networks*. Booth is a labor skate, acting as assistant to Gerald McEntee, president of the public employees union AFSCME.

> In 1973, "radical activists" Booth and his wife, Heather Booth, founded The Midwest Academy (MA), a "training organization ... for a variety of leftist causes and organizations," which "describes itself as 'one of the nation's oldest and best known schools for community organizations, citizen organizations and individuals committed to progressive social change.'" This is the usual coded language for local control/ community control counterinsurgency. Not surprisingly, one of The Midwest Academy's funders is the Woods Foundation of Chicago, on whose board Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) served 1999 to December 2002 as a paid director with domestic terrorist William Ayers. In 1999, The Midwest Academy received a $75,000 grant from the Woods Fund. In 2002, The Midwest Academy received $23,500 for its Young Organizers Development Program. Additionally, in February 2004 Paul Booth contributed $500 to Obama's 2004 senatorial campaign.' ("One-degree of separation: Obama's ultra-leftist backers," Rezkowatch, Monday, April 28, 2008)

WEATHERMAN HATRED OF WHITE WORKERS FROM 1969 TO OBAMA

Obama's top handler David Axelrod told NPR that it was a mistake to rely on white working class voters in the first place. In a statement dripping with elitist class prejudice, Axelrod observed: "The white working class has gone to the Republican nominee for many elections, going back even to the Clinton years. This is not new that Democratic candidates don't rely solely on those votes." This is simply factually wrong, since Bill Clinton won many of these voters. Obama's campaign manager David Plouffe was even more categorical that blue collar workers were out of reach. But these were after all registered Democratic voters that Obama was losing in a Democratic primary. These very damning statements illustrate the thesis of this book that Obama hates and resents white working families and blue collar voters. Since white working people represent the absolute majority of the US population, one must wonder by what system Axelrod hopes to win a general election. Again, the conclusion must be that Obama really has no plan to win a general election, but will hope for help from police state forces in the form of scandals which will conveniently destroy his opponent. This is, after all, the main reason Obama is in the US Senate in the first place – ask the hapless Trilateral victims Marson Blair Hull and Jack Ryan.

THE WOODS FUND AND THE CIA-CONTROLLED FACTIONS OF THE PLO

The Woods Fund of Chicago, with Ayers and Obama on the board for several years before 2002, appears to function as a funding conduit for certain US-controlled or US-influenced factions of the highly factionalized and crisis-ridden Palestine Liberation Organization and Palestinian Authority. Whether these US-manipulated factions are violent or moderate is less important than the fact that they represent CIA tentacles inside the PLO. The fact that various Palestinian or PLO factions are controlled by foreign states is, or ought to be, well-known. The Soviets had some of these factions.

The Israelis were known to control a part of the central committee of the Abu Nidal Organization, run by Sabri al-Banna, the son of the pro-British and later pro-Nazi founder of the Moslem Brotherhood. Ariel Sharon helped to create Hamas, and so forth. The French and the Vatican are not far behind. So, Obama is close to the apparatus that funds the pro-US fifth column in the PLO. The PLO-linked groups funded by the Woods Foundation with the help of Obama's august presence also appear to be devices for the social control of the Arab populations of Chicago and the surrounding areas, which are being managed according to the Hapsburg-style affirmative action/racial identity counterinsurgency method we have already seen at work against black Americans, Hispanics, and native Americans.

With Obama helping to get funding for his group, the radical Palestinian professor Rashid Khalidi helped to set up a fund-raiser for Obama when he ran for congress in 2000.

> Khalidi, now the Edward Said Professor of Arab Studies at Columbia University, and head of that school's Middle East Institute, in an interview in Tuesday's *Daily News*, said he hosted the fundraiser because he and Obama were friends while the two lived in Chicago. "He never came to us and said he would do anything in terms of Palestinians," Khalidi told the paper. Nevertheless, one Hyde Park source close to Obama, speaking only on condition of anonymity, recalled, "He often expressed general sympathy for the Palestinians — though I don't recall him ever saying anything publicly." Khalidi helped to arrange the recent appearance of Iran's Ahmadinejad last summer at Columbia University. (Rashid Khalidi, "Middle East Professor at Columbia University and PLO activist," *The Jewish Week,* 2007, noquarterusa.net)

Ahmadinejad's visit to Columbia University was marred by the university president's scurrilous insults against the foreign leader. In the estimation of this writer at the time, the visit created a turbulent scene of protests which could have been used as a covering screen to assassinate the Iranian leader and precipitate a general Middle East war. Thankfully, that had not occurred. But the question remains about Khalidi's motives in bringing the Iranian president into the chaotic and dangerous situation that prevailed at Columbia. Had some case officer told him to do it? Even after its privatization into foundations and private fronts under Executive Order 12333, US intelligence still does not pay out its money for nothing. What was it that US intelligence was buying from Khalidi?

As a pro-Israeli account details,

> Ayers and Obama had teamed up for three years on the board of the Woods Fund, a Chicago charitable organization. Together, they voted to donate $75,000 of the largesse they controlled to the Arab American Action Network. The AAAN was co-founded by Rashid Khalidi… Despite considerable evidence to the contrary, Khalidi denies having been a PLO operative or having directed its official press agency for six years (from 1976 to 1982).' (Aaron Klein, "Obama worked with terrorist; Senator helped fund organization that rejects 'racist' Israel's existence," WorldNetDaily, February 24, 2008)

The details on the grants are very interesting:

> In 2001, the Woods Fund, a Chicago-based nonprofit that describes itself as a group helping the disadvantaged, provided a $40,000 grant to the Arab American Action Network, or AAAN, for which Khalidi's wife, Mona, serves as president. The Fund provided a second grant to the AAAN for $35,000 in 2002. Obama was a director of the Woods Fund board from 1999 to Dec. 11, 2002, according to the Fund's website. According to tax filings, Obama received compensation of $6,000 per year for his service in 1999 and 2001. …

> The $40,000 grant from Obama's Woods Fund to the AAAN constituted about a fifth of the Arab group's reported grants for 2001, according to tax filings obtained by WND. The $35,000 Woods Fund grant in 2002 also constituted about one-fifth of AAAN's reported grants for that year. The AAAN, headquartered in the heart of Chicago's Palestinian immigrant community, describes itself as working to "empower Chicago-area Arab immigrants and Arab Americans through the combined strategies of community organizing, advocacy, education and social services, leadership development, and forging productive relationships with other communities." It reportedly has worked on projects with the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights, which supports open borders and education for illegal aliens. AAAN co-founder Rashid Khalidi was reportedly a director of the official PLO press agency WAFA in Beirut from 1976 to 1982….
>
> Khalidi's wife, AAAN President Mona Khalidi, was reportedly WAFA's English translator during that period. Rashid Khalidi at times has denied working directly for the PLO but Palestinian diplomatic sources in Ramallah told WND he indeed directed WAFA. Khalidi also advised the Palestinian delegation to the Madrid Conference in 1991…
>
> While the Woods Fund's contribution to Khalidi's AAAN might be perceived as a one-time run with Obama, the presidential hopeful and Khalidi evidence a deeper relationship. According to a professor at the University of Chicago who said he has known Obama for 12 years, the Democratic presidential hopeful first befriended Khalidi when the two worked together at the university. The professor spoke on condition of anonymity. Khalidi lectured at the University of Chicago until 2003 while Obama taught law there from 1993 until his election to the Senate in 2004. Khalidi in 2000 held what was described as a successful fundraiser for Obama's failed bid for a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives, a fact not denied by Khalidi. Speaking in a joint interview with WND and the John Batchelor Show of New York's WABC Radio and Los Angeles' KFI Radio, Khalidi was asked about his 2000 fundraiser for Obama. "I was just doing my duties as a Chicago resident to help my local politician," Khalidi stated. Khalidi said he supports Obama for president "because he is the only candidate who has expressed sympathy for the Palestinian cause." Asked about Obama's role funding the AAAN, Khalidi claimed he had "never heard of the Woods Fund until it popped up on a bunch of blogs a few months ago." He terminated the call when petitioned further about his links with Obama. Contacted by phone, Mona Khalidi refused to answer WND's questions about the AAAN's involvement with Obama. (Aaron Klein, "Obama worked with terrorist; Senator helped fund organization that rejects 'racist' Israel's existence," WorldNetDaily, February 24, 2008)

OBAMA AND THE CHICAGO ARAB UNDERWORLD: ATA "THE RAT"

In addition to such figures as Khalidi, Obama also came into contact with the gangsters, grafters, hoodlums, and other sociopaths who populate the wormy underside of the Chicago Arab community. We will talk in a coming chapter about the Syrian-Levantine Antoin Rezko, his fellow Levantine Nadhi Auchi, and the renegade Iraqi Electricity Minister Alsammarae. Here we will refer to a smaller fish, but a very significant one: Ali Ata, who was caught up in the FBI dragnet of Operation Board Games around the Illinois Combine for graft and corruption, which has a division for every ethnic group in Chicago. Ali Ata, now a convicted felon, gets us very close to Obama: all the way to Obama's godfather and moneybags Antoin Rezko, and all the way to Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich. Here we begin to see what kind of perks might emerge as by-products of Obama's role in helping get money for the US-controlled factions of the PLO:

> The Tony Rezko trial opened the door to more Board Game cases not yet tried and more Combine members threw in the towel. Ali Ata, the former director of the Illinois Finance Authority, entered into a plea agreement on April 22, 2008… Ata pled guilty to charges that included tax fraud, and lying to the FBI in saying he received nothing in return for $50,000 in contributions to Blagojevich when according to the plea agreement, he did "receive something for those contributions, specifically employment with a state agency ... with an annual salary of approximately $127,000." The agreement notes that Ata met with Blagojevich, not Rezko, in 2000 or 2001, and Blagojevich asked for his support because he was contemplating a run for higher office. Ata testified that he held his first Blagojevich fundraiser in the 1990s when he was asked to raise money for Blagojevich's run for Congress within the Arab community. Ata made a $5,000 donation to Obama on June 30, 2003. Talat Othman was also appointed to this Board, and he donated $1,000 to Obama on June 30, 2003. David Gustman was made chairman, and his wife, Lisa, also gave Obama $1,000 on June 30. Ata is a former president of the Chicago Chapter of the American Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. He represents "a deeper corruption" in the Arab American community, "an aspect of the story that has not received much attention," according to a May 2, 2008 report by Ray Hanania in the *Southwest News-Herald*. Hanania points out that many in the Arab community are calling Ata a "rat." But he's not alone, Hanania says: "The real rats are those who used their positions as "leaders" to rape and pillage their own community. The real rats are the so-called "leaders" who worked to benefit themselves pretending they were doing it for the benefit of the community." In his report, Hanania explains how Ata and others would often gather at a "hookah" café on Harlem Avenue, where they helped organize political dinners attended by Arab Americans from the Southwest suburbs at which politicians where "honored." "These Arab community leaders," he says, "would tell the community that if they bought tickets to their candidate's nights," their organization fundraisers or donated through them to local politicians, these politicians would respond by giving the Arab American community empowerment." "They said the politicians would give the Arab Americans a voice in their governments," he reports. "In truth," Hanania says, "these political leaders lied…. They did get jobs, contracts and clout," he notes, "but the people who benefited were not members of the community but rather the relatives, children, friends and business associates of these leaders." (Pringle, "Curtain Time for Barack Obama - Part IV," op-ed news)

Here again, the narrow and divisive identity politics purveyed by the Ford Foundation reveals its bankruptcy: it creates a thin layer of rich exploiters, while leaving the majority of each ethnic group worse off than when they started.

THE ROBERT MALLEY AFFAIR AND THE SOROS-BRZEZINSKI INTERNATIONAL CRISIS GROUP

Obama's relations with the Middle East agent community were also illuminated by the Robert Malley affair. Robert Malley worked for the International Crisis Group, which is heavily funded by George Soros and has Zbigniew Brzezinski on its board. With this, we know everything we need to know about the International Crisis Group: its operatives do not want peace in the Middle East, but rather mobilization of the Arabs and Moslems against Russia and China in the framework of Brzezinski's apocalyptic vision of confrontation. Robert Malley's father Simon Malley was born in Cairo to a Jewish-Syrian family. He moved to France in 1969, where he founded the pseudo-left journal *Afrique Asie*; the name was changed to *L'Economiste du Tiers Monde* in the 1970s. This was supposedly radical third world nationalist, but gave ample scope to Fanon and the future Pol

Pots and Bani Sadrs. Many suspected that Simon Malley was in fact running a British operation. Simon Malley was also used to sabotage French foreign policy in the third world, which is often in conflict with London and Washington. In October 1980, the French had had enough of Malley's constant wrecking operations, and they deported him, hustling him onto a plane bound for New York. Simon's son Robert obviously continued the family business of being a left-cover operative in the orbit of the US-UK imperial line.

After months of inconclusive sniping by various web sites against Robert Malley, he was quickly dumped by the Obama campaign from his role in Obama's Middle East Advisory Council at the end of the first week in May when it became known that he had been meeting with the Palestinian group Hamas. Malley told the *London Times* that he had been in regular contact with Hamas, which rules Gaza. Malley claimed that, when he met with Hamas, he was wearing his International Crisis Group hat, and not his Obama advisor's hat. "I've never hidden the fact that in my job with the International Crisis Group I meet all kinds of people," Malley said. Ben LaBolt, a spokesman for Obama, attempted damage control: "Rob Malley has, like hundreds of other experts, provided informal advice to the campaign in the past. He has no formal role in the campaign and he will not play any role in the future." The rapid departure of Mr Malley came after two days of heated clashes between John McCain, the Republican nominee-elect, and Mr Obama over Middle East policy. (*London Times*, May 10, 2008) Malley was a much less important advisor to Obama than the overall campaign controller and guru, Zbigniew Brzezinski. If Malley could be fired over a few meetings with Hamas, why was Brzezinski not fired because of his sponsorship of Ilyas Achmadov, the Chechen terrorist ambassador who was living high on the hog in Washington DC at US taxpayer expense as a result of Brzezinski's lobbying – lobbying in which Senator McCain was also a key participant?

THE *IKHWAN* ENDORSES OBAMA

The Muslim American Society (MAS) is an organization closely linked to the Muslim Brotherhood. On its website's "Personality Page," the MAS displays a photo and short bio of Barack Hussein Obama along with those it calls other prominent Muslims, such as Malcolm X, Saladin and Moqtada al-Sadr. A 2004 *Chicago Tribune* investigation revealed that, after a contentious debate, U.S. leaders of the fundamentalist Muslim Brotherhood, the classic British intelligence vehicle for fighting progressive nationalist regimes in the Arab world like Kassem of Iraq and Nasser of Egypt with benighted mystical reactionaries, decided in 1993 to begin calling themselves the Muslim American Society. The Brotherhood's goal is ostensibly to spread the rule of Islamic law throughout the world, but exceptions are made whenever required by British interests. Key Muslim Brotherhood ideologues, including founder Hassan al-Banna (whom we have already met as the father of British and Israeli-controlled provocateur Sabri al Banna/Abu Nidal), have endorsed violence as a means of doing so. Today, MAS' leaders admit that the group was founded by the Muslim Brotherhood, but claim that MAS has evolved since then.

MARK RUDD: THE WEATHERMEN AS FBI PROVOACTEURS?

It must always be understood that the Weathermen were in no way honest radicals gone astray, nor yet authentic communist revolutionaries: they were wreckers, saboteurs, and provocateurs who had been sent by the intelligence community into the student and peace movements for the purpose of destroying them. Here again, Thomas Ayers' seat on the board of General Dynamics, the largest

US defense contractor for the Pentagon in most years, tells us everything we need to know about the relations of the Ayers family to the intelligence community. Rumors that Bill Ayers was a spook circulated in SDS in the late 60s. One Weatherman leader who appears obsessed by the appearance that his old terrorist gang was in fact a tool of the FBI is none other than Mark Rudd. (Or, at least, Rudd chooses to harp on the FBI, perhaps to draw attention away from his more likely sponsors in the intelligence community, such as the domestic counterinsurgency operations of the Ford Foundation, with which Rudd has been linked by published sources.) At the time of the SDS split convention in Chicago in the summer of 1969, Mark Rudd was without question the most famous Weatherman leader because of the media attention to his role at the Columbia strike, and it was he who was chosen as the national secretary of the rump faction of SDS controlled by the Weatherman crazies after the expulsion of the Progressive Labor Party, the International Socialists, the Labor Committees, and a number of smaller Trotskyist groups. Rudd had been chosen by the New York City television stations as the authentic student anarchist voice of the Columbia University strike in April 1969, and this had given him a significant national profile. Rudd was sent on a national tour of university campuses and SDS chapters to make the case for the lunatic Weatherman point of view. The bomb throwing and cop killing Weatherman faction, however, considered Rudd as a lightweight and intended only to use him as a disposable figurehead. These crazies soon drove Rudd out of the Weatherman organization. In the following decades, Rudd appears to have developed some rudimentary understanding of the precious services rendered to the FBI and the intelligence community in general through the destruction of SDS by the Weatherman action faction. Rudd returns again and again to the idea that the Weathermen were doing exactly what the FBI wanted them to do, even though he also hysterically asserts that the Weathermen were not paid agents, conscious agents, or witting operatives. Here is a sample of Rudd's ruminations, dating back to an interview recorded in 2004: '… we in the leadership of Weatherman (predecessor to the Weather Underground Organization) made a historically criminal decision at the end of 1969 to scuttle Students for a Democratic Society, the largest student anti-war and radical organization, with over 300 chapters on college campuses and high schools. We mistakenly believed that we could bring into existence a revolutionary movement, led by an underground revolutionary army; SDS, with its purely legal above-ground existence and its reform agenda, was seen as an impediment to the growth of the revolutionary army. Our faction was in control of the national and regional offices of the organization, plus its newspaper. I remember sometime in January, 1970, dumping the membership lists of the New York Regional Office into a garbage barge at the W. 14th St. pier. **How could we have done the FBI's work better for them?** I believe that we weakened the larger movement, whose goal was uniting as many people as possible to end the Vietnam War. Besides causing people to drop out, we gave the government ammunition to smear the whole anti-war movement as violent crazies bent on destruction of the society. Did our actions help attract the huge middle of American society who might otherwise have joined the anti-war movement, public opinion being vastly against the war? "Bring the War Home," was as counter-productive a line in 1969 and 1970 as it was in 2001 at the World Trade Center. Last, and probably most important, the Weather Underground forced a debilitating ideological debate in the much larger anti-war movement over the "necessity" of engaging in armed "revolutionary" actions. In the summer of 1969 Weather-organized actions even disrupted the Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam ("Mobe") mass anti-war events and demonstrations. People became demoralized and left the anti-war movement because they didn't want any part of an armed revolution. **We destroyed SDS because it wasn't radical enough (it couldn't take the final step of anti-imperialism to armed action), thereby doing the work of the FBI.'** (*Radical History Review*, Spring, 2006, emphasis

added.) In fact, the control mechanism for the Weathermen ran through the foundations rather than through the FBI, for obvious reasons.

These same themes are developed in Rudd's retrospective analysis of how the proto-fascist Weatherman provocateurs succeeded in destroying SDS, which had been growing rapidly until the crazies seized control of the Chicago National Office in June and July of 1969: 'Students for a Democratic Society had been growing almost effortlessly since 1965 when the U.S. attacked Vietnam with ground troops. By 1968 there were over 300 autonomous chapters on college campuses, high schools, and even post-college; the number of active members may have been more than 100,000 (though dues-paying national membership was much smaller). The story of what happened became known as The Days of Rage has been told elsewhere, including the 2003 documentary, "The Weather Underground." What's significant for this story, though, is that the SDS chapters rejected en masse support for the action. Most chapters had been independent, neither PL nor RYM, and didn't participate in or even understand the argument. The effect of the split at the June Convention was to cut them off from the National Office. We in what became known as Weatherman had lost our base. But we kept going without one. **The effect on SDS as a whole was disaster. By the beginning of 1970 the national organization had ceased to exist.** We in the Weatherman leadership had made a decision that SDS wasn't radical enough, that it was an impediment to the building of a revolutionary movement in this country. We needed an underground guerilla army to begin the revolutionary armed struggle. So we disbanded the National and Regional Offices, dissolved the national organization, and set the chapters adrift. Many chapters kept organizing, in their own ways, against the war and racism; demoralized, others disbanded. **We couldn't have done the FBI's work better for them had we been paid agents, which I know we weren't.** [Maybe not of the FBI, but how about the foundations?] We were just stupid kids too in love with our ideas to realize they weren't real. We believed they were real because we thought them… My recall is that my comrades and I in the leadership of Weatherman made specific bad decisions based on our evolving and deepening ideology toward the chimera of revolution and the strategy revolutionary guerilla warfare. One thinks of the roads not taken. We could have chosen to fight to maintain the organization, to strengthen its anti-imperialism and anti-racism among students, to build the largest possible coalition against the war. Perhaps we could have ended the war sooner, who knows?'[52] Rudd is certainly right that without the efforts of the Weatherman wreckers and saboteurs, the Vietnam War might have been brought to an end much sooner, and other positive causes could have been advanced on the domestic front. But of course, the Weatherman domestic program was nothing but race war. Rudd's commentary on youthful fanatics, not far removed from their delusions of infantile omnipotence, who hysterically insist that their egocentric ideas must be real simply because they are thinking them gives us some insight into the mentality of Obama's swarming adolescents today. Perhaps someday, when the US and foundation archives are opened, we will be able to reconstruct the story of how the intelligence agencies destroyed SDS; we can be sure that an especially lurid chapter in this tale will feature the activities of Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn.

THE URGENCY OF COUNTERINSURGENCY, 1986-1988: ADLAI STEVENSON'S DEBACLE, AXELROD, AND THE 1313 GANG

The beginning of Obama's career with the Chicago Annenberg Challenge under the sponsorship of Thomas Ayers and Bill Ayers takes us back to a moment when the bi-partisan, financier-controlled social control apparatus ruling Chicago appeared to be undergoing definite strain and possible crisis. In the Illinois Democratic primary of March 18, 1986, the corrupt Chicago

Democratic machine was supporting the gubernatorial candidacy of Adlai Stevenson III, a former US Senator and the son of two-time Democratic presidential candidate and Illinois governor Adlai Stevenson, a favorite of the New York investment banks and a man who put a professorial face on the dirty Cook County Democratic organization, but lost the presidency to Ike Eisenhower in 1952 and in 1956. For Illinois Secretary of State, the Democratic machine wanted the political hack Aurelia Pucinski, who came from a politically prominent family and was supported by the party organization. The Democratic machine was stunned when the Democratic nominations for Lieutenant Governor and Secretary of State were won by Mark Fairchild and Janice Hart, two supporters of the political movement of Lyndon LaRouche. The national media went berserk over the idea that Illinois voters had chosen Fairchild and Hart, despite their association with LaRouche, as the most effective vehicles for an explosive protest vote against the existing order of things. Janice Hart said on the day after the primary: "I'm going to revive the spirit of Abraham Lincoln and General Patton. We're going to roll our tanks down State Street." Democratic National Committee chairman Paul Kirk joined in the hysteria, exclaiming, "Good Lord, we have a problem here." At this point, Stevenson could have kept his own hopes for the governorship alive by bowing gracefully to the will of the voters, and gracefully and silently taking his place at the top of a Democratic ticket including Fairchild and Hart for statewide office. After all, actual terrorist bombers and accused murderers like Ayers and Dohrn had already been welcomed back into the Chicago Democratic machine in those years. Fairchild and Hart had never killed or bombed anybody. Neither one had ever appeared on the FBI's most wanted list; neither had a criminal record. But, of course, Ayers and Dohrn were different: they had always been working as provocateurs for the intelligence community and the financiers. So Stevenson decided to go berserk, slandering the candidates chosen by the Illinois Democratic voters, and ruining his own hopes for the governorship in the process.

AXELROD PUSHES STEVENSON TO SELF-DESTRUCT

Ironically, the campaign manager who goaded the younger Stevenson to destroy himself was none other than Obama's current Svengali, the Chicago machine hack David Axelrod: 'Political consultant David Axelrod, who today runs Barack Obama's Presidential campaign, was in 1986 managing the campaign of Adlai Stevenson III for governor. Axelrod told Stevenson he should quit the race, rather than run in the general election on the same, Democratic, ticket with the LaRouche supporters. "'I thought he should resign. He couldn't run with those maniacs," Axelrod said later. Stevenson decided to quit the Democrats but to run as a third party candidate. Axelrod later recalled how Stevenson fared, under his guidance: "In the following months, Stevenson was battered by the press and deserted by the politicians. It reached the point of the absurd. It was the political equivalent of AIDS."' (*Chicago Magazine*, December 1987). David Axelrod grew up in New York City, where his mother, Myril Axelrod, was vice president of the Young & Rubicam advertising agency and was a pioneer of the use of "focus groups" for profiling the population, long before Frank Luntz and company had arrived on the scene. Attending the University of Chicago beginning in 1972, majoring in political science, Axelrod became associated with the financier-directed "political reform" movement centered at that University. While he was writing articles for the *Hyde Park Herald*, he was taken under the wing of Don Rose, a political operative of the Public Administration Service school at the University. That school was a component of the notorious 1313 building complex at the University of Chicago, a national center for the manipulation of America's public policy and municipal administrations. According to a 2004 article in the *Hyde Park Herald*, "1313 grew from a 1930 lunchtime conversation in Geneva, Switzerland between [University official Louis] Brownlow and Beardsley Ruml. Ruml was executive director of the

Spelman Fund of New York, a relatively new entity created to disburse Rockefeller dollars. Brownlow pressed his case for a public administration clearing house, Ruml enthusiastically embraced the idea and, in 1937 the [Rockefeller-controlled] Spelman Fund disbursed $1 million to the University of Chicago to underwrite the construction of what became 1313." (Mr. Ruml also helped organize the fascist psychiatry enterprise known as the Josiah Macy Foundation.) Don Rose recommended young Axelrod for an intern's job at the *Chicago Tribune* daily newspaper, where the intensely plugged-in Axelrod eventually rose to become political editor. Don Rose later told Chicago magazine, "Axelrod was the first political reporter at the Trib who was really associated with the liberal reform movement. He was sympathetic to the movement ... and he developed a lot of contacts. One of the reasons he looked good was because the people he developed associations with were on the ascendancy...." In 1984, Axelrod quit the *Tribune* to manage Paul Simon's senate race, followed later by jobs with Stevenson, Harold Washington, and others. Throughout, Axelrod has been identified with the movement for political "reforms" — such as privatization, budget cuts, etc. — representing the oligarchs at the University of Chicago and their financier sponsors. David Axelrod is the Obama campaign's overall director; Axelrod's partner (in the firm AKP Media), David Plouffe, is Obama's official campaign manager; and Axelrod's other partner, John Del Cecato, is a strategist for the campaign.' (larouchepac.com, April 24, 2008)

Stevenson formed the Solidarity Party and ran with Jane Spirgel as the Secretary of State nominee and Mike Howlett for Lieutenant Governor. Hart achieved 15% of the vote, with Spirgel taking 17%. Hart and Spirgel's opponent, Republican incumbent Jim Edgar, won the election by the largest margin in any state-wide election in Illinois history (until Barky's 2004 defeat of the carpetbagging buffoon Allan Keyes), with 1.574 million votes (67%). Fairchild was defeated, and Republican Big Jim Thompson took the governorship over the hapless Stevenson.

THE 1987 CHICAGO TEACHERS' STRIKE

As we have seen, one of the targets of any foundation-funded school reform is automatically to weaken or bust the teachers' union. In September 1987, the Chicago teachers' union went on strike for 19 days. This was the ninth strike in two decades. Secretary of Education William Bennett, in an attempt to encourage the busting of the union after the 1987 school strike, declared the city's schools the "worst in America." Under the late Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago had deliberately maintained a highly segregated system. 'As whites fled to the suburbs and many remaining white families sent children to the large Catholic school system, citizen support for the public schools diminished. Daley tried to buy labor peace with the unions through financial sleight-of-hand that, after his death, resulted in full-scale crisis in 1979. In response to the crescendo of discontent which was also orchestrated by foundation operatives, Mayor Harold Washington, the city's first black mayor, convened an "education summit" in 1986 to persuade businesses to guarantee jobs to public school graduates if they met performance standards." The LSC ploy also succeeded in splitting the black community, with Jesse Jackson lobbying forcefully against reform, fighting implementation, and battling, for example, to save the job of his old protégé, Manford Byrd, the superintendent of schools who was forced out. The black middle class, many of whom were school employees, was the political and financial base for Jackson's Operation PUSH, despite his vocal advocacy of the disenfranchised poor. When PUSH came to the shove of disgruntled black parents, Jackson's organization sided with the black administrators, above all, and the teachers.' About 550 positions have been cut out of a central bureaucracy of about 4,100, while top administrators have done everything they could to save themselves. Veronica Anderson, writing in the March 2008 issue of *Catalyst Chicago*, described the local control institutions as generally moribund, observing that

"The death knell is ringing for Chicago's local school councils, as it has been for years." 'One of the biggest abuses of the local control system is that principals have no tenure, and have to cater to the whims of local groups of parents who often have no concept of education except their own likes and dislikes. Anderson also reports that "the constant onslaught of negative buzz regarding LSCs has created the widespread impression that LSCs are hapless, ineffective, and at times as the case of Curie High School seemingly illustrates, dangerous to school improvement." The interest of the foundations, and their grant money, was steadily fading.' (David Moberg, "Can Democracy Save Chicago's Schools?," *American Prospect*, November 30, 2002) One of the few tangible results of the creation of the LSCs at the individual school level was that several hundred experienced and previously tenured principals were fired, which drastically lowered the administrative quality of the system, but which promised a big savings to the greedy banks who owned the Chicago municipal bonds marketed by firms like Nuveen and Co, and who wanted to be sure that their interest payments had top priority.

BILL AYERS: FROM TERRORIST TO EDUCATION REFORMER

Thanks to the fact that his father Tom had intelligence community connections on a very high level, Bill Ayers was able to emerge from clandestine criminal life and re-invent himself as an education reformer. A key part of this was his magical ability to get money from the foundations. His knack was so deft that it suggested that he had been a foundation operative all along, even before Executive Order 12333. Steve Diamond has chronicled the process by which the former fugitive Bill Ayers was transformed into a few short years into a top authority on education policy, and above all into a dispenser of tens of millions of dollars of corporate largesse: 'Bill raised money to start the Small Schools Workshop in the early 90s and eventually hired another former Maoist from the 60s (and actually someone who was a bitter opponent of Ayers as SDS disintegrated) named Mike Klonsky to head it up. Bill's brother John later got in on the small schools approach also, raising money in part from the Annenberg Challenge program started by Bill and chaired by Obama… A leading figure in the Chicago business groups that were lobbying for cost cutting and "efficiency" in the Chicago schools in the 1980s was Bill Ayers' father, Thomas Ayers…. Tom Ayers co-authored a report of a joint public-private task force on school reform and was later nominated to head up Chicago United, a business backed school reform group that Ayers helped found, by Chicago Mayor Jane Byrne, but was opposed successfully by black community activists. When the 1988 Reform Act was passed a group called Leadership for Quality Education (LQE) was formed…by the elite business lobby that was in part behind the new reforms, to train the newly elected local school council members. Some 6000 LSC members were elected. And they became a huge thorn in the side of school administration in Chicago. Interestingly, one LSC member was John Ayers, son of Tom and brother of Bill. In 1993, John was made head of the LQE - which, by then, according to Shipps, was caught in the middle of the battle emerging to re-centralize control of the schools in the hands of the mayor. In the fall of 1988, however, Obama left the city to go off to law school. My best guess, though, is that it was in that 86-88 time frame that Obama likely met up with the Ayers family.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008) Again, this cannot be seen as a matter of pure coincidence, but rather of people like Huntington and Brzezinski putting their protégé in contact with an important regional leader of the US financier establishment.

OBAMA'S BIG BREAK: AYERS AND THE CHICAGO ANNENBERG CHALLENGE

Diamond stresses that getting tapped to head up the prestigious and massively funded Annenberg Chicago Challenge – based on no visible qualifications – constituted Obama's key inflection point or career take-off. Diamond is of course attempting to explain this process based on more or less chance encounters among individuals, rather than being aware that we are watching an intelligence network which goes back well over half a century. Obama and the Ayers clan came together not by chance, but thanks to the fine Trilateral hand that fosters some careers and strangles others. Diamond recounts: 'Then, in late 1994 or early 1995, Obama made what I think was probably the key move in his early career. He was named Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, a $50 million grant program to funnel money into reform efforts at Chicago schools. It turns out that the architect of the Annenberg Challenge was Bill Ayers, who designed the grant proposal and shepherded it to success. The purpose of the program was to defend the controversial and troubled local schools council effort that had been put in place back in 1988. The first Executive Director of the Challenge was Ken Rolling, who came there from the much discussed Woods Fund (where he had been a program officer). The Woods Fund had provided grants to Obama's DCP in the late 80s and Rolling was a part of the school reform effort in which both Bill Ayers and Obama participated. Obama joined the board of the Woods Fund in 1993 in 1999 he would be joined on the board by Bill Ayers.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)[53]

Obama's role in heading up the Chicago Annenberg Challenge meant money, prestige, and above all an excellent chance to network with the lakefront oligarchs: '… the Annenberg Challenge money came through anyway due to the efforts of Bill Ayers, among others. It had to be matched 2 to 1 by corporate and foundation money (in fact, they raised an additional $60 million by 1999), so the Board Chairmanship would have allowed Obama to be in touch with the powerful money interests in Chicago, including possibly the Pritzker Family and others that Kaufman mentions in his story. Penny Pritzker would join the board of the Chicago Public Education Fund which received its startup funding from the Annenberg Challenge as the Challenge wound down in 2001 - the Challenge, in effect, handed the baton of support for school reform to the CPEF. Penny Pritzker [who owns a share of the Hyatt Hotel fortune, built on the backs of super-exploited Hispanic cleaning ladies] is now a key Obama campaign insider in charge of fund raising.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

Today, Ayers presents himself not as terrorist vermin, cowardly butcher and mass murderer, but rather as a theoretician of educating children, and Midwest moralist to boot. Ayers wrote on his website in a January 19, 2008 essay on school reform: "The dominant narrative in contemporary school reform is once again focused on exclusion and disadvantage, race and class, black and white. 'Across the US,' the National Governor's Association declared in 2005, 'a gap in academic achievement persists between minority and disadvantaged students and their white counterparts.' This is the commonly referenced and popularly understood 'racial achievement gap,' and it drives education policy at every level. Interestingly, whether heartfelt or self-satisfied, the narrative never mentions the monster in the room: white supremacy….Gloria Ladson-Billings upends all of this with an elegant reversal: there is no achievement gap, she argues, but actually a glancing reflection of something deeper and more profound—America has a profound education debt. The educational inequities that began with the annihilation of native peoples and the enslavement of Africans, the conquest of the continent and the importation of both free labor and serfs, transformed into

apartheid education, something anemic, inferior, inadequate, and oppressive. Over decades and centuries the debt has accumulated and is passed from generation to generation, and it continues to grow and pile up." (Emphasis added.)[54]

In April 2008 Sol Stern of the neocon Manhattan Institute gave a series of interviews seeking to show that Ayers' politics have hardly changed since his Weatherman days. According to Stern, 'Ayers still boasts about working full-time to bring down American capitalism and imperialism, but he does this now from his tenured perch as Distinguished Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, Chicago.[55] Instead of planting bombs in public buildings, Ayers now works to indoctrinate America's future teachers in the revolutionary cause, urging them to pass on the lessons to their public school students. […] 'In late 1994 or early 1995, Obama made what I think was probably the key move in his early career. He was named Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge….'[56] This was initially a $50 million grant program to funnel money into social engineering, manipulation, and divide-and-conquer efforts at Chicago schools. 'It turns out that the architect of the Annenberg Chicago Challenge was Bill Ayers, who designed the grant proposal and shepherded it to success.' (Pundita, noquarterusa.net)[57] Naturally, this must be considered a true elective affinity between Ayers and Obama, but it also reflects the network which was supporting them both: the left CIA foundation network was promoting the careers of its stalwarts, even as it carried out its appointed tasks for the banking elite.

Steve Diamond pointed out on Noquarterusa.net that 'the link between Obama and Ayers had to pre-date the November 1995 event because [by 1995] ***Obama was already Chairman of the Board of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge grant program***. The Annenberg Challenge was a $50 million grant (to be matched by additional donors 2:1) to a new Chicago non-profit entity to make grants to schools in Chicago. The grant proposal was conceived of and written by Bill Ayers. Ayers was named Chicago's "Citizen of the Year" for his efforts. He was featured on the PBS News Hour to discuss the grant. In every assessment of the program Ayers was given credit for leading the charge on the program. He began the design of the proposal in late 1993 and the grant was awarded in January 1995.' Steve Diamond goes on to elaborate that 'the Annenberg Challenge was not a random school improvement effort. The purpose of the Challenge was to help shore up the ongoing reform effort then underway in the Chicago public schools. It was a counter-attack by Ayers in what some commentators called the "Chicago school wars." The reform effort was floundering and facing increasing opposition from business groups and others. The reform was built on a 1988 law that imposed "local school councils" (LSCs) on the school system to create a new power center that would challenge both the Chicago teachers' unions and the school system administration. Both Ayers and Obama were supporters of these 1988 reforms. (One little discussed fact about the reform effort - when it targeted the union and the school administration, it was taking on two institutions that had been a new and important source of attractive professional jobs for black Chicagoans.)"' Diamond's suspicions are more than confirmed: since the New York City teachers' strike was broken in 1968-69, the stock in trade of the Ford Foundation and its co-thinkers has been to organize black parents into community control councils which can then be used to attack the teachers' unions, while also tearing down the school system itself. The goal is the financiers' aim of destroying free universal public education of any sort in this country, to facilitate the reduction of America into serfdom. So Ayers is doing his job as an affirmative action foundation provocateur eager to play black parents against teachers, many of them also black or Hispanic. The name of the game is always divide and conquer, playing one group of little people and victims of the system against another, to keep Wall Street and the financier elite above the fray. Caught between the top-down privatized business model, with private interests bilking the system, the voucher-school

choice-charter school route, and the lunatic left community control model peddled by Ayers with its eternal petty conflicts, quality education would never stand a chance. Real progress required resources, the rebuilding of neighborhoods, and the hope of good jobs on the horizon – all things which the US ruling financier elite had proven itself incapable of providing.

Diamond adds that '…it was not clear that the LSCs were helping students learn more. In 1995 a new law would pass in Springfield re-centralizing power, but this time in the hands of the mayor (Richard Daley) through a new CEO for the school system. This gutted the power of the LSCs. Bill Ayers opposed this re-centralization (I believe because Ayers saw the LSCs as a potential means by which to impose his authoritarian "social justice" education agenda). To lead the Challenge Ayers would certainly have wanted a board chairman who was sympathetic with his goals. That suggests that Obama and he had already established a relationship that convinced Ayers that Obama was the right man for this key leadership role. As I have said here, it is possible Ayers and Obama first met during the campaign for the creation of the LSCs in the wake of the 1987 teachers' union strike, an event that galvanized community and business support in Chicago for the LSC idea. Both Ayers and Obama were active in that campaign for the LSCs.' The self-defeating counterinsurgency strategy of community control had, of course, been what Obama was selling when he worked for the Alinskyite wreckers at the Gamaliel Foundation. But there was also a Trilateral hand guiding his destiny, as we must never forget.[58]

WILL OBAMA DEMAND REPARATIONS?

Other than Ayers, who qualifies as a top racist FOB (Friend of Barky), Senator Obama's main education advisor is Professor Linda Darling-Hammond, a prominent national theoretician of education policy who teaches at Stanford University's School of Education. Darling-Hammond operates through something called the Forum for Education and Democracy (FED). Darling-Hammond's program for education reform starts off with the need to 'Repay the "education debt."' This is a concept which is left vague, but which could very easily serve as a cloak for a demand for reparations for the black community only, a demand sure to create a violent paroxysm of racial tension and indeed race war if it were to gather strength under the present conditions of economic breakdown. The education debt, says Professor Darling-Hammond, is a concept invented by Professor Gloria Ladson-Billings, of the University of Wisconsin and a "convener" together with Professor Darling-Hammond of the FED. It is aimed at replacing the concept that has dominated much education reform discussion in recent years called the "achievement gap." As Darling-Hammond has written: "[T]he problem we face is less an 'achievement gap' than an ***educational debt*** that has accumulated over centuries of denied access to education and employment, reinforced by deepening poverty and resource inequalities in schools. Until American society confronts the accumulated educational debt owed to these students and takes responsibility for the inferior resources they receive, [Gloria] Ladson-Billings argues, children of color and of poverty will continue to be left behind."[59] This might well serve as a cloak for reparations demands.

The suspicions grow when we find Ladson-Billings quoting veteran foundation race operative Randall Robinson in an article on educational debt in *Educational Researcher* (Oct. 2005), where we read: "What is it that we might owe to citizens who historically have been excluded from social benefits and opportunities? Randall Robinson (2000) states: 'No nation can enslave a race of people for hundreds of years, set them free bedraggled and penniless, pit them, without assistance in a hostile environment, against privileged victimizers, and then reasonably expect the gap between the heirs of the two groups to narrow. Lines, begun parallel and left alone, can never touch. (p. 74)'" The book by Randall Robinson which is cited here is *The Debt: What America Owes to Blacks,*

which is a strident demand for reparations to be paid by non-blacks to blacks to redress the impact of slavery and discrimination. Darling-Hammond has also argued that there is in America "a growing number of ***'apartheid' schools*** that serve racial/ethnic minority students exclusively — schools that have little political clout and are extraordinarily impoverished." (Steve Diamond, noquarterusa.net) Once more, the implied correct answer seems to be reparations. Let it be clear: class-based, race-blind economic recovery programs for those facing poverty and exclusion will enjoy wide support and will help to overcome the depression. Demands for some groups to pay reparations to other groups because of a theory of collective guilt will lead towards race war and civil war, to say nothing of deepening depression. Obama by all indications is leading towards the latter.

OBAMA PROMISES DEEDS, NOT WORDS, FOR REPARATIONS

In a Chicago speech at the end of July 2008, Obama made clear that he will indeed attempt to impose reparations if elected, doubtless on the basis of American collective guilt. These reparations would apparently go to Native Americans and to African-Americans, and possibly to Hawaiian-Americans as well. '"There's no doubt that when it comes to our treatment of Native Americans as well as other persons of color in this country, we've got some very sad and difficult things to account for," Obama told hundreds of attendees of UNITY '08, a convention of four minority journalism associations. The Hawaii-born senator, who has told local reporters that he supports the federal recognition bill for native Hawaiians drafted by U.S. Sen. Daniel Akaka, noted other ethnic groups but did not mention native Hawaiians when answering a question about his thoughts on a formal U.S. apology to American Indians. "I personally would want to see our tragic history, or the tragic elements of our history, acknowledged," the Democratic presidential hopeful said. "I consistently believe that when it comes to whether it's Native Americans or African-American issues or **reparations**, the most important thing for the U.S. government to do is not just offer words, but offer deeds."'[60] Let there be no doubt: under depression conditions, this policy is a recipe to move the United States towards civil war in the form of race war. This is apparently the firm intent of Obama's Trilateral masters.

FATHER PFLEGER, REPARATIONS, AND RACE WAR

Another long-term close friend of Obama who is evidently supporting the concept of reparations is the renegade priest, Father Pfleger, who became a focus of controversy in late May 2008. Pfleger visited Trinity United, and was introduced by Otis Moss as "a friend of Trinity." Pfleger then launched in to a diatribe which seems to suggest a campaign for reparations: "I must now address the one who says, 'don't hold me responsible for what my ancestors did.' But you have enjoyed the benefits of what your ancestors did! And unless you are ready to give up the benefits — Throw away your 401 fund! [sic] Throw away your trust fund! Throw away all the money that been put away in the company you walked into 'cause your daddy and your granddaddy and your great granddaddy — Unless you are willing to give up the benefits, then you must be responsible for what was done in your generation! 'Cause you are the beneficiary of this insurance policy!"[61] There seems to be little doubt that the first year of an Obama presidency will be marked by convulsive campaign to impose punitive reparations on the non-black sectors of American society. Needless to say, this entire concept has been spawned by the cynical ruling class operatives of the foundation community as part of their eternal strategy of divide and conquer to keep the American people as a whole in submission to the Wall Street financiers, who are the ones that ought to be taxed for the benefit of the people as a whole.

Steve Diamond sums up the situation, noting that Obama's backers are heavily committed to the idea of reparations, specifically in the educational sphere: 'If you believe the rhetoric of the "social justice" crowd influencing the Obama camp's approach to education policy - the authoritarian leftists Bill Ayers and his sidekick Mike Klonsky as well as ed school professors like Linda Darling-Hammond and Gloria Ladson-Billings - only reparations for 400 years of oppression of non-whites will allow us to close the "achievement gap" between the oppressors, whites, and the oppressed, minority kids….Lying behind this argument is a pernicious concept - that white workers benefit at the expense of black workers and that more widely American workers live off the backs of workers in the third world. This is at the heart of the authoritarian and anti-union politics of the Ayers/Klonsky crowd.' (http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/26/white-guilt-politics-of-Obama-crowd-undermined/) Better than call Ayers an authoritarian, we should dub him a totalitarian liberal who has already reached stormtroop junction.

Very large sums of money were involved in the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, and it is well worth our while to follow them: 'The CAC was established in 1995 as a result of a $49.2 million grant from Walter Annenberg to support education reform in Chicago. Bill Ayers and Anne C. Hallett co-signed a letter submitting the grant proposal to Brown University President Vartan Gregorian on November 8, 1994 where the national Challenge office would be headquartered. The letter was on the letterhead of the University of Illinois at Chicago ("UIC"). Ayers identified himself as representing the UIC and the "Chicago Forum for School Change." Ms. Hallett is identified as the Executive Director of the Cross City Campaign for Urban School Reform. At the bottom of the letter, a parenthetical states: "On behalf of the Chicago School Reform Collaborative."' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) 'The letter and the attached detailed proposal grew out of a process that began in December 1993 when a small group led by Ayers, Hallett and Warren Chapman of the Joyce Foundation 'met to discuss a proposal to the Annenberg Challenge for support of this city's public school reform efforts." 'This group became the nucleus of the larger Chicago School Reform Collaborative, one of the two operational arms of the CAC, which Ayers would co-chair and on which Hallett and Chapman would serve.' (Program Report, CAC, Jan. 1, 1995 through Mar. 31, 1996 at 1). (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

The Chicago banking and finance elite includes the Chicago Board of Trade, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, and the Chicago Board Options Exchange, critical parts of the modern derivatives bubble. Did these ruling interests fear that Chicago was on the verge of a mass strike, in which white and black, employed and jobless, would demand economic concessions from the parasites that ran the city? There is some evidence that this fear might at least have dawned on the more far-sighted of them, especially after the Stevenson debacle of 1986 and the teachers' strikes leading up to 1987. Perhaps we can feel some of the ruling class fear in their bombastic prose when they write: "Chicago is six years into the most radical system-wide urban school reform effort in the country. The Annenberg Challenge provides an unprecedented opportunity to concentrate the energy of this reform into an educational renaissance in the classroom." (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

In reality, even before Bill Ayers became engaged in the CAC, patriarch Thomas Ayers of General Dynamics had already started the ball rolling: 'The Alliance for Better Chicago Schools ("ABCs") was formed then to push for the LSC idea in the Illinois state legislature. Active in the ABCs was Bill Ayers, Barack Obama's Developing Communities Project, and Chicago United, a

group of businessmen concerned about race and education issues founded by Bill Ayers' father, Tom Ayers, once CEO of the large Chicago utility, Commonwealth Edison (now Exelon).' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

From the counterinsurgency point of view of Bill Ayers, it was the Local School Council institutional machinery that mattered most, since these could be turned into a battering ram against the teachers' union on the one hand and the board of education bureaucracy on the other, wrecking both while the municipal bond holders laughed all the way to the bank: '…in 1993 the CAC grant proposal was seen by Ayers as an attempt, in part, to rescue the LSCs. The grant proposal states, "We envision a process to unleash at the school site the initiative and courage of LSC's…." Later, it states "[t]he Local Schools Councils…are important both for guiding educational improvement and as a means of strengthening America's democratic traditions." (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

Chicago was competing against many other cities for the massive largesse of the Annenberg Foundation. In writing the grant proposal, Ayers obviously had to show that the Annenberg Foundation could get more bang for its counterinsurgency buck by investing in the Chicago system: 'Indeed, the CAC proposal effort led by Ayers and Hallett was a critical part of what the Project Director of the CAC, Ken Rolling, described as the "political wars" being waged over schools in Chicago at that time. Ken Rolling was a veteran of those wars because in his previous role he had been a program officer of the Woods Fund, which supported the school reform effort through its grants, including grants to Barack Obama's Developing Communities Project. Other groups in other cities were competing for the same pool of funds (a total of $500 million made available by philanthropist Walter Annenberg) and, perhaps even more importantly, other groups in the city of Chicago with different policy views were applying to receive funds. However, the Ayers/Hallett proposal was successful in the end with the decision made in late 1994. In January of 1995 the formal announcement of a grant of $49.2 million was made. That money would have to be matched by contributions from the private and public sector 2:1 for a total amount over the life of the project of approximately $150 million dollars to be disbursed in Chicago. (Apparently the actual amount raised was an additional $60 million for a total of $110 million.) The CAC set up an office in rent-free space at the University of Illinois at Chicago, where Bill Ayers taught.' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

The one aspect of the Chicago Annenberg challenge which had no readily evident rational explanation was the choice of the unknown mediocrity, Barack Hussein Obama, who, as we already know, had been earmarked by the Trilateral Commission for greater things: 'The first chairman of the CAC Board was Barack Obama, at that point, 32 years old and a second year attorney at Davis, Miner, Barnhill & Galland, a small Chicago law firm. He began the Board position in early 1995 and stepped down from the chairmanship in late 1999, though he remained on the Board until the CAC phased itself out of existence and handed off its remaining assets to a permanent new institution, the Chicago Public Education Fund, in 2001. The Board began to meet in March of 1995 and formally incorporated the CAC as a non-profit entity in April 1995. Other board members included numerous already prominent Chicagoans: Susan Crown, Vice President of the Henry Crown Company; Patricia A. Graham, President of The Spencer Foundation; Stanley Ikenberry, President-Emeritus of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Handy Lindsey, Executive Director of the Field Foundation; Arnold Weber, former President of Northwestern University and

then President of the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago; and Wanda White, Executive Director of the Community Workshop on Economic Development. Some of these individuals would resign and be replaced by other equally prominent Chicagoans.' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

For practical purposes, the Chicago Annenberg Challenge was a monster with two heads. One was the Board, where Obama presided. 'The second operating entity of the CAC would be the Collaborative that would represent various constituencies in the Chicago schools and wider community. […] The co-chair of the CAC's Collaborative from 1995 until 2000 was Bill Ayers. Thus, the leaders of the two operative arms of the CAC from its inception until 2000 were Bill Ayers and Barack Obama. (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) Note the foundation jargon term, "the collaborative," which we have seen in a previous chapter.

One of the tasks which Obama and Ayers had to work on together derived from the fact that, even though the grant proposals had alleged that there was an insatiable hunger for community control among Chicago parents, there was overwhelming indifference throughout the city to the Local School Councils, and it soon proved to be very hard to recruit any candidates to run for the available posts. Accordingly, more foundation money had to be offered to convince parents to run for the LSCs. (The Chicago local school councils each consisted of the principal, two teachers, six parents, two community members, and a student representative in the case of high schools.) This question can be regarded as a crucial experiment which shows that community control of schools is generally not a spontaneous grass-roots demand by parents, but rather represents a completely artificial tactic introduced from the outside by cynical foundation operatives for purposes of manipulation and political wrecking. 'The Collaborative and the Board became direct players in the Chicago LSC elections held in 1996. According to the CAC Report: "In 1996 the Chicago Public Schools were scheduled to hold the fourth election of Local School Council (LSC) representatives since the school reform of act [sic] of 1988 was passed. As in the past two elections support from the central office of the Chicago Public Schools appeared to be minimal. Until, that is, members of the Collaborative coalesced with school reform groups around the city and began to put pressure on the Chicago Public Schools' central office to promote the elections both by recruiting enough candidates for the open seats so that contested elections would be held and by urging parents and community members to vote. […] The Board approved a grant of $125,000 for this effort. One of the first grants awarded in 1995 was a $175,000 Implementation Grant to the Small Schools Workshop. The Workshop had been founded by Bill Ayers in 1992 and was headed up by his former Weather Underground comrade, Mike Klonsky.' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) We have already seen that to suppose that conflicts between Ayers and Klonsky represented nothing more than the division of labor between two operatives.

$100 MILLION OF GRANT MONEY, HUNDREDS OF PRINCIPALS FIRED, BUT "NO MEASURABLE OR SIGNIFICANT GAIN" FOR CHICAGO SCHOOL KIDS

And how did the Annenberg Chicago Challenge pan out? If increasing levels of student achievement were the goal, it was an abject failure. A posting by Steve Diamond on noquarterusa.net pointed out that in a 'study that was done on the Annenberg Challenge in Chicago Public Schools—the one where Obama was Chairman of the Board, after all that funding which

included the $50 million from Annenberg and matching funds from state, Federal and other resources, the study concluded that there was "no measurable or significant gain" on the part of students.'[62] In other words Ayers and Obama promoted a program that spent millions of private and public funds and accomplished nothing. I would note that the rubric used for this evaluation included not just student gains in hard core academic achievement areas but also in soft areas such as self-image, personal efficacy, school attendance, persistence, etc. Voters, bloggers, media analysts and MSM should be asking an essential question: If Obama was the chair of this Board (I think for its duration adding up to about 8 years) and nothing was really accomplished to improve the achievement and capacities of children to learn, what makes us think he will be successful on a national scale?'[63] A good question. The answer must reflect that the goal of the Annenberg Chicago Challenge never had anything to do with helping students or improving schools. Its goal, and that of the foundation community that funded it, was social control through the divide-and-conquer counterinsurgency method of pitting Local School Councils against the unions and the administration. In this regard, it appears to have been reasonably successful. The Chicago political crisis of 1986-1987, which might have turned into a mass strike of all working people and unemployed people against the lunatic policies of the Reagan-Bush-Big Jim Thompson-Thomas Ayers financiers, was defused and deflected. The LSCs were also somewhat effective in providing cover for the system to fire principals, managers, and other trained and experienced personnel, possibly replacing them with political hacks looking for sinecures. Finally, the futility and constant strife of the LSCs wore out the existing parent activists until the situation was ripe for a partial privatization under corporate and business auspices, ratcheting everything down yet another big notch. Soon, the foundation oligarchs could see, the useless burden of universal free compulsory public education in the United States would cease to exist – a great savings from the point of view of Wall Street, but the death-knell for representative government in the United States.

THE BIGGEST PROJECT OF OBAMA'S LIFE ENDS IN ABJECT FAILURE

In 2003 the final technical report of the CCSR on the CAC was published. The results were not pretty. The "bottom line" according to the report was that the CAC did not achieve its goal of improvement in student academic achievement and nonacademic outcomes. While student test scores improved in the so-called Annenberg Schools that received some of the $150 million disbursed in the six years from 1995 to 2001, "This was similar to improvement across the system.…There were no statistically significant differences in student achievement between Annenberg schools and demographically similar non-Annenberg schools. This indicates that there was no Annenberg effect on achievement." The report identified the political conflict between the Local School Council promotion efforts of the CAC – such as the $2 million Leadership Development Initiative - as a possible factor hindering a positive impact on student achievement. (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008)

We must therefore conclude that Barack Hussein Obama, in the Chicago Annenberg Challenge, the biggest and most ambitious project of his life up until 2007, was an abject failure. His efforts produced no gain for Chicago school students. It should be clear in retrospect why he almost never talks about the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. On the one hand, he would have to talk about his close personal cooperation with the unrepentant terrorist bomber Bill Ayers. On the other hand, he would have to dodge embarrassing questions about what the positive impact of all of this sound and fury had finally been.

By 1997, the entire LSC community control project was visibly moribund, but it may well have served its purpose of warding off a political upsurge by a united city against the lakeside financiers. It had certainly functioned as a colossal manpower sink, consuming the energies of yet another generation of ignorant and naïve activists. 'The annual report for 1997 made special mention of the surrounding political context of the CAC's work. Director Ken Rolling noted that a goal of the CAC was "seeking a changed policy environment" but that this "has been the most elusive to date with no major progress to report at this time. He explained further: "The Challenge began its work in 1995 at the same time a dramatic change in the leadership and management of the Chicago Public Schools took place. The Illinois state legislature awarded complete control of the…Schools to the Mayor of Chicago in 1995. A new management team and Reform Board of Trustees was installed and a major emphasis began on administration, financial stability and accountability measures that are tied to specific test scores. The Challenge began its program at the time the central administration of the public schools took off in a different direction." Indeed, the 1995 law gave the Mayor and the Board the power to dissolve LSCs – the very bodies that the CAC was trying to bolster.' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) Counter-insurgency operations cannot be Johnny one note — they must always be modulated and varied according to sharp turns in the political and economic situation. 'By the end of this 1999, … Barack Obama would step down from the role of Board Chair as he anticipated an upcoming run for Congress.' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) Obama cultivated his glittering career, while the hapless victims of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge drifted off into educational mediocrity and personal obscurity.

Evaluations of the impact of Obama's Annenberg meddling have been largely negative. 'A report authored by Dorothy Shipps on the first three years of the Annenberg Challenge program, when Obama was its Board chair, concluded: "The Challenge sought to build on the momentum of the 1988 Chicago School Reform Act which had radically decentralized governance of the Chicago Public Schools." While apparently several hundred school principals had been fired by the LSCs, kids were still doing poorly in schools and there was chaos of sorts in the system.… Interestingly, Shipps concludes that the local control movement in Chicago, though backed by radicals like Ayers, gave "business the clearest voice in system-wide reform."' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008) Shipps discovered the obvious *post festum* when she pointed out that the scale of the LSCs was too fragmented, too minuscule, to be able to implement positive reforms; she recommended a district-wide or city-wide assembly, but this is still too narrow and parochial, since schools cannot be successful unless there are good jobs waiting for the graduates.

Diamond's estimate is that the political sponsors of Obama were the extended Ayers family. As long as we are limited to the purview of Chicago, this is doubtless a sound analysis: 'Thus, we have one possible answer to the question: Who "sent" Obama? It was the Ayers family, including Tom, John, Bill and Bernardine Dohrn. It is highly unlikely that a 30-something second year lawyer would have been plucked from relative obscurity out of a left wing law firm to head up something as visible and important in Chicago as the Annenberg Challenge by Bill Ayers if Ayers had not already known Obama very well. One possibility is that Obama proved himself to Ayers in the battle for local school control when he was at the DCP in the 80s. One guess as to why Obama does not play up his educational experience more thoroughly now – it certainly could be of use to him one would think in beefing up his "I have the experience to be President" argument – is that it would lead to a renewed discussion of the Ayers connection, which is clearly toxic for Obama. And

it turns out the impact of the Annenberg Challenge on actual students in Chicago schools is considered mixed at best, although Bill Ayers deemed it a success on political grounds. Indeed the 1995 and 1999 legislative attempts to recentralize power over the schools in the hands of the mayor did not quite succeed in wrestling control completely away from the LSCs, instead it helped, in the words of Alexander Russo, "keep the flame alive for decentralized, community-based school reform - even as the system was moving in a very different direction."' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008) Of course, Obama came from much farther way – he came from the Trilateral Commission and the worldwide Bilderberger Group.

ABC DEBATE: OBAMA'S BLATANT LIES ABOUT "ENGLISH PROFESSOR" BILL AYERS

On April 16, 2008, ABC News in the person of Charles Gibson and George Stephanopoulos hosted a debate in advance of the Pennsylvania Democratic primary. This debate stood out from more than a score of previous debates because of the refusal of the moderators to capitulate to the blackmail of the Obamakins and their demand that the Perfect Master be given a free ride. Since this was the first debate since the explosion of the Jeremiah Wright "God Damn America" controversy, Obama was asked about his relations with Wright. Obama went into serpentine contortions in response, at one point affirming that he had "disavowed" Wright, only to have to backtrack and specify that he had only disavowed the hate-monger's incendiary statements. Most offensive to the Obama acolytes was Stephanopoulos' query about Obama's relations with the deranged Weatherman terrorist bomber-provocateur, Bill Ayers. In response, the Perfect Master had disappeared into a cloud of stuttering, stammering, and tergiversation. On these and other questions regarding his personal associations and his character, Obama was exposed as a desperate demagogue running away from most of his own past, while testily harrumphing that the inquiries were irrelevant. This was network television, and the audience for this debate was by the far largest of any debate of the 2007-2008 cycle, with 10.7 million viewers, some 96% of whom stayed until the end. This was in many cases their first exposure to Obama, and they were treated to the epiphany of a scoundrel.

We can argue that Bill Ayers and his charming consort Bernardine Dohrn, along with Tony Rezko and the Jeremiah Wright TUCC crowd, represent Obama's closest and most intimate circle of backers, sponsors, benefactors, and cronies. Obama was thus lying big time in the Philadelphia debate when Stephanopoulos asked him about Ayers and the Perfect Master massively played down the nature of his symbiosis with the Weatherman leader and his pasionaria. As Diamond notes, 'This likely explains why Obama tried a kind of head fake when asked about Ayers by George Stephanopoulos in the TV debate with Clinton prior to the Pennsylvania primary. Obama said Ayers was a "professor of English." Yet, Obama chaired the Annenberg Challenge for three years and served on its board for another three years, working closely with Ayers on grants to Chicago schools. And he did not know that Ayers was a professor of education? That strains credulity. (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

BILL AYERS IN OBAMA'S KITCHEN CABINET

Diamond summed up: 'The Chicago Annenberg Challenge allowed Barack Obama and Bill Ayers to work together, no doubt closely, in the heat of political battle to help disburse more than $100 million to allies, particularly in the LSCs, in the Chicago School system. Under the circumstances, it seems more than a bit disingenuous of Senator Obama to dismiss Bill Ayers as

"some guy who lives in my neighborhood."' (Steve Diamond, 'That "Guy Who Lives in My Neighborhood": Behind the Ayers-Obama Relationship,' noquarterusa.net, June 19, 2008) In reality, there is every indication that Ayers functions as a close political adviser to Obama, and his umbilical cord to key parts of the intelligence community who have a say in the actions of the Perfect Master. As Diamond points out, 'Perhaps this would be of just historical interest if it could be firmly established that Bill Ayers no longer has any role in the Obama campaign. But that is not something we know for sure yet. In a recent television interview with Greta Van Susteren, John Murtagh, a Republican town council member from Yonkers, New York, said that Ayers is currently an "advisor" to Obama. Murtagh has a particular and understandable sensitivity to the Ayers-Obama connection besides his Republican politics: his father was a New York Supreme Court (in NY the Supreme Court is a trial court) judge who presided over a trial of the "Black Panther 21" in 1970-71…. Murtagh was 9 years old at the time. During the trial Murtagh's home was fire bombed and Murtagh claims the Weather Underground was responsible for that bombing along with several others in "solidarity" with the Panthers. He charges, specifically, that Bill Ayers' wife Bernardine Dohrn later took credit (apparently on behalf of the entire WU group) for the bombing.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008) Nor is this all. There are indications that the Weatherpeople regard Obama as one of their own, whose seizure of power will crown with unimagined success their long march through the institutions began in late 1969 and early 1970 when they went into clandestine and underground life. Does Obama bear the Weatherman tattoo flaunted by Ayers? Will Obama function as a Weatherman in the White House? Will he pardon Weatherman fanatic and butcher Dave Gilbert, thanks to whose efforts two cops and a security guard died in the Brinks robbery attempted by the Weatherpeople?

Large parts of the federal bureaucracy might well be in continuous insurrection against Obama from his hypothetical first day in office. This would include parts of the Justice Department and various individual law enforcement officials. Here are some excerpts from an April 18, 2008 interview by CNN's Lou Dobbs with Andrew McCarthy, a former federal prosecutor:

> *On CNN, April 18 — DOBBS*: Bill Ayers, we're hearing today from Mayor Daley that he also knows Ayers and he's just a fine fellow and no problem, don't be — please don't be discomforted by *Senator Obama*'s relationship with him.
>
> MCCARTHY*: Look, of all the people who've ever bombed the Pentagon and the State Department and the New York City police headquarters, I'm sure he's one of the best***.** But I — my sense is that regular Americans aren't going to see it that way.
>
> *DOBBS: Senator Obama*, you are declaring rather straight forwardly, is denying some relatively close relationships that he is suggesting are not — are distant.
>
> MCCARTHY*: Yeah, well he's denying the relationship, but I think more importantly what he's trying to obfuscate is that there's a trajectory to all of this and there's a theme that runs through it* and whether its some of the statements made by his wife or Reverend Wright or Bernardine Dohrn and Ayers, the fact is he's comfortable**...**Bernardine Dohrn being Ayers' wife. The other Weather Underground terrorist who was Ayers' wife. *But, he's comfortable with people who hate this country.* And *I think when he talks about and makes the theme of his campaign "Change," and since he hasn't really explained to us much about the change, we're entitled to infer, from the people he's comfortable with, who are social revolutionaries, the kind of change he wants to make in America.*
>
> *DOBBS:* You're including, obviously, Reverend Jeremiah Wright.
>
> *MCCARTHY:* Of course, right.

DOBBS: And — and Ayers. Others?

MCCARTHY: Well, there's *Rashid Khalidi***,** *who was a recipient of some of the largess that Obama controlled when he was on the Woods Board.* He is somebody who was –

DOBBS: He was on the board with Ayers?

MCCARTHY: Yes, when Obama was on the Woods Board with Ayers, *they gave grants to Rashid Khalidi, and his work….* (Lou Dobbs, CNN, April 18, 2008)

We note once again in passing that the primitive analysis which is typical of right-wing observers insists on viewing figures like Ayers as authentic radicals or revolutionaries, rather than the cynical foundation-funded intelligence community operatives which they actually are. In any case, we can see here that a future President Obama would have a hard time bringing the executive agencies of his own regime together, quite apart from his grandiose promises of bringing together the majority and the opposition in Congress.

OBAMA FANATICS WANT THE AYERS QUESTION DECLARED TABOO

Even while the Philadelphia debate was continuing, there was much wailing and gnashing of teeth among the Obamakins squatting in the outer darkness. The shrillest of the effete snobs that evening was probably Tom Shales, the television critic of the *Washington Post*, which had long since joined in the swoon for the new messiah. Shales howled that the debate "was another step downward for network news – in particular ABC News, which hosted the debate from Philadelphia and whose usually dependable anchors, Charlie Gibson and George Stephanopoulos, turned in shoddy, despicable performances…Gibson and Stephanopoulos dwelled entirely on specious and gossipy trivia that has already been hashed and rehashed." Shales mocked Gibson for "looking prosecutorial and portraying himself as a spokesman for the working class." Obama had brought "refreshing candor" into the debate. The moderators could only be compared to "dogs." (Tom Shales, "In the Pa. Debate, The Clear Loser is ABC," *Washington Post*, April 17, 2008)

The center-right oligarch David Brooks, by contrast, found that the ABC questions were "excellent. The journalist's job is to make politicians uncomfortable, to explore evasions, contradictions and vulnerabilities. Almost every question tonight did that. The candidates each looked foolish at times, but that's their own fault. We may not like it, but issues like Jeremiah Wright, flag lapels and the Tuzla airport will be important in the fall. Remember how George H.W. Bush toured flag factories to expose Michael Dukakis. It's legitimate to see how the candidates will respond to these sorts of symbolic issues. The Democrats have a problem. All the signs point to a big Democratic year, and I still wouldn't bet against Obama winning the White House, but his background as a Hyde Park liberal is going to continue to dog him. No issue is crushing on its own, but it all adds up. For the life of me I can't figure out why he didn't have better answers on Wright and on the "bitter" comments. The superdelegates cannot have been comforted by his performance. Final grades: ABC: A; Clinton: B; Obama: D+" (David Brooks, No Whining About the Media, *New York Times*, April 16, 2008) The ABC questions, far from representing a modern Torquemada treatment, had barely scratched the surface concerning Obama's relation to Ayers.

THE JOYCE FOUNDATION AND RULING CLASS PLANS FOR GUN CONTROL

Larry Johnson has reported that for eight years, Obama sat on the board of Chicago's Joyce Foundation — earning $70,000 in compensation — an influential board that 'funneled almost $3 million in grants to political groups opposing gun rights," according to Politico.com reporter

Kenneth Vogel. This raised another duplicity problem for Obama, since his campaign has worked to assure uneasy gun owners that he believes the Constitution protects their rights and that he doesn't want to take away their guns. As Jarlyn at *TalkLeft* indicated, "At Wednesday's debate, Barack Obama wouldn't say what his position is on the DC law banning handguns." In her view, Obama "dodged, saying he wasn't familiar with the facts of the case." She had the audacity to wonder didn't Obama answer the question at the debate instead of weaving and bobbing? Was it because he didn't want to alienate PA voters, many of whom favor strong gun ownership rights? And, did he fail to tell the truth? According to the said Jeralyn, in November, "his campaign told the *Chicago Tribune* he supported the ban. (*Chicago Tribune* November 20, 2007.)' (Larry Johnson, "Obama on Board That Funded Handgun Bans," Noquarterusa.net, April 20, 2008)

The Joyce Foundation website announces: "Our program areas are Education, Employment, Environment, Gun Violence, Money and Politics, and Culture. We focus our grant making on initiatives that promise to have an impact on the Great Lakes region, specifically the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. A limited number of environment grants are made to organizations in Canada. Education grant making in K-12 focuses on Chicago, Cleveland, and Milwaukee; early childhood grant making focuses on Illinois and Wisconsin. Culture grants are primarily focused on the Chicago metropolitan area, except for the Joyce Awards, which extend to other Midwest cities. We do not generally support capital proposals, endowment campaigns, religious activities, commercial ventures, direct service programs, or scholarships." This adds up to social engineering and mind control. Between the role of the Ford Foundation as the flagship US counterinsurgency foundation, plus the influence of the terrorist Bill Ayers as a theoretician of education, it is easy to see how Obama was able to become a beneficiary of the Joyce Foundation after having served on the Gamaliel Foundation and the Woods Fund, two other Ford satellites.

According to a focus group set up by the Pennsylvania television station WPVI held the night of the debate, "Senator Clinton is the debate winner, at least according to our focus group. 23% believe Senator Obama won while 50% believed Senator Clinton won." (WPVI Post-Debate Analysis, April 16, 2008) According to Chuck Todd of NBC News, Obama "did not have a good night….His answer on Ayers and the flag question were simply weak; He seemed unprepared for them; Kinda surprising because he normally has a decent rant against "old politics" and yet "old politics" questions seemed to stump him." (NBC First Read, April 16, 2008) The *Atlantic's* Marc Ambinder opined that there was "no way Obama could have fared worse. Chris Cillizza noted that Obama "struggled quite a bit more when asked to answer for Wright, his former pastor." (*Washington Post*, The Fix, April 16, 2008) Katharine Seeyle of the *New York Times* was impressed by how much better Hillary Clinton fared: "She's becoming expansive, seemingly in her element as she goes into details; Mr. Obama does not look as thrilled to be still standing there." (*New York Times*, The Caucus, April 16, 2008) A Philadelphia commentator chimed in: "Obama is again less certain, and rambles a bit when asked about the Washington D.C. gun ban. Gibson asks him to deny that he has ever advocated a complete ban on hand guns in 1996. Obama says no. But whatever the truth, no other answer is possible." (*Philadelphia Inquirer* Blog, April 16, 2008) This was actually a case of bare-faced, outright lying by Obama, since he denied the authenticity of a policy questionnaire which bore his own handwriting. Unnoticed by most was yet another pro-GOP testimonial by Obama, who this time pontificated that the foreign policy of George H.W. Bush was "wise" – this of the criminal adventurer who bombed Iraq back into the stone age in order to re-impose the regime of his own former business partner, the slave-holding Emir of Kuwait, and by doing so started the long agony of the US military presence in the Gulf.

BITTERGATE BY THE GOLDEN GATE; FASCIST HATRED OF THE WORKING CLASS

During a visit to San Francisco, Obama unwisely blurted out a series of remarks which revealed the extraordinary degree he shares the outlook of the present day foundation world. Obama showed himself to be a very reckless individual, not capable of hiding thoughts and ideas which are proving extremely damaging to his political ambition. This was especially the case when he turned away from the glass plates of the Teleprompter and had to speak extemporaneously.

One can imagine Obama meeting with a group of wealthy, ultra left, San Francisco elitists from whom he expects to get enormous amounts of bundled contributions for his political campaign. We can imagine some elitist of the general type of Gordon Getty, the partial heir to the Getty oil fortune and a person who shares with the Emperor Nero the conviction that he is the greatest lyric artist of the age. Getty or someone like him must have asked Obama why he is doing so poorly in Ohio and Pennsylvania, and the perfect Master is cut to the quick, since these are obviously the states which a Democrat must win in order to get the presidency. Obama therefore responds with these fateful words, which projected the questions of oligarchy, elitism, and class consciousness into the center of the US political debate in a way so extraordinary that it has not been seen in many, many decades:

> OBAMA: "So, it depends on where you are, but I think it's fair to say that the places where we are going to have to do the most work are the places where people feel most cynical about government. The people are mis-appre...I think they're misunderstanding why the demographics in our, in this contest have broken out as they are. Because everybody just ascribes it to 'white working-class don't wanna work — don't wanna vote for the black guy.' That's...there were intimations of that in an article in the Sunday New York Times today - kind of implies that it's sort of a race thing. Here's how it is: in a lot of these communities in big industrial states like Ohio and Pennsylvania, people have been beaten down so long, and they feel so betrayed by government, and when they hear a pitch that is premised on not being cynical about government, then a part of them just doesn't buy it. And when it's delivered by — it's true that when it's delivered by a 46-year-old black man named Barack Obama (laughter), then that adds another layer of skepticism (laughter). But — so the questions you're most likely to get about me, 'Well, what is this guy going to do for me? What's the concrete thing?' What they wanna hear is — so, we'll give you talking points about what we're proposing — close tax loopholes, roll back, you know, the tax cuts for the top 1 percent. Obama's gonna give tax breaks to middle-class folks and we're gonna provide health care for every American. So we'll go down a series of talking points. But the truth is, is that, our challenge is to get people persuaded that we can make progress when there's not evidence of that in their daily lives. You go into some of these small towns in Pennsylvania, and like a lot of small towns in the Midwest, the jobs have been gone now for 25 years and nothing's replaced them. And they fell through the Clinton administration, and the Bush administration, and each successive administration has said that somehow these communities are gonna regenerate and they have not. **So it's not surprising then that they get bitter, they cling to guns or religion or antipathy to people who aren't like them or anti-immigrant sentiment or anti-trade sentiment as a way to explain their frustrations.** Um, now these are in some communities, you know. I think what you'll find is, is that people of every background — there are gonna be a mix of people, you can go in the toughest neighborhoods, you know working-class lunch-pail folks, you'll find Obama

enthusiasts. And you can go into places where you think I'd be very strong and people will just be skeptical. The important thing is that you show up and you're doing what you're doing."[64]

This very imprudent outburst reveals much about the characteristic outlook of the foundation-funded political intellectual in the United States today. First of all, this utterance is dripping with patronizing condescension and contempt for the people he is describing. Obama, well-trained by his procommunist anthropologist mother, has been in effect on fieldwork in Ohio and Pennsylvania, and is reporting to a group of his peers about the strange mores of the peculiar populations he has been attempting to profile and manipulate, with limited success. Obama is trying as hard as he can to treat the American people like malleable ethnographic material, but they have realized this and do not like it.

Obama does not mention that the deindustrialization of the United States, and thus the destruction of the economic viability of the communities he has visited, were the direct result of the policies imposed by his own Trilateral Commission backers back at the time almost 30 years ago when Trilateral member Jimmy Carter, probably acting at the prodding of Trilateral member Zbigniew Brzezinski, place Trilateral member Paul Adolph Volcker at the helm of the Federal Reserve; it was Volcker's 22% prime rate which effectively destroyed the industrial infrastructure of the United States, including especially its export industries. This kind of historical background is seldom included in the analysis developed by a bankers' boy when it comes time to assign the blame.

It is not surprising that Obama is contemptuous of religion, gun ownership, and sports shooting. The reference to "antipathy" obviously suggests that the people he is dealing with really are racists after all. Most interesting of all is the reference to "anti-trade," since the suggestion here is that anyone who disagrees with economic and financial globalization is somehow irrational, anti-social, or even paranoid. This puts Obama's statement closely in line with the classics of academic and foundation-backed anti-worker ideology. We will not try to develop here the case that economic and financial globalization have effectively wrecked the world economy, leading to an overall world immiseration in the form of declining standards of living, and declining economic opportunity. We have made this case already in *Surviving the Cataclysm*. Today, the financial order of globalization is dissolving before the horrified eyes of world public opinion, with the entire system going to the brink of a systemic explosion of the world banking system on the Ides of March with the looming bankruptcy of Bear Stearns, which threatened to set off chain reaction bankruptcies throughout the world financial community in 2008.

One of the sources for the idea that anyone who opposes the prevailing economic and financial line of Wall Street, the US Treasury, and the Federal Reserve is suffering from some form of psychopathology is the work of the deeply dishonest and much reviled Columbia University historian, Richard Hofstadter. Hofstadter was the author of "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," (*Harper's*, 1964), and *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. He was especially brutal in his slanders of the late 19th century protest movement among farmers who called themselves the Populists. Hofstadter was one of the leaders of the school of "consensus historians," an approach which he described with the remark that "It seems to me to be clear that a political society cannot hang together at all unless there is some kind of consensus running through it." His favorite technique was to psychoanalyze protest movements, always coming to the conclusion that the dissidents and critics of the established regime were hopelessly irrational, after probing into their unconscious psychological motives, status anxieties, hatreds, and paranoia, presenting these syndromes as the real cause for their political discontent. His favorite way of dismissing a critic was

to accuse that person of suffering from a "status panic." Hofstadter's work boils down to the idea that politics is a morass of fear, hatred, provincial ignorance, and insanity, and that the only thing to do is to support the Establishment and its existing order at all costs. Inevitably, Hofstadter had been a communist, but he insulted Franklin D. Roosevelt by dismissing him as "The Patrician as Opportunist." Conservative commentator George Will once described Hofstadter as "the iconic public intellectual of liberal condescension," who "dismissed conservatives as victims of character flaws and psychological disorders — a 'paranoid style' of politics rooted in 'status anxiety,' etc. Conservatism rose on a tide of votes cast by people irritated by the liberalism of condescension."[65] Hofstadter, like so many pompous professors, was little more than a paid apologist of the financier ruling class.

And even such ideas as Hofstadter had were not really original, since most of them came from the 19th century French sociologist Emile Durkheim. Durkheim's critique of religion is based on an idea drawn from Feuerbach that God's kingdom is merely the projection into eternity and theology of the existing social relations in a given human group. Durkheim taught that God was "society divinized," that "God is society, writ large."[66] Here again there was a very strong overtone that anyone in the position of a critic, a naysayer, an outsider, a maverick, or a protester was an example of social pathology rather than being a valuable corrective to the undeniable abuses of a failing system.

Most importantly, Obama's Bittergate comments documented that once again his deep hatred for the American working class, a hatred which constitutes the first and central point in the Fanon/Weatherman political doctrine: blue-collar white workers are racist, warmongering "honkies" who have been bought off by capitalist concessions and integrated into the system so that no revolution, but only bloody race war, remains possible. This concept, in turn, is congenial to the bosses of the foundations, and to the US financier oligarchy in general, since it happens to coincide so totally with their plan for a campaign of savage austerity, draconian reductions in the standard of living, and related genocidal policies against US working people as a means of dealing with the current world economic and financial depression. Jimmy Carter was of course a useful tool to the Trilateral bankers, but his effectiveness was sometimes undermined by the qualms, reticence, and second thoughts suggested by the Christianity he professed. With Obama, there is no such danger; quite the contrary, Obama will bring to his appointed task a ferocious criminal energy which will help him to attempt to flay the American people alive.

OBAMA: A DEEP COVER AGENT OF THE 1313 GANG?

The dominant component controlling Obama in terms of his policies and tasks is, as we have stressed, the Trilateral Commission, founded with Rockefeller family money by David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's controller and Obama's top political director. In a general way, Obama can be accurately described as a controlled asset of the Rockefeller family and its allies. The Rockefeller apparatus of political and social manipulation which is sponsoring Obama has been around for a long time – more than a century. For them, manipulating elections is nothing new. The University of Chicago is a long-standing center for Rockefeller subversion. As we have seen, the University of Chicago 1313 gang was set up with the help of the Spelman Fund, a foundation created in December 1928 by the outrageous robber barons and sociopathic monopolists John D. Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller Jr., the great-grandfather and grandfather of today's fanatical Obama backer Senator John D. "Jay" Rockefeller IV of West Virginia. The Spelman Fund got $10 million 1928 dollars from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, which were to be used for social engineering in favor of financier interests in the field of child study, "parent education," race

relations, and cooperation with public agencies–a whole range of meddling with the bitter clingers, and not mere humanitarian concerns. The mission statement of the oligarchical Spelman Fund bluntly stated that "the interest of the Spelman Fund is not in improvement of some social practice or function, but is rather in the contribution which maybe made to all aspects of public welfare through increase of efficiency, technical competence, and rational purposefulness in the operation of the machinery of government." Not social progress, but totalitarian control was the goal.

A recent journalistic account of 1313 informs us: '1313, completed in 1938, embodied the vision of two men, Charles E. Merriam, and Louis Brownlow. Brownlow had forged a career (without benefit of formal education) as a city manager and as a forceful advocate for the public service professions. Merriam was a University of Chicago political science professor with a bent for activism that led to service as a Chicago alderman and to two (unsuccessful) runs for the Mayoralty. The two men conceived 1313 as a vibrant center for (in the words of a 1963 booklet) "the improvement of the organization, administrative techniques, and methods of government – municipal, county, state, and federal – in the United States." Within a few years, 1313 had clearly become a nerve center for American public administration. By 1963, it was organizational home to 22 non-profit entities, including: American Public Works Association, American Public Welfare Association, Council of State Governments. American Society of Planning Officials, American Society of Public Administration, National Legislative Conference, Public Administration Service, National Association of State Budget Officers, and the National Association of Attorneys General. Proximity was a key factor in the Merriam-Brownlow concept: proximity of the building's organizational inhabitants both to each other and to the resources of the University of Chicago. The lively, continuous, cross-fertilizing exchanges ensuing from these proximities were to advance the professionalization of public administration in the U.S.'[67] 1313 appears as a Rockefeller deployment running parallel to European fascism, and aiming at the destruction, under the banner of good government and efficiency, of the large urban political machines which were to be so important in the 1932-33 coming of the New Deal, which the reactionary Rockefellers were eager to see headed off.

AXELROD'S 1313 GANG AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Some of the 1313 gang's efforts were disrupted by World War II, but the 1313 operatives were quick to bounce back: 'First, the 1313-Spelman boys were thinking hard about the ways and means to organize a **New World Order**. A lot of them were involved in the brainstorming that was to give birth to the new international organizations: their concern for integrating public administration had now a new level, the international one, in the hope that it would be possible to build a more efficient system than the League of Nations.' Rockefeller-funded 1313 operatives played key roles in creating the United Nations, UNESCO, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), which dealt with refugees and displaced persons, the World Bank, and other components of the supernational bureaucracy. To each of these organisms the Rockefeller men imparted their characteristic features of sinister cruelty, manipulation, and the shameless pursuit of world supremacy for the Anglo-American financier oligarchy. The 1313 gang is thus central to the efforts for new world order: 'Thus, the Ford consolidated the work of international organization that had begun in the 1930s, placing the urban international under discrete but effective American patronage. It added stone to what could be called a "Chicago consensus" on urban issues at the international scale, this consensus being circulated through the net of links created since the 1930s, and put in action thanks to the overlapping personnel of the Ford, the Chicago organizations, the international societies, and the

international institutions. It needs more work to be able to say if the US involvement supported or engineered by the Big Foundations changed the way in which the city was imagined at the international scale, or rather created some new frame in which the city was imagined and managed. It seems that the big foundations heavily contributed to create a new market for governmental consultancy, quite close in its operation to the one that had been created on the domestic scene in the 1930s. A vital role in this development was the one played by 1313 leaders, when they cooperated with the Spelman and when they shaped the action of the Ford.'[68] Here, in typical barbarous foundation-speak, is a good description of the interlocking nests of foundation operatives which constitute the political, social, and intellectual milieu from which Obama has emerged: the foundations.

During the Eisenhower years, right-wing critics of the financier elite inevitably viewed the 1313 gang – in reality the proponents of a collectivism based on Wall Street finance capital, not the proletariat — as tinged with communism, and thus as 'a secret nest and nexus of totalitarian evil in the U.S. One lead voice in the chorus of accusations was a woman from southern California named Jo Hindman. In 1959 and 1960 she published six articles in the *American Mercury* magazine that identified an insidious threat to American values and traditions that she termed "Metropolitan Government" – Metro, for short. In a 1963 book entitled *Terrible 1313 Revisited*, Hindman disclosed to the world that ". . . .in the late 1950's, location of the Metro capital was discovered at 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois, a twenty-two organization clearing house. This arsenal of totalitarianism spews Metro directives, programs, and projects all over target U.S.A.…In concept, practices, and in rapidly multiplying instances, Metro has wrecked private homes, businesses, property rights, and the ballot franchise. Upon the shambles of these basic concepts in American government, Metro seeks to force upon Americans collectivized Metropolitan Government, totally." Metro's key devices as enumerated by Hindman included zoning, public health measures, building codes, urban renewal and transjurisdictional authorities like the New York Port Authority. An Internet search still finds many references to Terrible 1313 on right-wing websites today." (Bruce Thomas, "1313's Hidden History," *Hyde Park Herald*, May 23, 2004) Ms. Hindman's analysis may have lacked sophistication, but she was surely on firm ground when she ascribed a basic world outlook of malevolence and oligarchical arrogance to the 1313 gang. This look back at 1313 as the later spawning ground for David Axelrod has also provided us with the immediate pre-history of the Ford Foundation "community control" and "local control" counterinsurgency methods of the late 1960s.

Now a new generation of the 1313 project is poised to take power in the person of Ford-Rockefeller operative Obama, the Manchurian candidate whose campaign is dominated by David Axelrod, an operative who owes his training to the 1313 operation.

Obama's sordid associations suffered another implicit blow on the eve of the Pennsylvania primary, when Pope Benedict XVI concluded a visit to Washington and New York with the benediction, "God bless America," as he boarded his plane for the journey back to Rome. Many recalled the "No! No! No! God damn America!" rant of the satanic racist provocateur Jeremiah Wright of the foundation-funded black liberation theology synthetic religion, from whom the Perfect Master had imbibed hatred and political support for two decades.

CHAPTER V: OBAMA'S HEART OF DARKNESS: REZKO, AUCHI, ALSAMMARAE, AND CHICAGO GRAFT

"I am the first one to acknowledge that it was a boneheaded move…." – Obama

"If they bring a knife to the fight, we bring a gun." – Obama

"Illinois is awash in scandal and corruption." – Jay Stewart, Illinois Better Government Association

"The Illinois Combine… the bipartisan Illinois political combine." – US Senator Peter Fitzgerald

If Obama ever reaches the White House, he will certainly be classified as one of the most corrupt winners of a presidential election in the history of our country. Past presidents from Grant to Harding have been generally considered corrupt, but it is likely that a future Obama administration would eclipse them all. As this chapter will make clear, Obama has climbed out of a veritable sewer of corruption, crime, graft, bribery, kickbacks and rake offs to assume his current role as seraphic advocate of good government and public probity. Obama may not be the most corrupt individual ever to approach the presidency, but he is in all probability the person in whom the reality of corruption and a hypocritical pretense of clean government are most at variance. In this sense, Obama qualifies as a hypocrite greater than Molière's Tartuffe, greater than Dickens' Mr. Pecksniff in *Martin Chuzzlewit*.

At the center of Obama's universe of corruption are three godfathers. They are all Levantine Arabs from the eastern Mediterranean, corsairs of those dark seas where dirty machine politics and illegal financial manipulations flow together. The first is **Antoin "Tony" Rezko**, a nominal Catholic from the port of Aleppo in Syria, who has been Obama's most immediate sponsor, backer, friend, and bagman during his entire political career. Rezko has probably bilked the public treasury for something approaching one hundred million dollars in the form of public-and private partnerships allegedly designed to rehabilitate, renovate, and restore decayed slum properties and make them fit for human habitation. In reality, the properties have been given over to rats and cockroaches, while Rezko has grown fabulously rich. Obama and his wife Michelle personally participated in this ill-gotten gain when Rezko assisted them in acquiring the bombastic and ostentatious mansion in the Kenwood district in which this *nouveau riche* couple now resides. Rezko got his start in Chicago opening Subway sandwich shops in places that needed city concessions. Rezko then became close to Jabir Herbert Muhammad, former manager of heavyweight champion Muhammad Ali and son of the late Nation of Islam leader, Elijah Muhammad, and he entered active politics in 1983 to support the successful mayoral candidacy of Harold Washington, Chicago's first black mayor.

The second of Obama's three godfathers is **Nadhmi Auchi**, who was born in Iraq, professes the Roman Catholic religion, and is ranked as the eighth (or 18th, depending on the account you read) richest person in the United Kingdom with a personal fortune approaching £2,000,000,000 or about $4 billion. In 2003, Auchi was convicted of fraud in the Elf Aquitaine bribery scandal, probably the largest corruption investigation in the history of postwar Europe. Auchi has a 15 month suspended sentence hanging over his head. The Elf scandal came complete with accusations against former French police Minister Charles Pasqua and former French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, plus the involvement of the Corsican mafia and various Freemasonic lodges. The basic charge was that a network including scores of oligarchs had conspired to lose the French state owned oil company

Elf-Aquitaine of about 3 billion French francs (about $750 million), principally during the 1980s and 1990s. As a newspaper account related at the time of the Elf trial,

> Another powerful figure whose dealings were examined by the magistrates is a British-Iraqi businessman, Nadhmi Auchi. Defense attorneys said the magistrates investigated Mr. Auchi's alleged role in Elf's 1991 purchase of the Spanish oil company, Ertoil, from its Kuwaiti owner. According to French press reports, Mr. Auchi helped Elf by initially buying the company quickly - and avoiding regulatory delays - and then selling it on to Elf. Defense attorneys said Mr. Auchi allegedly received a commission from Elf of more than 300 million French francs for his role. Among the magistrates' questions is whether Mr. Auchi funneled any "retro-commissions" on the deal back to Elf executives or political figures in France. Commissions and corporate bribes for foreign officials were legal under French law at the time - indeed, they were tax deductible. But it was illegal to kick money back to France through these so-called retro-commissions, which nonetheless are thought to have been widespread on major oil and arms deals. Mr. Auchi has denied any wrongdoing, and defense attorneys said he had offered to buy Ertoil back and repay any commissions he received. But he has refused to appear in France before the magistrates, who have issued an international arrest warrant for him. Although Mr. Auchi's name is almost unknown to the French or British public, he is sometimes described as the eighth-richest man in Britain, with a broad portfolio of assets grouped under his holding company, General Mediterranean. At one time, he was also reputed to be the largest individual shareholder in the French bank, Banque Paribas, and a member of its international advisory board. According to press reports, the French government last year seized his shares in Paribas, said to be worth $500 million. Queried about his holdings Thursday, Paribas failed to respond. (Joseph Fitchett and David Ignatius, "Lengthy Elf Inquiry Nears Explosive Finish, *International Herald Tribune*, February 1, 2002)[69]

Aiham Alsammarae (also known as Ayham al-Samarie or Ahyam al Samarrai) is the third of Obama's godfathers, and a picaresque figure in the annals of international crime. Alsammarae is officially listed as a Sunni Arab Iraqi politician and the former Iraqi Minister of Electricity. In his ministerial post, Alsammarae was accused of looting funds from the Iraqi Electricity Ministry during the reign of the feckless neocon proconsul, Paul "Jerry" Bremer, the Viceroy of the so-called Coalition Provisional Authority. In August 2006 Al-Samarie was arrested on corruption charges involving irregularities in the letting of contracts and the misappropriation of millions of dollars. He was convicted in October 2006 of corruption relating to a $200,000 generator purchase, and was sentenced to two years' imprisonment. In December 2006, his conviction for corruption was thrown out, but he remained in jail awaiting trial for twelve additional corruption cases. Alsammarae fled his trial in Iraq on corruption charges after hiring Blackwater USA to break him out of prison. He currently resides in Chicago. . Alsammarae's international flight to escape prosecution on felony corruption charges was openly aided and abetted by the Bush regime, since an American plane carried him out of Iraq to Jordan. Alsammarae is one of the international jackals whose looting of Iraq under the Coalition Provisional Authority helped to created the armed backlash of a national resistance which has so far cost the United States well over 4000 dead.[70]

Now, o muse, let Nixon's Bebe Rebozo be silent; let Albert Fall of Harding's Teapot Dome and Grant's Credit Mobilier sink into obscurity. Let LBJ's Billy Sol Estes and Reagan's Gorbanifar and Kashoggi go gibbering into Hades, while Carter's Bert Lance and Clinton's Marc Rich retreat to the shadows wrapped in Sherman Adams' vicuna coats from the Eisenhower era. A new champion of crime and logothete of corruption is at hand, and he is Obama.

THEN: TINKER TO EVERS TO CHANCE; NOW: ALSAMMARAE TO AUCHI TO REZKO TO OBAMA

Obama has boasted and strutted about his alleged October 2002 speech opposing the idea of a US attack on Iraq, but it is quite possible that blood money looted from the Coalition Provisional Authority may have found its way into Obama's infamous Kenwood mansion. The old Chicago Cubs double play went from Tinker to Evers to Chance. Obama's new triple play of corruption may have gone from Alsammarae to Auchi to Rezko to Obama, with the US taxpayer being one of the main victims. As Jerome Corsi commented, "Following this twisted trail of suspicious millions, investigative reporters have drawn a line from Obama to Rezko to Saddam Hussein's Oil for Food scandal, with the key connecting point being billionaire Nadhmi Auchi."[71]

Most of the funding of Bremer's Coalition Provisional Authority came from the Bush regime, and this was the money appropriated from the Iraqi Electricity Ministry by Alsammarae. Might Alsammarae then have transferred some of these funds to Auchi in London in the course of certain joint ventures in which these two were engaged? Might some of those same dollars then have made up part of a $3.5 million loan from Auchi to Rezko? Such money might have helped Rezko recoup some of his largesse to Barky involved in the earlier below-cost purchase of the lot next door to Obama's mansion, a transaction which was indispensable to allow Barky and Michelle to get control of the property they wanted and later to expand the size of their yard:

> When Obama bought his mansion in Chicago's Kenwood neighborhood, Rezko's wife Rita, purchased adjoining land for $625,000 – land that the house's owners insisted on selling at the same time. Seven months later, she sold the Obamas one-sixth of her lot, for $105,000, so they could expand their yard.[72]

According to another account, this time from a left liberal source:

> Troubling to the Obamas' image of civic rectitude is their entanglement with a campaign contributor named Antoin (Tony) Rezko in a 2005 real-estate deal. (Rezko is now awaiting trial on corruption charges.) That year, as the *Tribune* reported, the Obamas moved to a $1.65-million Georgian Revival mansion in Hyde Park, which features a thousand-bottle wine cellar and bookcases made of Honduran mahogany. On the day they bought the house, Rita Rezko, Tony's wife, purchased the adjacent lot, which was wooded and empty, for $625,000. After the deal went through, Michelle contacted the city's landmarks commission, which she had served on, and received an e-mail from a deputy commissioner with suggestions for obtaining permits to erect a fence between the parcels. The Obamas paid for legal, architectural, and landscaping work, while Rezko got the bill for the fence's construction, for fourteen thousand dollars. (*New Yorker*, March 11, 2008)

The impudence and flagrance of this corrupt transaction underline once again what can only be called Obama's megalomania, a sense that he has been absolved of obedience to the law in the same way that earlier false messiahs have proclaimed the suspension of all the rules. It was reckless folly for Obama to insist on getting the mansion with an assist from an organized crime figure, but he went ahead anyway. This is the same kind of antinomian mentality which we can detect in the crimes of presidents from Nixon to Bush. As Pringle comments,

> Obama's entering into real estate deals with Rezko, while it was public knowledge that he was under investigation for funneling illegal contributions to Illinois politicians, was not a "boneheaded" move, it was motivated by pure greed. While knowing that he would get caught up in a major scandal, Obama went ahead with the deal because he and his wife wanted that

mansion, with four fireplaces, six bathrooms, and a wine cellar, period. (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

THE ILLINOIS BIPARTISAN COMBINE; MOTHER SHIP FOR OBAMA

At the center of this worldwide network of crime and intrigue we find the one form of bipartisan political cooperation to which Obama is sincerely devoted: this sinister centerpiece is the bipartisan Illinois Combine, a continuing criminal enterprise under the definitions of the RICO statute through which a gang of racketeers composed of elected officials of the Democratic and Republican parties have systematically looted and despoiled the public treasuries of the city of Chicago, Cook County, and the state of Illinois in particular. In his specific capacity as a ward heeling machine hack political operative, Obama looks to this criminal bipartisan Illinois Combine as his mother ship. Due to the pervasive presence and overwhelming rapacity of the bipartisan Illinois Combine, it may well be that Illinois and Chicago specifically represent the most filthy and corrupt jurisdictions anywhere in the United States today. How ironic that Obama, the self-styled angel of clean government, has chosen to climb out of this repulsive sewer.

The working hypothesis of this book is that the Rezko conviction, which may well be followed by similar convictions of Illinois Governor Rod Blagojevich and of Chicago Mayor Daley, will not be used by Soros and the Trilateral financiers to sabotage the candidacy of their own handpicked bankers' boy during the 2008 contest. This would of course represent a self-defeating exercise in futility, a contradiction in terms. It is instead likely as Operation Board Games represents a capability which will be kept in reserve for the future, should it ever become necessary for the banking faction to remind the megalomaniac Obama about who is boss. If Barky becomes too rambunctious, he can be threatened with indictment and incarceration using the testimony of his longtime crony Rezko. Alternatively, Operation Board Games and the Rezko conviction might be used as convenient detonation devices, should the Trilateral bankers ever feel the need to jettison their puppet in a big hurry. This use of a large-scale federal investigation of the corrupt operations of a statewide political machine recalls a similar pattern which emerged around the puppet President Harry S. Truman, who could always be disciplined by reminding him that his patron and the architects of his political career, boss Tom Pendergast, had been sent to the federal penitentiary in 1939, where Harry could also be sent at any time if he were to forget whose servant he actually was. This grim reality of the Rezko conviction being available to enforce permanent puppet status on Obama, no matter what the latter might desire to do once he got to the White House, is yet another consideration for voters looking for an independent-minded president in 2008.

The Rezko case, like a lugubrious Greek chorus, provided an ominous counterpoint to Obama's activities during the primary season. Rezko was arrested at his home in Wilmette, Illinois on January 29 by federal agents and was taken forthwith to the hoosegow. Federal authorities said that Rezko had violated the conditions of his bail bond. Jury selection for the Rezko trial began about a month later. At this time, the Chicago newspapers were much more aggressive than the swooning national media who made up most of the press corps that was accompanying Obama on his campaign travels. None of the national pundits was the least bit interested in the fact that the Perfect Master had such a dirty godfather, but the Chicago types were more hard-bitten. Chicago papers demanded that Obama come clean, issuing the following set of demands just as the Rezko trial preparations were beginning:

> Jury selection began Monday in the trial of political influence peddler Tony Rezko. This would be the time — before a single witness takes the stand — for Barack Obama to finally share

every detail of his relationship with Rezko. Rezko stands accused of funneling state business to companies that lined his pockets and made campaign contributions to Gov. Blagojevich. Rezko allegedly directed $10,000 to Obama's 2004 campaign for the U.S. Senate. For months, *Sun-Times* investigative reporters have had a standing request to meet with Obama, face to face, to get answers to questions such as these: How many fund-raisers did Rezko throw for Obama? Obama is donating $150,000 to charity that Rezko brought into the campaign. But how much in all did Rezko raise? Did Rezko find jobs for Obama backers in the Blagojevich administration or elsewhere? Why did Obama only recently admit — after Bloomberg News broke the story — that Rezko had toured his South Side mansion with him in 2004 before he bought it? Dribs and drabs of people's lives have a most unfortunate way of coming out in trials.' (*Chicago Sun-Times*, "Sen. Obama, time to call us about Rezko: (312) 321-2417," March 4, 2008)

FITZGERALD DELIBERATELY SHIELDED OBAMA IN THE REZKO TRIAL

US Attorney Patrick Fitzgerald, whose status as a high-level enforcer for the ruling class had been established during the Scooter Libby prosecution, elected not to bring Obama's name into the Rezko trial at the numerous points where mentioning Obama would have been pertinent. Even in the original indictment against Rezko, Fitzgerald's office had bent over backwards to avoid negative publicity for Obama: 'The list of names in the indictment includes about eight persons referred to as "Co-Schemers," and reads like a "who's who list" of major campaign donors to Obama, Blagojevich, Daley and other powerful Illinois politicians. Blagojevich is referred to as "Public Official A," Obama is referred to as a "political candidate," and there is a list of "Individuals" from "Individual A" all the way up to "Individual HH."' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com) The same tender regard for Obama's reputation continued through the entire Rezko trial: 'Newly unsealed documents show that prosecutors sought to call witnesses to testify about Rezko's ties to Obama, the presumptive Democratic nominee for president. The Illinois senator was the recipient of "straw" campaign contributions made by others on behalf of Rezko — money that Obama has since given to charities, but only after he got caught. The documents indicate that prosecutors considered offering witnesses to explore why Rezko used others to contribute to Obama and also to Blagojevich, and U.S. District Judge Amy J. St. Eve ruled that they could. But they did not end up offering any such testimony during the trial. "Witnesses will testify that Rezko was a long-standing supporter and fund-raiser of Barack Obama," prosecutors wrote.[74] This deliberate decision to spare Obama for now, while his chief godfather and donor was hustled off to the federal penitentiary, supports the Truman-Pendergast hypothesis of how the entire Rezko and Operation Board Games verdicts are likely to be used in the future to ensure that Obama remains under strict financier control.

OBAMA: "THIS ISN'T THE TONY REZKO I KNEW"

Rezko was then convicted just after the last primary elections were held:

One-time Barack Obama political fundraiser Tony Rezko has been convicted in federal court in Chicago of corruption charges in a kickback scheme involving the Illinois state government. Rezko was convicted of 12 counts of mail and wire fraud, two counts of corrupt solicitation and two counts of money laundering. Rezko allegedly schemed to corrupt two state boards and solicited contributions for the campaign of Governor Rod Blagojevich from companies seeking state business. He was acquitted of one count of attempted extortion, four counts of corrupt solicitation and three counts of fraud. (Yahoo Wires, June 4, 2008)

Obama released a statement announcing that he was "saddened," adding in part that "this isn't the Tony Rezko I knew, but now he has been convicted by a jury ... that once again shines a spotlight on the need for reform." (cbs2chicago.com) This trope was now a very overworked *topos* from Axelrod's rhetorical grab bag, having previously figured in Obama's boiler plate "This isn't the Jeremiah Wright I knew" evasive denial right after the ranting reverend's geek act at the National Press Club. As Pringle points out, '…Obama knew about the Operation Board Games investigation during his year-long wheeling and dealing escapade with Rezko to arrange the purchase of the mansion and lot, and any claim to the contrary by the "I did not know" candidate is ludicrous.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com) This was all bad enough, to be sure. But these monstrous crimes themselves are nothing but the tip of the iceberg. To estimate the real dimensions of the bipartisan Illinois Combine, we call on Evelyn Pringle, an expert in the ethnic labyrinths that are now the city of broad shoulders and former hog butcher to the world.

TONY REZKO: FROM CAMELOT TO OBAMA'S LOT

Pringle's thesis is simple: Obama is an organized crime figure, and the Democratic Party should never have allowed him to get anywhere near its presidential nomination:

> The most trusted leaders of the Democratic party, such as John Kerry and Ted Kennedy, ought to be ashamed of themselves for supporting Barack Obama. With use of the internet, a fifth grader could connect the dots to show a picture of a guy who was picked up in college and carried up the political ladder by a corrupt gang of influence peddlers. John McCain is just drooling waiting for Obama to become the nominee so that he can come out with the trail of dirt that the Democratic Party is too afraid to reveal this late in the game. If nominated, Obama will not survive a month when faced with the Republican attack machine. If he becomes the nominee, the web of corruption leading to Obama's rise to power that this investigative journalist was able to untangle in less than three weeks, will be front page news right up until election day, handing the Republicans their only chance in hell of winning the White House. (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

The keystone in this vast edifice of corruption is the Rezko-Auchi axis, which, thanks to Obama's complicity, has allowed Rezko to become the owner of a huge piece of prime real estate in the Loop, the central business district of the lakeside metropolis. Pringle writes:

> The investigation called "Operation Board Games" will lead to Obama's downfall and it will begin with what he claims was a "boneheaded" mistake in entering into real estate deal with the Syrian-born immigrant, Antoin 'Tony' Rezko, less than a month after Rezko received a $3.5 million loan from the Iraqi-born billionaire, Nadhmi Auchi, who ended up with Riverside Park, a $2.5 billion 62-acre development project in the Chicago Loop. [This immense prize of Riverside Park is a central feature of the entire scandal, since] … following the names linked to Riverside Park is the key to understanding Operation Board Games.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Today, Obama is naturally running away from Tony Rezko as fast as his legs will carry him, but the evasion is useless. At various times in his career, Obama has been a most assiduous frequenter of the Levantine gangster.

> 'For a year, [Obama] also minimized his relationship with Rezko by telling the media that he only had dinner or lunch with Rezko one or twice a year. But when confronted by *Sun-Times* reporters during the March 14 interview, with the allegation that an FBI mole saw him coming

and going to Rezko's office often and that three sources said he talked to Rezko on the phone daily, Obama changed his tune.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

'In the media, Obama always made it sound like he rarely saw Rezko, saying they met for breakfast or lunch once or twice a year. However, the FBI mole John Thomas helped investigators "build a record of repeat visits to the old offices of Rezko and former business partner Daniel Mahru's Rezmar Corp., at 853 N. Elston, by Blagojevich and Obama during 2004 and 2005," according to the February 10, 2008 *Sun-Times*.' (Evelyn Pringle, "Curtain for Barack Obama Part II," opednews.com)

At the height of the Jeremiah Wright scandal in mid-March 2008, Obama finally gave in to the demands of the Chicago press corps and agreed to answer some questions about his relations with Rezko over the years. Obama was obviously seeking to use one scandal to eclipse another, but Pringle has gone through the relevant articles and found much material which is damaging to the Illinois Messiah. One aspect of this was the infiltrated FBI spy had testified that Obama was constantly in the company of Rezko:

During his March 14, 2008 interview, the *Sun Times* told Obama, Thomas is an FBI mole and he "recently told us that he saw you coming and going from Rezko's office a lot." "And three other sources told us that you and Rezko spoke on the phone daily." "Is that true?" the reporter asked. "No," Obama said, "That's not accurate." "I think what is true," he said, "is that, it depends on the period of time." "I've known him for 17 years," Obama stated. "There were stretches of time where I would see him once or twice a year." He told the *Sun Times*, "when he was involved in finance committee for the U.S. Senate race, or the state senate races, or the U.S. Congressional race, then he was an active member." "During the U.S. Senate race, there'd be stretches of like a couple of weeks - for example prior to him organizing the fundraiser that he did for us - where I would probably be talking to him once a day to make sure that was going well," he said. "But the typical relationship was one that was fond," he added. "We would see each other." Now the story is that he may have talked to Rezko daily at times during campaigns but sometimes he went for a whole month without talking to him. "I have to say we're talking over the course of 10 years," Obama said, "there might have been spurts where I talked to him daily." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Further invasion is useless; Obama was as close to Rezko as the thumb is to the forefinger. One way to document this is by following the money. Obama himself has confessed to accepting something in the neighborhood of a quarter million dollars from his convicted felon backer.

'Tony Rezko was Obama's political Godfather. Obama received his first contributions of $2,000, to launch his political career as a state senator on July 31, 1995, from Rezko. Obama started out saying that Rezko only raised $50,000 or $60,000 for his political career but after a year of lying his way through the primaries, the latest total he gave to the *Sun-Times* and *Tribune* during interviews on March 14, 2008, adds up to $250,000.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

OBAMA: REZKO "NEVER ASKED ME FOR ANYTHING" FOR THE $250K!

Rezko and Obama go back a long way together, back to the early 90s when Obama was completing law school at Harvard. 'Obama met Rezko soon after graduating from Harvard Law School. Rezko was well connected in Chicago's African-American community, in part because he had worked with Jabir Herbert Muhammad, the son of Nation of Islam founder Elijah Muhammad,

when he was managing the career of boxer Muhammad Ali, according to a May 2005 profile in the *Chicago Tribune*. Rezko moved into real estate and political fundraising, often a combustible combination in Chicago. Rezko offered Obama a job with his real estate company soon after they met, around 1991, but Obama declined. When Obama decided to run for the state Senate in 1995, Rezko was his "first substantial contributor," according to the Tribune. That money relationship continued, with Rezko raising as much as $250,000 over the course of Obama's five Illinois races, reported the *Chicago Sun-Times*. The friendship may have reflected the fact that both men were outsiders, trying to establish themselves in the rough-and-tumble world of Chicago. Obama told the *Sun-Times* last month: "My assessment of Tony Rezko was that he was an immigrant who had sort of pulled himself up by his bootstraps. ... I think he saw me as somebody who had talent, but he was probably also intrigued by my international background." Part of what Obama says he liked about Rezko was his graciousness: "He never asked me for anything." The relationship became controversial because of the now-famous home-purchase deal: When Obama and his wife bought a $1.65 million house in Chicago in June 2005, Rezko's wife simultaneously bought the adjoining lot and later sold part of it back to the Obamas so that they could have a bigger yard. Obama conceded in an interview with the Chicago Tribune last month that in the real estate deal, "I made a mistake in not seeing the potential conflicts of interest or appearances of impropriety." He said of Rezko's motivation in buying the adjoining lot, "He perhaps thought that this would strengthen our relationship. He could have even thought he was doing me a favor." What's troubling about this story is that at the time Obama bought the house in June 2005, allegations had already surfaced about Rezko's alleged influence-peddling. A Feb. 13, 2005, story in the *Chicago Tribune* criticized Rezko's receipt of lucrative state contracts to operate restaurants on Illinois toll roads; an April 8, 2005, story said he was "under fire from Chicago's city hall" because his restaurant chain had taken two spots at O'Hare airport designated for minority firms; a May 17 article reported that Rezko had been subpoenaed in a corruption probe. (David Ignatius, "Obama and the Chicago Insider," *Washington Post*, April 20, 2008)

Obama's absurd claim that Rezko "never asked me for anything" shows his real contempt for the intelligence of voters, and in any serious presidential debate he would have been questioned mercilessly on this point. But Ignatius, a drooling acolyte of the Perfect Master, is more than willing to accept this nonsense at face value.

OBAMA'S DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY FOR GRAFT

Obama returns to this particular lie (the one about Rezko never having asked him for any favors whatsoever) again and again, like a dog to its vomit:

> …Obama has continuously claimed that Rezko never asked him for favors. On November 5, 2006, the *Sun-Times* published his answers to questions that were submitted to him after the news of the real estate deal with Rezko surfaced, and Obama stated: "I have never been asked to do anything to advance his business interests." A day later, on November 6, 2006, he told reporters in Waukegan Illinois, "He had never asked me for anything. I'd never done anything for him." In December 2006, he told the *Washington Post*: "I've known him for 15 years." "He had never asked me to do anything." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Even the chickens are laughing at Obama's mendacity.

But the record indicates that Obama did a large number of very dirty favors redolent of graft and corruption for his sugar daddy Rezko.

> On June 13, 2007, the *Sun-Times* reported that as a state senator, "Obama wrote letters to city and state officials supporting his political patron Tony Rezko's successful bid to get more than $14 million from taxpayers to build apartments for senior citizens." In the *Sun Times*, Novak reported that the deal included $855,000 in development fees for Rezko and [ex Obama employer and alleged public housing abuser Allison] Davis, while Obama was still working at the Davis law firm, for a bid on a project that was "four blocks outside Obama's state Senate district." Although the law firm represented several companies owned by Davis and Rezko when Obama wrote the letters, the firm did not represent New Kenwood in the deal. According to the *Sun-Times*, Davis and Rezko instead hired a firm owned by Mayor Daley's brother Michael, "to help them get $3.1 million from bonds issued by the city of Chicago." (Pringle, op-ed news)

MICHELLE OBAMA'S FASHION SHOW OF GRAFT

Michelle Obama joined her husband in eagerly cavorting in the cesspool of the bipartisan Illinois Combine. Michelle was the guest of honor at a veritable fashion show of graft; among those present was Patti Blagojevich the consort of the overlord of the entire bipartisan Illinois Combine.

'In the November 2007, *Chicago Magazine*, James Merriner described a "fashion show" that took place in the first week in November 2006, to benefit St Jude Children's Research Hospital, which he said, "attracted little if any media coverage, which may have been exactly as its organizers and sponsors had hoped." "The invitation to the affair," he wrote, "offered a veritable guidebook to political influence in Illinois, much of it centered on one St. Jude benefactor, Antoin 'Tony' Rezko." "Just three weeks earlier," Merriner pointed out, "Rezko had been indicted on charges of extorting kickbacks from businesses seeking contracts from the Blagojevich administration." The "fashion show" was chaired by Rita Rezko, co-chaired by the Governor's wife, Patti Blagojevich, and Michelle Obama was a special guest that day, according to Merriner. Two weeks after the "fashion show," on November 17, 2006, the *Sun-Times* reported that Blagojevich's wife Patti got nearly $50,000 from a real estate deal in late 2002 involving Rezko. (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

VALERIE JARRETT, FRIEND OF BARKY

Michelle Obama had in fact been an integral part of the Illinois Combine even before Barky. It was Michelle who introduced Obama into the secrets of the machine:

> 'Obama's ties to the corrupt Daley machine began when he was dating his wife Michelle and she brought him into the fold. Valerie Jarrett, the deputy chief of staff to Mayor Daley, hired Michelle as her assistant in 1991…. Obama's introduction into the "Combine" came when his wife Michelle was hired by Jarrett in the early 1990s, and served as Jarrett's assistant in Daley's office and followed her to the Department of Planning and Development.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

During the 2008 primaries, Valerie Jarrett was listed by *Newsweek* magazine as part of Obama's standard traveling entourage. Valerie Jarrett played a key role in introducing both Obama and Michelle into the higher levels of the Combine:

> 'Daley made Jarrett the chairman of the Chicago Department of Planning and Development and Michelle worked as her assistant in that Department during 1992-93. From there Michelle moved up the political tiers to the University of Chicago and ultimately got an overnight pay

raise from about $121,000 to close to $317,000, after Obama became a US Senator, as a vice president at the University of Chicago.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

At the University of Chicago, the careers of Michelle Obama and Valerie Jarrett moved in tandem, like Plutarch's parallel lives:

On June 13, 2006, Michelle's employer, the University of Chicago, announced that, "Valerie Jarrett has been appointed as the new Chair of the University of Chicago Medical Center Board and also Chair of a newly created Executive Committee of that board. She has also been named Vice-Chair of the University's Board of Trustees." Jarrett served on Obama's US Senate campaign finance committee and serves on Obama's presidential campaign finance committee along with Alex Giannoulias and Mayor Daley's brother Bill.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Valerie Jarrett has also been important for the fundraising of the Obama campaign, the source of Obama's much-vaunted claims of superiority over all his rivals:

'When it came time for Obama's US Senate campaign, Valerie Jarrett became the campaign finance chairman and worked hand and hand with fellow finance committee members, Rita and Tony Rezko, and his [Obama's] former boss at the law firm, Allison Davis, in fundraising endeavors. The committee raised more than $14 million, according to Federal Election Commission records, Tim Novak reported in the *Sun-Times* on April 23, 2007. Jarrett is now the CEO of Habitat Co, a real estate development and management firm which manages the housing program for the Chicago Housing Authority, the entity mandated to administer public housing, and she serves as an unpaid advisor to Obama's Presidential campaign.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

DAVID AXELROD: A FLACK FOR THE COMBINE

The mastermind of Obama's campaign, David Axelrod, whom we have already encountered as a graduate of the infamous University of Chicago 1313 school of mind bending, can only be properly understood in his role as a flack and public-relations man for the corrupt bipartisan Illinois Combine.

On April 1, 2007, Dick Simpson, a former Chicago alderman who is now chairman of the political science department at the University of Illinois at Chicago, told Ben Wallace-Wells in the *New York Times*: "David Axelrod's mostly been visible in Chicago in the last decade as Daley's public relations strategist and the guy who goes on television to defend Daley from charges of corruption." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

The need for such services has been increasingly evident:

'On January 6, 2006, the *New York Times* ran the headline, "Corruption Scandal Loosening Mayor Daley's Grip on Chicago," and reported that a "wide-ranging federal investigation into what prosecutors describe as "pervasive fraud" in hiring and contracts at City Hall has led to 30 indictments, including two senior administrators close to the mayor, and a dozen cabinet-level resignations." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Axelrod's network in the Daley machine and the *Chicago Tribune* has been a priceless asset for the Redeemer. Various websites have advanced the allegation that Patti Solis Doyle, Clinton's campaign manager in 2007-2008, had come under the influence of Axelrod as a result of Solis Doyle's Chicago connections to The Combine. In a posting on Taylor Marsh's site, we find that 'Daniel "Danny" Solis is a Chicago politician who serves as the alderman for the 25th ward which

includes the Lower West Side. He was appointed by Mayor Richard M. Daley in 1996. He is the brother of Patti Solis Doyle, Senator Hillary Clinton's former campaign manager. Solis was a member of Clinton's Illinois Steering Committee. Throughout his career as alderman, Solis has been an ally of Mayor Daley and in 2001 was appointed President Pro Tempore of the City Council, allowing him to oversee council proceedings in the mayor's absence.'[75] Some concluded from this that Patti Solis Doyle had turned into a submarine in the Clinton camp. This would explain why Clinton had little or no organization in the February 2008 post-Super Tuesday caucus and primary states, a failing which allowed Barky to build up his lead in delegates thanks to caucuses in Republican states where the Democratic Party was a restricted club dominated by rich elitists and global warming neo-Luddite fanatics.[76] The charges were plausible, but there was also the matter of Mark Penn as another nefarious influence who shared responsibility for defeat.

AN OBAMA BODY COUNT?

During the Clinton era, right-wingers delighted in circulating a list of deceased persons which they referred to with much stretching of the imagination as a Clinton body count. It may now be time to revive this venerable institution for Obama and the bipartisan Illinois combine: John Stroger was the Cook County Board President and thus the top-ranking African-American elected official in the county in which Chicago is located. On January 31, 2006, Obama pointedly declined to endorse Stroger for re-election. The Chicago Democratic machine turned against Stroger, forcing him off the ticket and out of office. Stroger was elderly and not in good health, but he succumbed at a time that was convenient for the Daley machine:

> John Stroger will not be answering any questions about corruption, or any other matter, because he died on January 18, 2008. His former chief of staff and godson, Orlando Jones, will not be talking either because he was found dead of self-inflicted gun wounds in September 2007, "just as a corruption inquiry targeting him was heating up," according to a September 7, 2007 report by CBS News channel 2 Chicago.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Was Jones suicided?

> '"Jones left his position in county government to create a lobbying firm in association with Tony Rezko, who has been indicted on fraud charges," CBS reported. Cook County Commissioner Tony Peraica [a Republican who had tried to get Stroger's post] told CBS that Orlando Jones' death raised many questions about the Cook County president's office. "Some of these matters Jones was involved in that are currently being investigated by the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office are reaching to the highest level of county government," Peraica said. (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Other names that might figure on an Obama body count include Donald Young, the gay choirmaster of Jeremiah Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ, Larry Bland, and Nate Spencer, the latter also black gay men from the south side of Chicago who have died recently under mysterious circumstances. Nate Spencer was also a member of Wright's Trinity United church. Despite all the media attention for this highly politicized church, two murders in the cathedral have not been reported by the controlled corporate outlets.

LOOTING OF PENSION FUNDS WAS OBAMA'S SPECIALTY

Important aspects of Combine operations in which Obama was involved dealt with the organized looting of investment funds earmarked for the retirement income of state employees. Obama's contribution was to streamline the process by which these pension funds could be bilked.

> Obama's using the lure of the pension funds to raise campaign money goes way back. In 1999, he "was instrumental in the formation of a coalition of black investment firm owners and legislators in Illinois to create an initiative that would award black-owned firms with the management of some of the state's retirement funds," according to a 2004 article on Black Enterprise.com. […] However, the *Times* pointed out that Obama's political career had benefited many times over from his ties to the group. "Several of the businessmen or their wives would help clear the debts from his Congressional race," the *Times* wrote, "and six of the group's members are now among the top fund-raisers for his presidential campaign, according to campaign finance records." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Obama's services in making it easier for black oligarchs to siphon off money from these retirement accounts led in turn to increased campaign contributions for the Perfect Master:

> During this period, the *Times* says, campaign finance records show executives from Ariel Capital, Loop Capital, Holland Capital and Capri Capital, "sharply increased their donations" to Obama's State Senate campaign fund. "And once he began his campaign for the United States Senate," the *Times* wrote, "they quickly became a fund-raising core that has carried over into the presidential race." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

These machinations also help to explain one of the legendary Damascus road conversions of the 2008 primary season, the decision of former Clinton ally and DNC Chairman David Wilhelm to join the ranks of the renegades endorsing Obama. Wilhelm had been implicated for some years in shady activities in which Obama had also been a protagonist:

> Obama was chairman of the Senate Health & Human Services Committee in January 2003. A few articles in the media have mentioned that Obama sat on a committee that reviewed matters related to the Planning Board in conjunction with the Governor's staff but none have discussed his integral part in getting the bill passed A June 2003 email exchange produced in the trial shows Obama was one of eight officials who received the names of the nominees for the new Board ahead of time, from the office of David Wilhelm, who headed Blagojevich's 2002 campaign for governor. The corrupt new appointees were all contributors to the presidential hopeful, Blagojevich, and the US Senate hopeful Obama. On February 14, 2008, Wilhelm endorsed Obama in a call with reporters, citing the senator's "masterful" campaign organization and strategy as well as his "undeniable momentum." "He has outworked, out-organized and out-raised his opponents every step of the way," Wilhelm said. "The Obama campaign, win or lose, will serve as a model for future generations to come." Wilhelm's firm has received a subpoena for records related to pension fund investments.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Pringle thinks that the Combine wanted to put Blagojevich into the White House, but the presidency is beyond the reach of gangsters at this level, unless the Trilaterals and related financier forces approve.

The pecuniary rewards for Obama and his fellow racketeers were most gratifying, but the impact on Chicago and Illinois was devastating. The Combine was a cancer so big that it was beginning to drain the life blood of its host, causing a gradual strangulation of the real economy:

> Illinois citizens are sick of paying the cost of corruption. A September 26, 2007 news release by Steve Stanek of the Heartland Institute carried the headline: "Proposed Tax Hike Would Give Chicago Nation's Highest Sales Tax Burden" "Chicagoans would face an 11 percent sales tax rate, highest in the nation, if Cook County officials go through with a plan to more than triple the county's portion of the area's sales tax," Stanek wrote. And let there be no doubt, Obama is a member of this corrupt gang. On January 22, 2007 ABC News in Chicago announced that Senator Obama "is supporting Mayor Daley's re-election bid despite a series of City Hall corruption scandals." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

NADHMI AUCHI, PARTNER OF REZKO – AND BARKY?

Obama's second Levantine godfather is the British billionaire Auchi, whose front company, General Mediterranean Holdings (GMH), is now the owner of some prime Chicago real estate, thanks to his close relations with the Illinois Combine. This is

> Nadhmi Auchi, who ended up with Riverside Park, a 62-acre lot in the Chicago Loop estimated to now be worth $2.5 billion. On September 29, 2005, *Crain's Chicago Business* news reported that General Mediterranean Holding, "a Luxembourg-based conglomerate headed by Nadhmi Auchi, is buying Riverside Park, a yet-to-be-built development on a prime 62-acre parcel on Roosevelt Road," … General Mediterranean is owned by Nadhmi Auchi, who public source documents describe as a British-based Iraqi billionaire who was convicted several years ago in France on fraud charges. Auchi was sentenced to 15 months in prison and fined $2 million euros, but the sentence was suspended as long as Auchi committed no new crimes…. Auchi's conviction was a part of the gigantic investigation into the corruption of the Elf oil company, "the biggest fraud inquiry in Europe since the Second World War. Elf became a private bank for its executives who spent £200 million on political favours, mistresses, jewelry, fine art, villas and apartments," according to the November 16, 2003 *Guardian*. (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Auchi and Alsammarae both have their pied-à-terre in Chicago; Alsammarae, in fact, has three:

> "The three homes belonging to former Iraqi Electricity Minister Aiham Alsammarae — a dual U.S.-Iraqi citizen who broke out of a Baghdad jail in 2006 — are part of a long list made public ... following a *Sun-Times* request." "Alsammarae is the weakest link in the chain of people who stole money from the CPA and the Iraqi people since 2003. The evidence against him is strong and convincing. His conviction is a problem for the people in his gang. The Baathists." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

There is little doubt that a serious probe of Chicago real estate and public housing graft would reach all the way up to Mayor Richard Daley and beyond: Pringle has demanded that 'an "Operation Board Games" investigation should be conducted on the slumlord business in Illinois over the past 15 years. Daley became Mayor in 1989 and Rezmar got its first city loan of $629,000 the same year, even though Rezko and Mahru had no construction experience.' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

According to *Rawstory*, "Auchi, a native of Iraq who lives in Great Britain, has a colorful past of his own. The businessman set up a variety of deals with Saddam Hussein's regime prior to the 1991 Gulf War, and was one of the largest private shareholders in BNP Paribas, the bank that trafficked most of the funds involved in the UN Oil-For-Food scandal. He also admitted taking kickbacks from the French petroleum company TotalFinaElf in the 1990s (Auchi later sued Elf for entangling him in their criminal activities, according to *Forbes*)."

By late summer 2008, right-wing papers from the mainstream media were finally beginning to realize the dimensions of the Auchi issue. Neocon John Fund wrote in the *Wall Street Journal* online edition: 'Rezko's trial raised a host of questions. Was Mr. Obama able to save $300,000 on the asking price of his house because Rezko's wife paid full price for the adjoining lot? How did Mrs. Rezko make a $125,000 down payment and obtain a $500,000 mortgage when financial records shown at the Rezko trial indicate she had a salary of only $37,000 and assets of $35,000? Records show her husband also had few assets at the time. Last April, the *London Times* revealed that Nadhmi Auchi, an Iraqi-born billionaire living in London, had loaned Mr. Rezko $3.5 million three weeks before the day the sale of the house and lot closed in June 2005. Mr. Auchi's office notes he was a business partner of Rezko but says he had "no involvement in or knowledge of" the property sale. But in April 2004 he did attend a dinner party in his honor at Rezko's Chicago home. Mr. Obama also attended, and according to one guest, toasted Mr. Auchi. Later that year, Mr. Auchi came under criminal investigation as part of a U.S. probe of the corrupt issuance of cell-phone licenses in Iraq. In May 2004, the Pentagon's inspector general's office cited "significant and credible evidence" of involvement by Mr. Auchi's companies in the Oil for Food scandal, and in illicit smuggling of weapons to Saddam Hussein's regime. Because of the criminal probe, Mr. Auchi's travel visa to the U.S. was revoked in August 2004, even as Mr. Auchi denied all the allegations. According to prosecutors, in November 2005 Rezko was able to get two government officials from Illinois to appeal to the State Department to get the visa restored. Asked if anyone in his office was involved in such an appeal, Mr. Obama told the *Chicago Sun-Times* last March, "not that I know of." FOIA requests to the State Department for any documents haven't been responded to for months.'[77]

REZKO JAILED BEFORE SUPER TUESDAY OVER PAYMENT TO REZKO

Auchi suddenly became big news just before Super Tuesday, when court proceedings connected to the Rezko trial revealed that Auchi had transmitted a hefty sum of cash to Rezko to help him to make bail and get sprung out of jail. When the judge in the Rezko trial learned of Auchi's conveyance of this cash, Rezko was ordered back to jail at a very sensitive moment in the primary season – but most of the impact was blunted because of the media smokescreen for Barky. Important background information was provided by the *London Times*, the British newspaper of record: 'An undeclared $3.5 million (£1.8 million) payment from a Iraqi-British businessman has landed Barack Obama's former fundraiser behind bars. The payment, disclosed in court papers, is the first time that Mr Obama's long-serving bagman Antoin "Tony" Rezko, a Syrian immigrant to the United States, has been linked to Nadhmi Auchi, the Iraqi-born billionaire who is one of Britain's richest men. Court papers describe Mr Rezko as a close friend of Mr Auchi, although Mr Auchi disputes this. The two are involved in a large Chicago land development together. But it is unclear how long the two men have known each other or whether they were linked before the 2003 Iraq war. Neither side would discuss their relationship. The Times has, however, discovered

state documents in Illinois recording that Fintrade Services, a Panamanian company, lent money to Mr Obama's fundraiser in May 2005. Fintrade's directors include Ibtisam Auchi, the name of Mr Auchi's wife. Mr Auchi's spokespeople declined to respond to a question about whether he was linked to this business. Mr Rezko, to be tried for corruption this month, had his bail revoked on Monday after he disobeyed a court's instructions to keep it informed of changes to his finances. Prosecutors feared that he could try to flee abroad…. According to prosecution documents Mr Rezko tried to persuade unnamed Illinois officials to help Mr Auchi to get a US visa after he was convicted of fraud in France. Mr Auchi denies asking Mr Rezko to approach any officials and Mr Obama's aides deny that he was approached. There is no suggestion that any lobbying was related to the loan. Mr Rezko has been indicted for pressuring companies seeking state business for kickbacks and campaign contributions, although none for Mr Obama. He was granted bail in October 2006. He told a judge that he had no access to overseas money. But in April 2007 Mr Auchi's business, General Mediterranean Holding (GMH), wired $3.5 million to Mr Rezko from a bank account in Beirut via a law firm. Mr Auchi has attracted attention at Westminster because of his closeness to politicians and the Establishment. He says that his brother was executed by Saddam Hussein's regime. His business partners in Britain have included Lord Steel of Aikwood, the former Liberal leader, and Keith Vaz, the Labour MP and Home Affairs Committee chairman. On the 20th anniversary of his business in 1999, Mr Auchi received a greeting card signed by 130 politicians, including Tony Blair, William Hague and Charles Kennedy, who were then leaders of their respective parties. Norman Lamb, the Liberal Democrat MP, went on to table parliamentary questions asking why the Blair Government appeared slow to respond to a French extradition request. Mr Lamb said last night: "It's a matter of public interest to understand why the payments were made. This deserves thorough investigation." Mr Auchi founded GMH in 1979, a year before he left Iraq. He says that he did business with his native country when it was considered a friend of the West but ceased to trade with Saddam's regime once sanctions were imposed after the invasion of Kuwait. US prosecution documents recall Mr Auchi's suspended jail sentence and €2 million fine for corruption in France five years ago. Defence lawyers said that Mr Auchi lent the $3.5 million for legal and family expenses.' (James Bone, "Obama bagman is sent to jail after failing to declare $3.5m payment by British tycoon," *London Times*, February 1, 2008)

AUCHI IMPLICATED IN OIL FOR FOOD SCANDAL, CELL PHONE SCAM

In addition to his other escapades, Auchi has according to published reports also been implicated by US government investigators in a bribery scheme to fix cell phone contracts let by the US-imposed Coalition Provisional Authority of Iraq, as well as of having played a key role in the Oil for Food scandal. The Oil for Food scandal occurred when international profiteers embezzled money from a UN program designed to deliver food and medicine to the people of Iraq during the period of the genocidal US-imposed sanctions, which resulted n the needless deaths of hundreds of thousands of Iraqis. A crucial component of this story was provided by neocon Bill Gertz, who pointed out: 'Auchi gave at least $10.5 million to Obama fundraiser Antoin "Tony" Rezko, including a payment of $3.5 million that coincided with Mr. Obama's purchase in 2005 of a $1.65 million Chicago house, the *London Times* reported Tuesday. The newspaper said the timing of the

payment and the house purchase, along with the purchase of land next door by Mr. Rezko's wife Rita from the same seller, raise questions about whether Auchi helped buy the house. Bill Burton, a spokesman for Mr. Obama, would not answer when asked if Auchi helped buy the senator's house. He said the senator did not recall ever meeting Auchi, who was convicted of corruption charges in France in 2003. A 2004 Pentagon report obtained by *The Washington Times* identified Auchi as a global arms dealer and Iraqi billionaire… The report to the Pentagon inspector general stated that "significant and credible evidence was developed that a conspiracy was organized by Nadhmi Auchi to offer bribes to 'fix' the awarding of cellular licensing contracts covering three geographic areas of Iraq" under the U.S. Coalition Provisional Authority."

> "Additionally, significant and credible evidence has been developed that Nadhmi Auchi has engaged in unlawful activities working closely with Iraqi intelligence operatives to:
>
> "Bribe foreign governments and individuals prior to Operation Iraqi Freedom to turn opinion against the American-led mission to remove Saddam Hussein.
>
> "Arrange for significant theft from the U.N. Oil-for-Food Program to smuggle weapons and dual-use technology into Iraq ....
>
> "Organize an elaborate scheme to take over and control the post-war cellular phone system in Iraq."

The report suggests Auchi has ties to British intelligence through a 2002 association with a former British intelligence chief, and that British telecommunications companies may have used Auchi to gain access to cellular phone markets in post-invasion Iraq. Auchi has denied accusations over the cell phone contract.'[78]

In a clear attempt to undermine free speech and the protections guaranteed to Americans by the First Amendment, Alasdair Pepper of the British law firm Carter-Ruck has been busy attempting to intimidate American web sites into taking down material deemed offensive by Auchi. Evelyn Pringle is one writer who has received such threatening communications. This amounts to an attempt to take down the First Amendment and impose the alien, British concept of libel, which tends to protect powerful or wealthy public figures from criticism, thus chilling political debate. The Obama campaign has been a direct beneficiary of the resulting suppression of news about Auchi. Pro-Obama news organs like the *New York Times* have tacitly cooperated with these activities, willingly weakening free speech to get their candidate elected[79].

THE OBAMA-ALSAMMARAE MUTUAL AID SOCIETY

Alsammarae, a convicted felon in Iraq and an international fugitive, has contributed to Obama's presidential campaign, and also helped pay the bail necessary to spring Rezko from the cooler. Obama reciprocated by doing favors for Alsammarae:

> Three days after the *Chicago Sun-Times* reported that Aiham Alsammarae, the former electricity minister convicted of corruption in Iraq, put up $2.7 million in property to help raise $8.5 million to free Tony Rezko from jail in Chicago, the *Times* reported that Alsammarae had contributed six times to Obama's presidential campaign. The April 29, 2008 report also noted that before he escaped from jail in Baghdad in December 2006, and returned to Chicago, Obama's US Senate office had sought information about Alsammarae from the State Department on October 16, 2006 on behalf of Alsammarae's family while he was being held in jail in Iraq. As usual, when busted on the contributions given in January, February and March [2008], the Obama camp said it would donate Alsammarae's money to charity and his

spokesman, Ben LaBolt, put out the standard line that Obama does not ever "recall" meeting Alsammarae. The Associated Press ran a follow-up story on April 14, 2008, calling Auchi a "mysterious billionaire with his hands on a major chunk of Chicago real estate," and described his arrival in Illinois in April 2004, as a major event in which Lt. Governor Quinn "headed a welcoming delegation that greeted Auchi when his private plane touched down at Chicago's Midway Airport." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

REZKO'S 2004 RECEPTION FOR AUCHI: DID OBAMA AND MICHELLE ATTEND?

Auchi was plainly treated like a head of state when he arrived at O'Hare in 2004 to meet with his cohorts. How could a convicted felon enter the US so easily? Did Senator Obama help Auchi clear some hurdles with the federal authorities? Pringle notes that 'all members of the "Combine" have tried to distance themselves from Auchi's visit because, as previously explained, he is not allowed in the US. However, the question that remains is, how did he enter this country in April 2004, after his 2003 conviction in France. According to the February 28, 2008 *Sun-Times*: "Auchi's London-based lawyer, Alasdair Pepper, wouldn't answer that." "State Department and Homeland Security officials said they couldn't comment," according to the *Times*. During a March 14, 2008 interview, the Times asked Obama: "Did you ever help Auchi enter the country?" He said, "No." But when asked the follow-up question of whether "his office" helped Auchi enter the country, he replied, "Not that I know of." On January 28, 2008, *Raw Story*'s Michael Roston reported that after rumors began spreading that Auchi may have met with Obama, "In what appears to be a clumsy 'cleanup' operation, evidence of Auchi's visit to Illinois has now been deleted from two websites linked to his company, General Mediterranean Holding." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Then there is the fascinating issue of a sumptuous reception, fit for a king, which was offered in the honor of visiting dignitary Auchi by his close business associate, Tony Rezko. At the time of this reception, invitations were doubtless very much in demand. But now, in a surprising reversal, the local bigwigs who attended are frequently attempting to argue that they were not there at all: because Auchi has now become a hot potato, especially for Obama, there is

> … a disagreement over whether Obama did or didn't attend a party at Rezko's house for an Iraqi-born billionaire named Nadhmi Auchi. A prosecution witness testified that Obama and his wife were guests at the April 3, 2004, gathering in the Chicago suburb of Wilmette. The Obama campaign responded that neither of the Obamas recalled attending such an event. Auchi similarly has "no recollection of meeting Senator Obama at any party in 2004 or at any other time," according to his lawyer, Alasdair Pepper.'(David Ignatius, "Obama and the Chicago Insider," *Washington Post*, April 20, 2008)

There is a very good chance that we have just caught the distinguished senator and his charming consort lying, once again. This scandal makes the Billygate scandal of the Carter administration look like an innocent flirtation. The official position of the Obama campaign is that Obama has never met Auchi, meaning that the sworn testimony of Stuart Levine in the Rezko trial on this issue was perjury.

Obama may have been smart enough to make sure that he did not get photographed together with Auchi, but his Governor Blagojevich apparently did not exhibit the same level of elementary prudence. There are in fact pictures of Auchi together with Blagojevich:

> ABC News first posted a link to photos showing Auchi meeting with Blagojevich on the site, "Middle East Online." The description under a picture of Auchi and Blagojevich, still accessible on the internet a month ago, stated: "Governor of the State of Illinois, Mr Rod Blagojevich hosted an official reception in honour of Mr Auchi." Another picture, taken in the Chicago office of the President of the Illinois State Senate bears the title: "Illinois State Senate President Mr Emile Jones Jr. meets Mr Auchi." (Pringle, op-ednews.com)

Jones is of course another of Obama's friends and patrons, and a key wheel horse of the Illinois Combine.

But there are other accounts, very embarrassing for Obama as a proponent of clean government, that place him among those present at the 2004 Rezko-Auchi bash, with Obama leading the well-heeled guests in drinking to Auchi's health and long life:

> …on April 16, 2008, *Sun-Times* columnist, Michael Sneed, reported that Obama had even made toasts at Rezko's party, and wrote: "Dem presidential contender Barack Obama's handlers may be telling the press Obama has NO "recollection" of a 2004 party at influence peddler Tony Rezko's Wilmette house, but a top Sneed source claims Obama not only gave Rezko's guest of honor, Iraqi billionaire Nadhmi Auchi, a big welcome . . . but he made a few toasts!"[80] In an April 26, 2008, interview with the *Chicago Tribune* reporter, John McCormick, Obama did not deny that he and Michelle were at the party but said he did not recall being there, stating: "I have to say that I just don't recall it. I mean this has been, I guess, four years ago. My understanding, through his lawyer, Mr. Auchi doesn't recall meeting me and you know, I can't speak for other people's recollections." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

This is another example of Obama's technique of rhetorical evasion under the guise of disarming frankness.

On February 25, 2005, a report by Charles Smith for NewsMax said, "Newly released documents from the Bush administration show that a former member of Saddam Hussein's inner circle has resurfaced inside the new Iraqi government, bringing charges of corruption, bribery and bid-rigging." "As a result," he wrote, "millions of U.S. aid dollars and billions in Iraqi government funds have disappeared in an ongoing scandal that is poised to engulf Baghdad and Washington." :

US SENATOR PETER FITZGERALD: "THE BIPARTISAN ILLINOIS COMBINE"

Perhaps the most authoritative confirmation of the existence of the Illinois bipartisan Combine from former US Senator Peter Fitzgerald of the GOP, an elected official who for some reason did not completely fit in with the prevailing general agreement to loot the citizens. Senator Fitzgerald categorically affirmed the existence of such an ongoing criminal conspiracy, in which Obama is unavoidably implicated:

> Journalist John Kass asked US Senator, Peter Fitzgerald, "what do you call that connection that Stuart Levine describes from the witness stand [in the Rezko trial], you know that arrangement across party lines, with politically powerful men leveraging government to make money — what do you call it?" "The Illinois Combine," he said. "The bipartisan Illinois political combine." "And all these guys being mentioned, they're part of it," he told Kass. "In the final analysis," the Senator said, "The Combine's allegiance is not to a party, but to their pocketbooks." "They're about making money off the taxpayers," he added. According to Kass, "the Rezko trial is part of the U.S. Justice Department's attack on The Combine." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

AIHAM ALSAMMARAE OF MESOPOTAMIA

Alsammarae's ability as a con man carried him all the way to a meeting with George Bush in the White House.

> Alsammarae moved to Chicago in the 1970s and met Rezko while attending engineering school. Reports indicating the Combine's corruption extended to the electricity minister in Iraq began in mid-summer 2005. On July 29, 2005, Sandra Jones reported in *Crain's Chicago Business*: "Rezmar ... controlled by Tony Rezko, a controversial confidant of Gov. Rod Blagojevich, entered into a joint venture with a British firm in a $150-million deal to build a power plant in Iraq." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Paul Bremer, the leader of the notoriously corrupt Coalition Provisional Authority, appointed him minister of electricity in August 2003. Alsammarae was photographed at a White House ceremony in the Oval Office on September 22, 2003, at which Bush called him a "good soul," who "inherited a system of a corrupt tyrant." (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com) Bush met Alsammarae, but Obama cannot be sure about his own track record:

> During a March 14, 2008 interview with the *Sun-Times*, Obama was asked: "Did you ever meet Nadhmi Auchi or Dr. Aiham Alsammarae?" "I have to say I do not recall meeting them. It's been reported that a dinner Tony hosted at the Four Seasons, I don't have the exact date, so I don't know whether it was the before November '04 when I hadn't been elected but had already won the primary or whether it was after the election, in which I was . . . "Tony called and asked if I could stop by because he had a number of friends that he had invited to dinner and he wanted to meet them. "I told him that I would be happy to come by if my schedule allowed it. And it did. Although I couldn't, I think, stay for dinner, so I remember meeting a bunch of people who I had not met before. I frankly don't remember what their names were. "Business was not discussed at the meeting. It was more of a social meeting and they asked me questions about the senate race and so forth and so on. "I have no specific recollection. They may have been there. I can't say unequivocally that I did not meet them, but I just don't recall."' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Again, these answers by Obama are as interesting for the technique of evasion as they are for the factual situation they refer to.

OBAMA'S PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FOR GRAFT IN ACTION

At the end of June 2008, when Obama believed that he already had the Democratic presidential nomination locked up, the *Boston Globe* published a limited hang out investigative report on graft and corruption involving public housing and related issues in Chicago. This series was valuable for the first-person accounts it offered of the immense human suffering and despair left behind in the wake of the looting operations championed by Obama. It is also remarkable that Obama still maintains that the Chicago model of public-and private partnerships (PPPs), despite its blatant and scandalous failure in the Windy City, is the model he wants to bring to Washington to be applied to the entire United States. The PPPs represent catastrophic public policy, and probably also embody a sleazy payback by the Perfect Master to the various shady characters that have contributed to his campaign fund, and now want to feed at the federal trough.

The *Boston Globe* evokes Obama's archipelago of despair in graphic terms:

> The squat brick buildings of Grove Parc Plaza, in a dense neighborhood that Barack Obama represented for eight years as a state senator, hold 504 apartments subsidized by the federal government for people who can't afford to live anywhere else. But it's not safe to live here. About 99 of the units are vacant, many rendered uninhabitable by unfixed problems, such as collapsed roofs and fire damage. Mice scamper through the halls. Battered mailboxes hang open. Sewage backs up into kitchen sinks. In 2006, federal inspectors graded the condition of the complex as an 11 on a 100-point scale - a score so bad the buildings now face demolition. Grove Parc has become a symbol for some in Chicago of the broader failures of giving public subsidies to private companies to build and manage affordable housing - an approach strongly backed by Obama as the best replacement for public housing. As a state senator, the presumptive Democratic presidential nominee coauthored an Illinois law creating a new pool of tax credits for developers. As a US senator, he pressed for increased federal subsidies. And as a presidential candidate, he has campaigned on a promise to create an Affordable Housing Trust Fund that could give developers an estimated $500 million a year. But a *Globe* review found that thousands of apartments across Chicago that had been built with local, state, and federal subsidies - including several hundred in Obama's former district - deteriorated so completely that they were no longer habitable. Grove Parc and several other prominent failures were developed and managed by Obama's close friends and political supporters. Those people profited from the subsidies even as many of Obama's constituents suffered. Tenants lost their homes; surrounding neighborhoods were blighted. Some of the residents of Grove Parc say they are angry that Obama did not notice their plight. The development straddles the boundary of Obama's state Senate district. Many of the tenants have been his constituents for more than a decade. "No one should have to live like this, and no one did anything about it," said Cynthia Ashley, who has lived at Grove Parc since 1994.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

It is bad enough that things are this way in Chicago; is this then what we want to impose on every city in the United States? Obama says it is.

CASE STUDY: CECIL BUTLER, SLUMLORD AND OBAMA BACKER

We have already encountered Valerie Jarrett as an early patroness of the rise of Michelle Obama in the corrupt Chicago city bureaucracy. For the *Boston Globe*, she features prominently in the Chicago housing story along with Allison Davis, the boss of Obama's old law firm, and, of course, with Tony Rezko:

> Among those tied to Obama politically, personally, or professionally are: Valerie Jarrett, a senior adviser to Obama's presidential campaign and a member of his finance committee. Jarrett is the chief executive of Habitat Co., which managed Grove Parc Plaza from 2001 until this winter and co-managed an even larger subsidized complex in Chicago that was seized by the federal government in 2006, after city inspectors found widespread problems. Allison Davis, a major fund-raiser for Obama's US Senate campaign and a former lead partner at Obama's former law firm. Davis, a developer, was involved in the creation of Grove Parc and has used government subsidies to rehabilitate more than 1,500 units in Chicago, including a North Side building cited by city inspectors last year after chronic plumbing failures resulted in raw sewage spilling into several apartments….Rezko's company used subsidies to rehabilitate more than 1,000 apartments, mostly in and around Obama's district, then refused to manage the units, leaving the buildings to decay to the point where many no longer were habitable. Campaign finance records show that six prominent developers - including Jarrett, Davis, and

> Rezko - collectively contributed more than $175,000 to Obama's campaigns over the last decade and raised hundreds of thousands more from other donors. Rezko alone raised at least $200,000, by Obama's own accounting.

The *Boston Globe* also includes a somewhat lower level figure as an example of the broader clientele implicated in these operations:

> One of those contributors, Cecil Butler, controlled Lawndale Restoration, the largest subsidized complex in Chicago, which was seized by the government in 2006 after city inspectors found more than 1,800 code violations.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

The Chicago landscape is filled with individuals who claim to have once been civil rights activists, but who now seem to be concentrating on graft; Obama himself is an example. The *Boston Globe* writes:

> Chicago's struggles with the deterioration of its subsidized private developments seemed to reach a new height in 2006, when the federal government foreclosed on Lawndale Restoration, the city's largest subsidized-housing complex. City inspectors found more than 1,800 code violations, including roof leaks, exposed wiring, and pools of sewage. Lawndale Restoration was a collection of more than 1,200 apartments in 97 buildings spread across 300 blocks of west Chicago. It was owned by a company controlled by Cecil Butler, a former civil rights activist who came to be reviled as a slumlord by a younger generation of activists. […] In 1995, Butler's company got a $51 million loan from the state to fund additional renovations at Lawndale Restoration. In 2000 Butler's company brought in Habitat Co. to help manage the complex. Nonetheless, the buildings deteriorated badly. The problems came to public attention in a dramatic way in 2004, after a sport utility vehicle driven by a suburban woman trying to buy drugs struck one of the buildings, causing it to collapse. City inspectors arrived in the ensuing glare, finding a long list of code violations, leading city officials to urge the federal government to seize the complex.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

Valerie Jarrett, who has been part of Obama's traveling entourage during much of the primary season, turns out to be a dedicated ideologue of the public-and private partnership, that is to say, of privatization in a way which would be typical of a Friedmanite economics professor at the University of Chicago:

> Jarrett, a powerful figure in the Chicago development community, agreed to be interviewed but declined to answer questions about Grove Parc, citing what she called a continuing duty to Habitat's former business partners. She did, however, defend Obama's position that public-private partnerships are superior to public housing. "Government is just not as good at owning and managing as the private sector because the incentives are not there," said Jarrett, whose company manages more than 23,000 apartments. "I would argue that someone living in a poor neighborhood that isn't 100 percent public housing is by definition better off."' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

This, we should recall, is one of Michelle Obama's closest friends and indeed in many ways the initial sponsor of her career. Concepts like the "Chicago development community" may translate into "the Chicago graft community" on closer examination.

INSPIRATIONAL: OBAMA ONCE EYED A CAREER AS A SLUMLORD

As we have already seen, Obama's close cooperation with Rezko and Davis goes back almost twenty years. Obama now claims that part of the affinity among these figures was their shared ideology in favor of the public-private partnership, a setup which appears to combine the worst disadvantages of government ownership with all the pitfalls of private rapacity: Obama 'once told the *Chicago Tribune* that he had briefly considered becoming a developer of "affordable housing." But after graduating from Harvard Law School in 1991, he turned down a job with Tony Rezko's development company, Rezmar, choosing instead to work at the civil rights law firm Davis, Miner, Barnhill & Galland, then led by Allison Davis. The firm represented a number of nonprofit companies that were partnering with private developers to build affordable housing with government subsidies. Obama sometimes worked on their cases. In at least one instance, he represented the nonprofit company that owned Grove Parc, Woodlawn Preservation and Investment Corp., when it was sued by the city for failing to adequately heat one of its apartment complexes. Shortly after becoming a state senator in 1997, Obama told the *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin* that his experience working with the development industry had reinforced his belief in subsidizing private developers of affordable housing. "That's an example of a smart policy," the paper quoted Obama as saying. "The developers were thinking in market terms and operating under the rules of the marketplace; but at the same time, we had government supporting and subsidizing those efforts."' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008) Smart policy? Chicago's ghetto victims are not in agreement, as this article will show.

Obama's election-year promises have generally turned out to be worthless, but the promise of inflicting public-private partnerships on the entire country seems to be one promise which we really can take to the bank:

> Obama has continued to support increased subsidies as a presidential candidate, calling for the creation of an Affordable Housing Trust Fund, which could distribute an estimated $500 million a year to developers. The money would be siphoned from the profits of two mortgage companies created and supervised by the federal government, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. "I will restore the federal government's commitment to low-income housing," Obama wrote last September in a letter to the Granite State Organizing Project, an umbrella group for several dozen New Hampshire religious, community, and political organizations. He added, "Our nation's low-income families are facing an affordable housing crisis, and it is our responsibility to ensure this crisis does not get worse by ineffective replacement of existing public-housing units." (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

Given the Chicago results, Obama has negative credibility on this issue. Will he make Rezko or Daley the Secretary of Housing an Urban Development, which is already one of the most corrupt cabinet agencies? With Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac now insolvent, where would Obama get the money for so much graft?

We have seen the reports from an FBI mole at various times in recent years that Obama was meeting Rezko once a day and more than once a day. Despite this, the Perfect Master wants us to believe that he was not aware that the properties Rezko had received from the city administration were now in total disrepair and unfit for human habitation.

> Eleven of Rezmar's buildings were located in the district represented by Obama, containing 258 apartments. The building without heat in January 1997, the month Obama entered the state

> Senate, was in his district. So was Jones's building with rats in the walls and Frizzell's building that lacked insulation. And a redistricting after the 2000 Census added another 350 Rezmar apartments to the area represented by Obama. But Obama has contended that he knew nothing about any problems in Rezmar's buildings. After Rezko's assistance in Obama's home purchase became a campaign issue, at a time when the developer was awaiting trial in an unrelated bribery case, Obama told the *Chicago Sun-Times* that the deterioration of Rezmar's buildings never came to his attention. He said he would have distanced himself from Rezko if he had known. Other local politicians say they knew of the problems.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

Obama may have plausible deniability on some other issues, but he certainly has none here.

2004: A CECIL BUTLER BUILDING COLLAPSES

Things soon got so bad in the Cecil Butler concessions that the federal government had to step into the midst of a mushrooming scandal. Given the regulatory laxity of the Bush regime, we can gauge the horrendous situation that must have been required to get federal authorities to act.

> Chicago's struggles with the deterioration of its subsidized private developments seemed to reach a new height in 2006, when the federal government foreclosed on Lawndale Restoration, the city's largest subsidized-housing complex. City inspectors found more than 1,800 code violations, including roof leaks, exposed wiring, and pools of sewage. Lawndale Restoration was a collection of more than 1,200 apartments in 97 buildings spread across 300 blocks of west Chicago. It was owned by a company controlled by Cecil Butler, a former civil rights activist who came to be reviled as a slumlord by a younger generation of activists. […] In 1995, Butler's company got a $51 million loan from the state to fund additional renovations at Lawndale Restoration. In 2000 Butler's company brought in Habitat Co. to help manage the complex. Nonetheless, the buildings deteriorated badly. The problems came to public attention in a dramatic way in 2004, after a sport utility vehicle driven by a suburban woman trying to buy drugs struck one of the buildings, causing it to collapse. City inspectors arrived in the ensuing glare, finding a long list of code violations, leading city officials to urge the federal government to seize the complex.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

CECIL BUTLER'S VICTIMS RALLY AGAINST OBAMA, 2004

For those who had suffered from the rapacity of the "civil rights" slumlord Cecil Butler, there was no doubt that Obama bore a major share of responsibility for the tragic decay of these housing developments. At one point, the public rage was so great that Obama had to face a public demonstration against his policies in the midst of his campaign to grab his Illinois seat in the U.S. Senate. 'In the midst of the uproar, a small group of Lawndale residents gathered to rally against the Democratic candidate for the US Senate, Barack Obama. Obama's Republican opponent, Alan Keyes, trailed badly in the polls and was not seen as a serious challenger. But the organizers had a simple message: Cecil Butler had donated $3,000 to Obama's campaign. Habitat had close ties to Obama. And Obama had remained silent about Lawndale's plight. Paul Johnson, who helped to organize the protest, said Obama must have known about the problems. "How didn't he know?" said Johnson. "Of course he knew. He just didn't care."' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

This demonstration and the growing climate of public discontent, however, had absolutely no impact on Obama, who was determined to continue on his path of graft:

> Even as Lawndale Restoration and Rezmar's buildings were foreclosed upon, and Grove Parc and other subsidized developments fell deeper into disrepair, Obama has remained a steadfast supporter of subsidizing private development.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

Nothing but nothing will pry Obama's fingers away from the bankrupt and despicable model of the public-private partnership, as the Obama campaign underlined once again after the close of the primary campaign:

> Throughout his career in public service, Barack Obama has advocated for the development of mixed-income housing and public-private partnerships to create affordable housing as an alternative to publicly subsidized, concentrated, low-income housing," the Obama campaign said in a statement provided to the Globe.' (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

A THREE-YEAR OLD TODDLER CRUSHED TO DEATH AT THE CABRINI GREENS, JUNE 2008

The Chicago housing scandals have come to represent a massive political vulnerability for Obama, even among those who would otherwise be sympathetic to his candidacy: "I'm not against Barack Obama," said Willie J.R. Fleming, an organizer with the Coalition to Protect Public Housing and a former public housing resident. "What I am against is some of the people around him." Jamie Kalven, a longtime Chicago housing activist, put it this way: "I hope there is not much predictive value in his history and in his involvement with that community." (Binyamin Appelbaum, "Grim proving ground for Obama's housing policy," *Boston Globe*, June 27, 2008)

The dirty public-private partnership deals favored by Obama claimed yet another victim in late June when a small boy died in a bizarre accident when a piece of the steel barrier around his housing complex came down on him, costing the toddler his life: 'A 3-year-old boy was crushed to death Friday evening by a large, rusted steel gate at the Cabrini-Green housing complex, prompting a crowd to gather and hurl accusations of mismanagement at property managers. "How many accidents happen over here because of failed inspections," screamed Willie J.R. Fleming, a resident and a director with the Coalition to Protect Public Housing. "There's no accountability, there's no oversight of this." (*Chicago Tribune*, June 28, 2008, noquarterusa.net)

The Cabrini Greens were already notorious in the late 1980s as one of the worst slum properties in the world, buildings full of murder, narcotics, crime, and despair. 20 years later, Obama's much vaunted public-private partnerships had only made matters worse.

ALEXI GIANNOULIAS AND MICHAEL "JAWS" GIORANGO; FRIENDS OF BARKY

Obama, who poses in public as a reformer who wants to restore good government and end partisan haggling, has in fact been one of the most loyal soldiers of the corrupt Illinois Combine. It is instructive to view the case of Alexi Giannoulias, the Combine's 2006 choice for the sensitive post of Illinois State Treasurer. Giannoulias, who had facilitated loans to a certain Michael Giorango, a convicted bookmaker and prostitution ring promoter, was so sleazy that even some

Combine stalwarts found that it was not politic to offer him their public endorsement. But Obama had no such qualms, and gave the shady Giannoulias his stamp of approval forth with.

> During the campaign, the Democratic speaker of the state House and other party leaders criticized Giannoulias because of loans his family bank made to Michael "Jaws" Giorango, a convicted felon. Obama stuck with Giannoulias after the revelations, though he did call on him to explain the matter. "I'm going to ask Alexi directly what is happening," Obama said in April 2006, according to the *Chicago Tribune*.[81]

The public has never gotten an answer. But Obama gave full support to this sleazy character:

> In the 2006 Democratic primary, for example, Obama endorsed first-time candidate Alexi Giannoulias for state treasurer despite reports about loans Giannoulias' family-owned Broadway Bank made to crime figures. Records show Giannoulias and his family had given more than $10,000 to Obama's campaign, which banked at Broadway.' Obama endorsed the re-election of Gov. Rod Blagojevich, whose administration is now heavily embroiled in the Rezko corruption probe.' (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

Obama had to be tolerant about convicted felons: if Barky can associate with Rezko, then surely Giannoulias can associate with Jaws Giorango and smaller sharks. If Obama were a member of a big city police force like the NYPD, he would be fired for associating with known criminals.

OBAMA A "POLITICAL PSYCHOPATH"

This affair led Pringle to observe:

> Obama is a political psychopath. He exhibits no shame, no matter where his money comes from. On September 5, 2007, the *New York Post* reported that, "Alexi Giannoulias, who became Illinois state treasurer last year after Obama vouched for him, has pledged to raise $100,000 for the senator's Oval Office bid." "Giannoulias is so tainted by reputed mob links," the *New York Post* noted, "that several top Illinois Dems, including the state's speaker of the House and party chairman, refused to endorse him even after he won the Democratic nomination with Obama's help."' (Evelyn Pringle, opednews.com)

Obama was also happy to have Giannoulias organize a fund-raiser for his campaign shortly before the Iowa caucuses and the opening of the 2008 primary season: On September 5, 2007, the *New York Post* reported that: "A man who has long been dogged by charges that the bank his family owns helped finance a Chicago crime figure will host a Windy City fund-raiser tonight for Senator Barack Obama." Alex Giannoulias had vowed to raise $100,000 for Obama's campaign. Naïve persons who believe the fairy tale that Obama is financed by millions of widow's mites had better think again in the light of these revelations.

PAY TO PLAY OBAMA: LOGOTHETE OF GRAFT AND CORRUPTION

Daniel J. Kelly of the *Chicago Daily Observer* examines Obama's relation to and political record regarding Alexi Giannoulias in the light of the mechanisms know to govern the Combine, where the first commandment is *Pay to play*, meaning in effect pay bribes however disguised to take part in the looting:

> "Pay to play" seems to be another disturbing constant in Obama's meteoric political rise. He always seems to be available to the highest bidder. … the curious relationship between Obama

> and his political protégé, Illinois State Treasurer Alexi Giannoulias has not been widely publicized. Locally, the story generated some brief coverage, but the subject has been barely examined by the mainstream media. Bloggers are familiar with the tale, but Obama has skated on this subject with the general public. Some background is necessary: after spending a season playing professional basketball in Greece, Giannoulias returned to the USA and enrolled in law school at Tulane University in New Orleans, where every day is Mardi Gras. Less than three years after being admitted to practice in Illinois, Giannoulias launched his campaign for State Treasurer. With the financial support of his family banking business and US Senator Barack Obama's endorsement, this politically inexperienced individual secured the Democratic nomination. In the general election campaign, State Democratic Party Chairman, Michael Madigan, continued to keep Giannoulias at arm's length. Madigan had supported a different candidate in the primary and disseminated disquieting rumors about the business background of Giannoulias, the former Vice President and Senior Loan Officer of the Broadway Bank, which was owned by his family members. During his brief tenure in the banking industry, Giannoulias appears to have approved loans to convicted felons with ties to organized crime. One such loan applicant was a convicted bookmaker with an alleged sideline business promoting prostitution. Our colleague Russ Stewart was one of the few who pointed out the fact that Obama played the role of kingmaker in Giannoulias' successful first time candidacy. At the age of thirty, Giannoulias became the youngest treasurer in Illinois history. What qualified Giannoulias for public office and earned him Obama's endorsement? He plays basketball with Obama. No park district field house or asphalt parking lot games for these two men of the people. When in Chicago, Obama and his pal prefer to play at the exclusive East Bank Club. Throughout the primary season, Giannoulias has hit the campaign trail to play Obama in pick up games on the dates of the respective state primaries. Obama finds it relaxing to play hoops when ballots are being cast. Apart from shooting buckets, it also helped that Giannoulias and his family members have contributed so generously to the various Obama campaigns. Giannoulias and his family are not absolutely committed true believers in the Democratic Party and its causes, however, as they hedged their bets by contributing to the House Republican Congressional Campaign Committee and to have also made campaign contributions to former Governor George H. Ryan. ("A Consumer's Guide to Obama and the Company That He Keeps," Daniel J. Kelley, *The Chicago Daily Observer* , May 22, 2008.)

Obama thus exhibits a pervasive pattern of graft through his policy of assisting his campaign contributors to get their hands into the public till. This method of graft is applied to donors of all ethnic groups and backgrounds, provided that they fork over campaign funds:

> In 2001, for example, Obama steered $75,000 to a South Side charity called FORUM Inc., which promised to help churches and community groups get wired to the Internet. Records show five FORUM employees, including one who had declared bankruptcy, had donated $1,000 apiece to Obama's state Senate campaign. As the grant dollars were being disbursed to FORUM, the Illinois attorney general filed a civil lawsuit accusing the charity's founder of engaging in an unrelated kickback scheme. Just days after the suit was filed, Obama quietly returned the $5,000 in donations. "I didn't want to be associated with money that potentially might have been tainted," he said. FORUM founder Yesse Yehudah, who unsuccessfully ran for state Senate against Obama in 1998, denied wrongdoing and, without admitting guilt, settled the attorney general's lawsuit by paying $10,000 to a charity. (*Chicago Tribune*, May 3, 2007)

STATE SENATOR FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The Hyde Park suburb which Obama represented in the Illinois State Senate was notorious as a plantation for the University of Chicago, and thus for the Rockefeller (and Trilateral) interests more broadly speaking. Hyde Park is located on the South Side of Chicago, about seven miles south of the Loop. The University of Chicago is a citadel of reaction and oligarchism, having been founded in 1890 by the American Baptist Education Society and the oil magnate John D. Rockefeller. One of the university's key leaders between the world wars was Robert Maynard Hutchins, a high-level operative of the US ruling elite. The term "Chicago boys" is the object of worldwide execration because of the unspeakable crimes against humanity of the Chicago school of economics, most prominently associated with the name of the right-wing anarchist and extremist Milton Friedman, the top advisor of the brutal and murderous Pinochet regime in Chile.

THE *NEW YORK TIMES* WHITEWASHES OBAMA

Having now acquired some notion of the cesspool of corruption in which Obama has been natating for decades, we can now proceed to briefly contemplate the absurdity of the cover-up of some of these matters dished up by Obama's backers at the *New York Times.* In a classic fallacy of composition, the newspaper of record makes Obama's alliance with State Senate boss Emil Jones look like an elective affinity at the personal level, when it in fact represents an internal transaction of The Combine:

> Obama 'positioned himself early on as a protégé of the powerful Democratic leader, Senator Emil Jones, a beneficiary of the Chicago political machine. He courted collaboration with Republicans. He endured hazing from a few black colleagues, played poker with lobbyists, studiously took up golf. ("An awful lot happens on the golf course," a friend, Jean Rudd, says he told her.) With the assistance of Senator Jones, Mr. Obama helped deliver what is said to have been the first significant campaign finance reform law in Illinois in 25 years. He brought law enforcement groups around to back legislation requiring that homicide interrogations be taped and helped bring about passage of the state's first racial-profiling law. He was a chief sponsor of a law enhancing tax credits for the working poor, played a central role in negotiations over welfare reform and successfully pushed for increasing child care subsidies.'(Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

The measures sponsored by Obama, we sense, were simply acts of window dressing designed to festoon his brag sheet later on as he moved up the ladder.

Naturally, even in an environment where most legislators were devoted supporters of the Combine, Obama's irrepressible arrogance and megalomania, his self-righteous posturing and holier-than-thou gift for talking down to those around them, were sure to generate frictions, and so it came to pass:

> We could barely have meetings in caucus because Donne and Rickey [black legislators] would give him hell," said State Senator Kimberly A. Lightford, a Democrat and former chairwoman of the Senate's black caucus. "Donne would be, 'Just because you're from Harvard, you think you know everything.' Barack was like the new kid on the block. He was handsome and he was mild mannered and he was well liked. Sometimes there was a little 'Who's this? He coming here, he don't know anything." (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

Already at this point in his life, Obama was exhibiting all the telltale signs of consuming ambition for higher and higher public office, a quest wholly divorced from any notion of achievement or public service on his part. This trait is so marked that even Obama acolytes ventured to offer timid criticisms:

His critics say Mr. Obama could have accomplished much more if he had been in less of a hurry to leave the Statehouse behind. Steven J. Rauschenberger, a longtime Republican senator who stepped down this year, said: "He is a very bright but very ambitious person who has always had his eyes on the prize, and it wasn't Springfield. If he deserves to be president, it is not because he was a great legislator."' (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

All mincing of words aside, Obama was a thoroughgoing mediocrity in Springfield.

In a pattern which Americans have now come to know: after a short stint in the State Senate and precious little to show for it, Obama tried to grab a seat in the US House of Representatives. But this time he had a serious opponent in the person of Congressman Bobby Rush. Another pattern of Obama's public life is that he has been unable to win public office in any seriously contested election, and his resounding defeat by Bobby Rush confirms this rule. But losing his congressional race only made Obama more greedy for advancement, this time into the United States Senate with a significant helping hand from Emile Jones of the Combine.

> Within three years of his arrival, Mr. Obama ran for Congress, a race he lost. When the Democrats took control of the State Senate in 2003 — and Mr. Jones replaced James Philip, known as Pate, a retired Pepperidge Farm district manager who served as president of the Senate — Mr. Obama made his next move. "He said to me, 'You're now the Senate president,'" Mr. Jones recalled. "'You have a lot of power.' I said, 'I do?' He said, 'Yes.' I said, 'Tell me what kind of power I have.' He said, 'You have the power to make a U.S. senator.' I said, 'I do?' He said, 'You do.' I said, 'If I've got that kind of power, do you know of anyone that I can make?' He said, 'Yeah. Me.'" (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

But these are not two drifting individuals who meet by chance; they are two cogs in The Combine.

BETRAYING ALICE PALMER TO GET INTO THE STATE SENATE UNOPPOSED

In making his first run for the state Senate, Obama went out of his way to have all of his opponents thrown off the ballot with the help of a high-priced election lawyer who appeared out of nowhere as if by magic at precisely the right moment to help Obama's career – no doubt an example of Trilateral magic.[82] One of the victims of this operation was a veteran black female civil rights leader who had been something of a benefactress to Obama – long-time State Senator Alice L. Palmer. With his usual ruthlessness and brutality, Obama had Palmer thrown off the ballot along with the others without so much as a second thought:

> Three years later, a congressman from the South Side of Chicago was convicted of having sex with a minor. A Democratic state senator from his district, Alice L. Palmer, decided to run for the seat. Carol Anne Harwell, Mr. Obama's first campaign manager, said Ms. Palmer invited Mr. Obama, then 35, to run for her seat. But after losing in the primary, Ms. Palmer had second thoughts. A delegation of her supporters asked Mr. Obama to step aside. He not only declined, but his campaign staff challenged the signatures on Ms. Palmer's campaign petitions and kept

her off the ballot. It was nothing personal: They did the same thing to every other Democrat in the race. "He knocked off the incumbent, so that right there gave him some notoriety," said Ron Davis, who served as Mr. Obama's precinct coordinator. "And he ran unopposed — which for a rookie is unheard of."' (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007) Trilateral magic again.

Democratic Senator Paul Simon of Illinois may perhaps be recalled by some Americans as the boring buffoon in the bow tie who competed in the Democratic primaries for the presidential nomination back in the 1980s. Simon's role appears to have been to put a professorial, "good government" façade on the nefarious activities of the Combine. This included the absurdity of a bipartisan ethics bill that would in effect apply a thin film of lipstick to the corrupt porker of graft rollicking in the Combine's pigsty.

Illinois had one of the least regulated campaign finance systems in the country and a history of corruption. Paul Simon, the former United States senator, was running a public policy institute at Southern Illinois University and asked each of the four legislative leaders to name a trusted lawmaker to work on a bipartisan ethics bill. Mr. Jones recalls receiving a call from Abner J. Mikva, a former Chicago congressman, federal judge and friend of Mr. Simon. Judge Mikva, who had once tried to hire Mr. Obama as a law clerk, suggested him for the job. Mr. Jones says he knew that the new senator was hard-working and bright and that few others would want the assignment. "He caught pure hell," Mr. Jones said of Mr. Obama. "I actually felt sorry for him at times." The job required negotiating across party lines to come up with reform proposals, then presenting them to the Democratic caucus. Senator Kirk Dillard, the Republican Senate president's appointee, said, "Barack was literally hooted and catcalled in his caucus." On the Senate floor, Mr. Dillard said, "They would bark their displeasure at me, and then they'd unload on Obama." (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

COSMETIC REFORMS TO CAMOUFLAGE THE COMBINE

Today Obama claims that his campaign does not take contributions from federal lobbyists, but in reality he is eager to take contributions from the law partners, close associates, families, and friends of those lobbyists through the notorious corrupt practice known as bundling. Here we see another aspect of Obama's method as it has evolved since his days in Springfield, Illinois. He defines some aspect of the prevalent corruption in the most narrow and exclusive possible way, and then parades his stance on this tiny slice of the overall corruption pie as offering proof of his peerless probity and rectitude. So far, quite a few suckers have been taken in by this tactic.

"I know [Obama] wanted to limit contributions by corporations or labor unions, and he certainly wanted to stop the transfers of huge amounts of money from the four legislative caucus leaders into rank-and-file members' campaigns," Mr. Dillard said. "But he knew that would never happen. So he got off that kick and thought disclosure was a more practical way to shine sunlight on what sometimes are unsavory practices." (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

Affluent suburbanites interested in clean government rather than in securing broad-based economic benefits for the disadvantaged went ga-ga over Obama's exercise in cosmetic and window-dressing reform. All the while, the wheels of the Combine were grinding out graft in the back room. One example of Obama's successful deception was a measure for public disclosure of campaign contributions:

> The disclosure requirement "revolutionized Illinois's system," said Cindi Canary, executive director of the Illinois Campaign for Political Reform. By giving journalists immediate access to a database of expenditures and contributions, it transformed political reporting. It also, she said, "put Senator Obama on a launching pad and put the mantle of ethics legislator on his crown." (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

OBAMA AS "THE WHITE MAN IN BLACKFACE IN OUR COMMUNITY"

Obama by now was receiving largess from a number of foundation payrolls, so he could afford some clean government posturing which some of his colleagues could not. This again led to conflicts:

> By many accounts, there was already friction between him and Mr. Hendon, whose West Side Chicago district is among the poorest in the state, and Mr. Trotter. When Mr. Trotter and Mr. Obama both ran for Congress two years later — unsuccessfully, it turned out — Mr. Trotter told a reporter that Mr. Obama was viewed in part as "the white man in blackface in our community." Mr. Dillard said, "I remember Rickey chiding Obama that, 'What do you know, Barack? You grew up in Hawaii and you live in Hyde Park. What do you know about the street?' To which Obama shot back: 'I know a lot. I didn't exactly have a rosy childhood. I'm a street organizer by profession and a lot of my area, once you get outside the University of Chicago neighborhoods, is just as tough as your West Side, Rickey.' In an interview, Mr. Trotter said Mr. Obama had arrived "wanting to change things immediately," as though he intended "to straighten out all these folks because they're crooks." … Mr. Hendon, who says he is writing a book on electoral politics called "Backstabbers," said ethics reform would have passed with or without Mr. Obama because of scandals that preceded it. He said the sponsors of ethics bills tended to be "wealthy kind of people, the same kind of people who vote against pay raises, who don't need $5,000 a year. Whereas senators like me from poorer communities, we could use that $5,000."' (Janny Scott, "In Illinois, Obama Proved Pragmatic and Shrewd," *New York Times*, July 30, 2007)

ILLINOIS STATE SENATE: A RACE OF BETRAYAL

Of course, it was not just the old Weathermen who were mobilized to support Obama's bid for public office. Many parts of the left countergang scene were mobilized to advance the career of the candidate chosen by the Trilateral financiers: As one ultra-right-wing observer notes,

> Obama's socialist backing goes back at least to 1996, when he received the endorsement of the Chicago branch of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) for an Illinois state senate seat. Later, the Chicago DSA newsletter reported that Obama, as a state senator, showed up to eulogize Saul Mendelson, one of the "champions" of "Chicago's democratic left" and a long-time socialist activist. Obama's stint as a "community organizer" in Chicago has gotten some attention, but his relationship with the DSA socialists, who groomed and backed him, has been generally ignored. (Cliff Kinkaid, http://www.aim.org/aim-column/Obamas-international-socialist-connections/)

THE NEW MUSICAL: *OBAMA'S LOT*

The appalling contrast between Obama's presidential campaign and its hypocritical slogans about hope and change, on the one hand, and a horrendous reality of the senator's corruption was a national mockery of the first magnitude. Obama claimed that he was setting out to teach the world to hold the United States in high regard once again, but the first result of his candidacy was to demonstrate to any rational foreign observer that most Americans were abject fools, eager to listen to edifying verbiage from the mouth of a sleazy Chicago ward heeler who was lucky not to be standing in the dock next to his godfather Rezko. Fortunately, the spirit of self irony is not dead in Chicago, and a local journalist parodied the resulting situation by imagining a new musical comedy along the lines of Lerner and Lowe's Kennedy era *Camelot*, but this time featuring Obama and Rezko as knights of a roundtable of graft. John Kass asked himself,

> Can Tony Rezko — the indicted Illinois political fixer and Sen. Barack Obama's personal real estate fairy and fundraiser — carry a tune? Can Rezko really sing, loudly in a clear voice, in that orange federal jumpsuit he's forced to wear, after a federal judge on Tuesday revoked his bond, figuring he'd run to Syria and skip out on his federal political corruption trial? If Rezko can sing, there's a starring role in a new musical I'm writing about politics and real estate called "Obama's Lot." He'll make a fortune if Obama becomes president. It's sort of like "Camelot," with magic and demons and unicorns and an evil enchantress. Can't you see Rezko now? He waltzes across a national stage, surrounded by a chorus of Illinois politicians. They explain how Rezko helped the Obamas in the purchase of their nice home and that sumptuous lot next door. […] But in a unique use of symbolism, "Obama's Lot" involves a magical sword of power. The brave young Obama pulls it from the cornerstone of Chicago's City Hall and wields it proudly before his superiors in the Illinois State Senate. And, after a limited Washington engagement, he becomes president of the United States. A Hillary Clinton type plays the sensual Morgan La Fay, who uses her husky voice as she's constantly trying to wrest power from the brave Obama. I'm not going to give it all away, but in my musical, Rezko walks behind Obama, part willowy magician, part jealous jester. He's constantly judging, winking broadly at the audience during Obama's few bouts with temptation.

In the finale, Rezko sings to the tune of "If Ever I Should Leave You," familiar in the renditions by Robert Goulet and Richard Harris:

> If ever I would squeal on you/It shouldn't be in autumn.
> But it might just be in autumn/ as voters go to the polls.
> I'm no rat in the springtime/ summer, winter or fall
> But I don't like being in here/No, not at all.[83]

REZKO AS OBAMA'S BOSS PENDERGAST: A PERPETUALLY PENDING INDICTMENT

So why did the feds go to all the trouble of convicting Rezko and gathering plenty of evidence to bring down Obama for good, if they were determined all along not to bring down the arrogant Illinois senator? For the answer, we need to go back to 1944, a time when Franklin D. Roosevelt had rescued and restored to the American presidency the full panoply of constitutional powers intended by the framers. But Franklin D. Roosevelt, exhausted by his struggle with the world economic depression and by his exertions to win World War II, was dying. Despite the fact that

FDR had saved their otherwise doomed system in 1933, the Wall Street oligarchs so hated and resented the yoke of constitutional government that they were determined never again to allow a real president to occupy the White House and exercise the actual powers prescribed by the U.S. Constitution. From now, they vowed, only puppet presidents, mere marionettes obedient to the dictates of Wall Street, would be permitted. The first step in reestablishing this Potemkin presidency was to make sure that the Democratic Party's 1944 vice presidential candidate would not be Henry Wallace, a competent and capable representative of the basic philosophy of the New Deal who might well have been capable of continuing the full constitutional presidency which Roosevelt had been able to restore. Instead, the ruling class through various operatives demanded that Senator Harry Truman of Missouri occupy the second place on the Democratic ticket. Truman had been an artillery captain in World War I, had attempted to make a career of haberdashery, but had failed. Truman had been attached himself to the corrupt political machine of boss Tom Pendergast, which dominated Democratic party politics in Kansas City, Missouri. As a loyal cog in the corrupt Kansas City machine, just as Obama has been a loyal cog in the filthy Chicago party *apparat*, Truman soon found himself up to his neck in the then prevalent forms of graft and corruption. In 1925, thanks to boss Pendergast, Truman was elected as a county judge. In 1933, again with Pendergast's blessing, Truman was named Missouri's director for the Federal Re-Employment program, a sub-set of the Civil Works Administration (CWA), at the request of FDR's patronage boss Postmaster General James Farley as payback to Pendergast for delivering the Kansas City vote to Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1932 presidential election. Truman then became boss Pendergast's handpicked candidate for the US Senate in 1934. But in 1939, Pendergast was indicted for income tax evasion involving a bribe. Pendergast was released after serving 15 months in prison at the nearby United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, and died in 1945. Truman showed more loyalty towards boss Pendergast than Obama has shown towards Rezko and Wright: as Vice President, Truman attended Pendergast's funeral a few days after being sworn in, and just a few weeks before Truman succeeded Franklin D. Roosevelt as President.

It is safe to say that Truman always remained aware of the definite possibility that he too might be sent to the penitentiary at Leavenworth because of his participation in the same corrupt activities which had brought down his friend boss Pendergast. The ruling elite desired a president with a built-in detonator of this type: Truman, after all, was inheriting the presidency at the peak of its powers, bequeathed to him by FDR. What Wall Street oligarch could be sure under these circumstances that Truman would follow orders in the way that, say, Coolidge had? Accordingly it was necessary to deploy a sword of Damocles over Truman said in the form of a perpetually pending indictment in the Pendergast Kansas City corruption scandal. Naturally, the ruling elite had other means of manipulating little Harry. In foreign policy, he was dominated by the right-wing Democrat and anti-Roosevelt renegade Dean Acheson, and adept depth of one of the lesser Yale secret societies. Working closely with Acheson was soon W. Averell Harriman of Skull and Bones and the Brown Brothers Harriman investment bank in Wall Street, which also featured the presence of Prescott Bush, the grandfather of the current tenant of the White House. Acheson and Harriman successfully dominated Truman's options in the arena of world politics. In domestic policy, a committee of Wall Street operatives chaired by Clark Clifford, himself something of a Harriman man, was able to manipulate Truman in ways he was not even aware of, as Clifford has boasted in his memoirs. Generally, Truman's handlers were able to manipulate him most easily through his periodic rage fits, which gave the White House palace guard an opportunity to direct the puppet president's hatred against some target of their choosing. But beneath all this, and underpinning the entire edifice of control of the sitting president by forces above and behind the Oval Office, there always remained the specter that Truman could be indicted for some dirty

dealings connected to the Pendergast machine. Today's Republicans and other opponents of Obama would do well to realize that it is very unlikely that the Rezko case will spontaneously emerge as his central campaign issue in 2008, if this matter is left up to the wishes of the Wall Street elite. The Rezko-Auchi-Alsammarae Illinois Combine scandal can be made to explode, but it will not explode on its own. The strategy of the Wall Street faction is to elect Obama now and to use the Rezko affair as a means of guaranteeing his future obedience, even though he would be president during a world economic and financial depression of unprecedented severity, and would also be able to mobilize something closely resembling a fascist movement in the streets and on the Internet in support of his power.

CHAPTER VI: GRABBING A SENATE SEAT WITH A LITTLE HELP FROM HIS TRILATERAL FRIENDS

> The emerging oligarchy of the United States holds the vast majority of the American population in deep contempt, considering them as Okies, bubbas, ghetto-dwellers, white trash, wetbacks, Appalachians, crackers, red-necks, losers, marginals, rubes, and hicks. – Webster G. Tarpley, *Surviving the Cataclysm*, 1998.
>
> No matter his ultimate political fate, there is already enough pathos in Barack Obama to make him a cautionary tale. His public persona thrives on a manipulation of whites (bargaining), and his private sense of racial identity demands both self-betrayal and duplicity. His is the story of a man who flew so high, yet neglected to become himself. – Shelby Steele, March 18, 2008

As political candidates go, Obama is an intrinsically weak specimen. In this chapter we will further illustrate the two sides of the proposition that Obama has never in his life won public office through a genuinely contested and disputed election. Obama's preferred mode of taking office has been by having his patrons in the banking establishment mobilize their resources to destroy his opponents. We will see the truth of this basic tenet first in Obama's failed 2000 attempt to take away the seat of popular Southside Chicago Black congressmen Bobby Rush, who represented a real opponent capable of contesting an election, and thus defeated Obama by a wide margin. We will then see the other side of the proposition in the form of Obama's Senate race in the year 2004, when not one but two reasonably formidable opponents had to be destroyed by piloted scandals, and when a carpetbagger and buffoon had to be brought in from far away Maryland, all to make sure that Obama finally got into the Senate as the Trilaterals wanted. In the course of telling this story, we will comment on the hollow gesture represented by Obama's October 2002 speech concerning the Iraq war, which will be put into the necessary perspective by showing Obama's support for the Iraq war and rejection of impeachment as a remedy after he got to the Senate. Our story here takes on the character of a *Bildungsroman*, a novel of coming of age, or a rake's progress — in this case, the growth and advancement of one of the most ruthless, treacherous, and unprincipled political opportunists of our age, who is at the same time one of the most reckless of politicians in his personal life as well as in his devil- may-care attitude towards his own flip-flops.

2000: FAILED CHALLENGE TO CONGRESSMAN BOBBY RUSH

In 2000, Obama made an unsuccessful Democratic primary run for the U.S. House of Representatives seat held by four-term incumbent Bobby Rush. Obama radically overestimated his own chances of winning this election, and insisted on forging ahead despite advice to the contrary from some of his oligarchical sponsors, including Newton Minnow. In Obama's rash behavior in undertaking this long shot bid for the Congress, we can see the signs of the overweening pride and arrogance verging on megalomania which already characterized his mentality. The megalomania, as we will see, has grown over the years, and by the late summer of 2008 was reaching proportions worthy of the Emperor Nero.

Obama's failed bid for the Congress is also instructive because, since both major candidates were black, it removes the race issue from consideration, and can thus be used as a crucial experiment to show that Obama's fundamental weakness lies in his elitism and systematic oligarchical refusal to understand the situation of working families in the United States today. It also shows that Obama can be a very stubborn and headstrong subject:

> The rise of Barack Obama includes one glaring episode of political miscalculation. Even friends told Mr. Obama it was a bad idea when he decided in 1999 to challenge an incumbent congressman and former Black Panther, Bobby L. Rush, whose stronghold on the South Side of Chicago was overwhelmingly black, Democratic and working class. "Campaigns are always, 'What's the narrative of the race?'" said Eric Adelstein, a media consultant in Chicago who worked on the Rush campaign. "In a sense, it was 'the Black Panther against the professor.' That's not a knock on Obama; but to run from Hyde Park, this little bastion of academia, this white community in the black South Side — it just seemed odd that he would make that choice as a kind of stepping out." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

When the idea of challenging Congressman Bobby Rush first occurred to him, Obama made some calls to his backers. One was Newton Minow, who as chief of the Federal Communications Commission had coined the phrase "vast wasteland" to describe network television back during the Kennedy administration. But Minow was now far from the New Frontier, and had settled in as an official of the Sidley Austin law firm, the lawyers on retainer for Tom Ayers' Commonwealth Edison, where Bernardine Dohrn and Michelle Obama had worked, and where Barky met Michelle one summer. Not just Minow, but also his daughter, apparently worked as his case officers for the promising young property called Obama. Newton Minow was skeptical that Obama could win the race:

> Mr. Obama called Mr. Minow, his former boss, asking to see him. Mr. Obama was eyeing the Hyde Park Congressional seat held by Bobby L. Rush, a former Black Panther leader. "Are you nuts?" Mr. Minow recalled telling the younger man. "Barack, I think this is a mistake." Mr. Minow flipped through his Rolodex, calling black businesspeople and asking them if they would help finance Mr. Obama's bid. He said he received a uniform answer: "No — let him wait his turn." Nevertheless, the impatient Mr. Obama jumped into the race. Brimming with confidence, he equated Mr. Rush with "a politics that is rooted in the past" and cast himself as someone who could reach beyond the racial divide to get things done. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA BLINDED BY OVERWEENING AMBITION

As for Congressman Rush, he realized that he was dealing with an egomaniac at the very least:

> "He was blinded by his ambition," Mr. Rush said. "Obama has never suffered from a lack of believing that he can accomplish whatever it is he decides to try. Obama believes in Obama. And, frankly, that has its good side but it also has its negative side." Mr. Rush's district, the state's most Democratic, was 65 percent black. And in 1999, it included not only Hyde Park, home of the University of Chicago, but several relatively affluent Irish-American neighborhoods. (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

LATTE LIBERALS FOR OBAMA

The divide between Rush and Obama therefore occurred along class lines rather than according to any racial divide. The affluent and the elitists went for Obama, and the working families chose the alternative of Rush.

> There were plenty of college-educated, white, "latte liberals" with whom Mr. Obama polls well. But he was barely known outside his state Senate district, in the eastern part of Mr. Rush's district. To win, he would have to expand his support among blacks, including the older, church-going, Rush loyalists who vote disproportionately in primaries. "Taking on Bobby Rush among black voters is like running into a buzz saw," said Ron Lester, a pollster who worked for Mr. Obama. "This guy was incredibly popular. Not only that, his support ran deep — to the extent that a lot of people who liked Barack still wouldn't support him because they were committed to Bobby. He had built up this reserve of goodwill over 25 years in that community." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

Congressman Rush had a strong base in the community, but he had exhausted some of his resources by attempting to oust Mayor Daley from City Hall:

> Mr. Rush had grown up in Chicago, enlisted in the Army, joined the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and helped found the Illinois Black Panther Party in 1968. He coordinated a medical clinic that pioneered mass screening for sickle cell anemia, which disproportionately affects blacks. As an alderman in 1992, he had ousted a black political legend — Representative Charles A. Hayes, a veteran of the civil-rights and labor movements who was caught up in a scandal that year involving the House bank. In February 1999, Mr. Rush lost the mayoral primary to Mr. Daley, getting just 28 percent of the vote. Toni Preckwinkle, a city alderman, encouraged Mr. Obama to challenge Mr. Rush. … Mr. Shomon said he and Mr. Obama did an amateur poll to gauge his chances. They designed questions, recruited volunteers to telephone 300 people, and concluded that Mr. Rush was vulnerable. Mr. Shomon, who became Mr. Obama's campaign manager, said, "Obama will tell you that this poll was not the best poll in the world." Asked why, he said, "Because the results didn't turn out to be correct." State Senator Terry Link, a friend of Mr. Obama, said he advised him not to run. "He tried to justify it: He didn't feel Bobby was representing the area, he thought he could do a better job," Mr. Link recalled. "I think he misread it. He didn't analyze the strength of the congressman in that area, the will of the people." Mr. Obama, in a brief telephone interview, said, "In retrospect, there was very little chance of me winning that race. That was a good lesson — that you should never be too impressed with your own ideas if your name recognition in a Congressional district is only eight or whatever it was." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007),

It was not to be the last time that inaccurate polling shows up in an Obama campaign. Today, polls favoring Obama are deliberately and repeatedly fabricated.

DAVID AXELROD, HOPEMONGER

Obama's 2000 attempt to oust Rush is also the point in his career where he becomes permanently wedded to the sinister political consultant, David Axelrod. Axelrod, as we have seen, worked on political campaigns, and also dedicated much of his time to refuting charges of corruption against Mayor Daley and other members of the Combine. In Obama's tirades against Rush as a practitioner of the old politics, we can already hear the rhetorical notes which have resonated *ad nauseam* during Obama's 2008 campaign, and which are building towards a crescendo in Obama's match up with the geriatric Senator McCain.

> Obama…entered the race in late September, six months before the primary. He told voters that Mr. Rush represented "a politics that is rooted in the past, a reactive politics that isn't good at

> coming up with concrete solutions." He promised new leadership, reaching beyond the black community and leading coalitions to take on contemporary problems, cut crime, expand health care coverage, promote economic development and expand educational opportunities. But several weeks later, Mr. Lester's polling put Mr. Rush's approval rating at 70 percent and Mr. Obama's at 8 percent. Forty-seven percent of the people polled favored Mr. Rush, 10 percent favored Mr. Obama and 5 percent favored a third candidate, State Senator Donne E. Trotter, who is also black. Almost all of Mr. Obama's support initially came from whites, Mr. Lester said.' (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

Rush thus had some vulnerabilities, but he could also count on significant loyalty in the black neighborhoods. Part of the election result was also determined by the shooting of Rush's son in what appeared to be a random street crime.

> "Bobby Rush had not been the most active member of Congress from Illinois, but there was no issue that made him particularly vulnerable," [Obama ally Abner] Mikva said. "He hadn't robbed a bank or beaten his grandmother or things like that. In that respect, I was concerned." "Also," Mr. Mikva said, "I had seen reform candidates running against incumbents in African-American areas. It's hard. Reform is not the most compelling issue to people who don't have a job." Then in mid-October, Mr. Rush's 29-year-old son, Huey Rich, was shot on his way home from a grocery store. He hung between life and death for four days. Mr. Rush benefited from an outpouring of sympathy; the wake was studded with politicians and there were renewed calls for gun control, one of Mr. Rush's causes. "That incident seemed to wash away any bad feelings that voters had or might have had about Bobby Rush," said Chris Sautter, whose communications firm worked on the Obama campaign.' (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

OBAMA AWOL ON KEY GUN CONTROL VOTE: WAS MICHELLE RESPONSIBLE?

Obama also committed the fundamental political error of considering a family vacation more important than a vote in the state legislature on a key piece of gun control legislation, of which he had been one of the main backers. Here we may hear the strident voice of Michelle Obama demanding that she get her vacation, and gun control be damned:

> Later, Gov. George Ryan called the Legislature into special session to try to re-enact a package of gun-safety bills that the Illinois Supreme Court had overturned. Mr. Obama was voting consistently in favor of it. But the session dragged on toward Christmas and an annual trip to Hawaii to visit his grandmother, who had helped rear him. He had planned to return after the holiday when the session was to resume, Mr. Shomon said. But a crucial vote came up earlier than expected. With Mr. Obama and others absent, it failed by five votes. Mr. Obama, in particular, came under fire. In his defense, he said he had not flown back in time because his 18-month-old daughter was sick. But he was hammered by editorial writers, the governor and Mr. Rush. "We were thrown under the bus," Mr. Shomon said. "It was a terrible day of news coverage, since, A, we got blasted for not being there and, B, the perception was that Obama doesn't care about gun safety."

By this point, Obama was one chastened megalomaniac, as he tells us himself in his generally self-serving memoir:

> In his book "The Audacity of Hope," Mr. Obama wrote: "Less than halfway into the campaign, I knew in my bones that I was going to lose. Each morning from that point forward I awoke with a vague sense of dread, realizing that I would have to spend the day smiling and shaking hands and pretending that everything was going according to plan." Billboards in the district read: "I'm sticking with Bobby." A few black elected officials endorsed Mr. Obama but most fell in line behind the incumbent. Ministers closed ranks. The Rev. Michael Pfleger, pastor of the St. Sabina Catholic Church, said other ministers and congregation members called to complain when he endorsed Mr. Obama.' (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

Pfleger is the renegade priest whose hate-filled and sexist mockery of Senator Clinton became a scandal at the end of the primary season; Pfleger, we see, is a close friend of Obama and has been for a long time. If Pfleger had wanted to follow the black community, he would have gone with Rush. Instead, he went with Obama, the darling of the elite law firms, the foundations, and the University of Chicago. Pfleger renders much more to the foundations than he renders unto God, or even to his crackpot race theories.

CONGRESSMAN BOBBY RUSH: OBAMA AN "EDUCATED FOOL"

When the vote came in, Obama had 30.36 percent, and Representative Rush had 61.02 per cent. In 2000, just as in 2008, a deciding factor in the voting was Obama's pedantic and condescending professorial elitism and holier-than-thou demeanor, which gave the clear impression that he was concerned about oligarchical opinion, and not about the wishes of the constituencies in the congressional district he was asking to represent. This is a trait which, one thinks, will be with Obama as long as he lives.

> Mr. Obama's Ivy League education and his white liberal-establishment connections also became an issue. Mr. Rush told *The Chicago Reader*, "He went to Harvard and became an educated fool. We're not impressed with these folks with these Eastern elite degrees." Mr. Rush and his supporters faulted him for having missed experiences that more directly defined the previous generation of black people. "Barack is a person who read about the civil-rights protests and thinks he knows all about it," Mr. Rush told *The Reader*. Mr. Obama was seen as an intellectual, "not from us, not from the 'hood," said Jerry Morrison, a consultant on the Rush campaign. Asked recently about that line of attack, Mr. Rush minimized it as "chest beating, signifying." The implication was not exactly that Mr. Obama was "not black enough," as some blacks have suggested more recently; his credentials were suspect. "It was much more a function of class, not race," Mr. Adelstein said. "Nobody said he's 'not black enough.' They said he's a professor, a Harvard elite who lives in Hyde Park." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

In the 2000 contest, class was trump, along with the uneasy perception that Obama talked a good game in many fields in which he had never actually accomplished anything whatsoever.

Characteristically, Obama's strong suit was fund-raising. Given the extent of Obama's backing from top elitist law firms and financial interests, this is hardly a surprise. Obama was a pluto-candidate in 2000, and remains one to the present day. But, as the Obama machine discovered in places like Ohio and Pennsylvania in the spring of 2008, even outspending an opponent by three to one, four to one or even five to one will not produce victory if the candidate is viewed as an arrogant oligarchical elitist. In 2000,

> Mr. Obama proved unusually good at raising money. He raised more than $500,000 — less than Mr. Rush but impressive for a newcomer — tapping connections at the University of Chicago, Harvard Law School, law firms where he had worked, and a network of successful, black, Chicago-based entrepreneurs who have played an important role in subsequent campaigns. He was also catching on among whites in the district thanks to Thomas J. Dart, then a popular state representative who is now Cook County sheriff. But President Clinton's endorsement of Mr. Rush, an early supporter of Mr. Clinton, dealt a final blow. According to Mr. Adelstein, Mr. Clinton — after a personal request from Mr. Rush — overrode his own policy of not endorsing candidates in primaries. Mr. Rush won the primary with 61.02 percent of the vote; Mr. Obama had just over 30 percent. Mr. Obama was favored by whites but lost among blacks, Mr. Lester said. Looking back, some say the magnitude of the loss reflected Mr. Obama's failure to connect with black, working-class voters. Mr. Mikva said, "It indicated that he had not made his mark in the African-American community and didn't particularly have a style that resonated there." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

Clinton's endorsement for Congressman Rush may account for some of the bitter hatred towards the former president shown by Obama during the 2008 primary season. Obama, ever the megalomaniac, had apparently gotten it into his head that his work on Project Vote in 1992 had been decisive in delivering Illinois for Clinton in the 1992 presidential election. In 2000, Obama evidently thought that Clinton owed him, and that the endorsement of Congressman Rush was therefore a betrayal. Look for a President Obama to continue making emotional blunders of this sort because of his hyper-inflated sense of his own importance.

A DEBUT FOR OBAMA'S DEMAGOGY OF "HOPE"

It was apparently in this race that Obama made the empty abstraction of "hope" into the workhorse of his rhetorical arsenal. From a demagogic point of view, the multiple advantages of using such a vacuous construct should be immediately evident. By using hope as his main slogan, Obama was able to avoid specific commitments to concrete improvements in the living standards, working conditions, and public infrastructure of the people he was appealing to. Hope is green, and so is the chameleon most of the time. By talking about hope, Obama was able to skirt the issues of how any new programs would be paid for, a touchy topic that would always grate on the ears of greedy bankers who wanted to make sure that the bonded debt of the city of Chicago always came first, since these were the payments which were flowing into their own pockets. We should also note that the appeal to hope also presupposes very high levels of despair in the target community, which apparently was indeed the case. One Obama backer from 2000 recalled:

> "There was a gradual progression of Barack Obama from thoughtful, earnest policy wonk/civil rights lawyer/constitutional law expert to Barack Obama the politician, the inspirer, the speaker." Denny Jacobs, a friend of Mr. Obama and a former state senator, agreed. "He stumbled on the fact that instead of running on all the issues, quote unquote, that hope is the real key," he said. "Not only the black community but less privileged people are looking for that hope. You don't have to talk about health care, you have to talk about 'the promise' of health care. Hope is a pretty inclusive word. I think he is very good at selling that."' (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

"Hope for sale" might be the real motto of the Obama-Axelrod machine since 2000. For the sake of historical accounting, we should point out that the rhetorical promise to deal with the despair of the masses emerges as a distinct characteristic of the irrationalist totalitarian mass movements of the 1920s and 1930s in Europe.

After Obama had emerged victorious from a very peculiar U.S. Senate contest four years later, Congressman Rush, who had been backing an opponent of Obama who was destroyed by piloted scandals at just the right moment, commented bitterly that Barky had now become accustomed to winning without a fight:

> In March 2004, Mr. Obama won the Democratic primary for the United States Senate with nearly 53 percent of the vote, racking up huge totals in wards he had lost to Mr. Rush in 2000. (Mr. Rush, still stung by Mr. Obama's challenge to him, endorsed a white candidate in the race, Blair Hull, a former securities trader.) Mr. Obama won the general election with the biggest margin ever in an Illinois Senate race. "For what he's doing now, he didn't need to march against police brutality," Mr. Rush said, invoking his own record. "He didn't need to demonstrate against poor meat in substandard grocery stores. He didn't need that kind of stuff because obviously his audience was at a different level." (Janny Scott, "In 2000, a Streetwise Veteran Schooled a Bold Young Obama," *New York Times*, September 9, 2007)

OBAMA NETWORKS WITH THE ELITE

After his defeat by Congressman Rush, Obama concentrated on building networks that would assist him in the more grandiose projects that were now on his horizon. Having disregarded the advice of his mentor Newton Minnow, Obama now assiduously cultivated this hoary patriarch:

> Mr. Obama was comfortable attending performances of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra with city scions like Newton N. Minow, the father of Martha Minow. Mr. Minow, who had served in the Kennedy administration and managed the white-shoe law firm of Sidley Austin when Mr. Obama worked there after his first year of law school, began introducing him to Chicago's business titans. "He felt completely comfortable in Hyde Park," said Martha Minow, his former law professor and a mentor. "It's a place where you don't have to wear a label on your forehead. You can go to a bookstore and there's the homeless person and there's the professor." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA LAUDS TERRORIST AYERS' 1998 BOOK: "A SEARING AND TIMELY ACCOUNT"

Obama also drew closer to the unreconstructed Weatherman terrorist bomber Bill Ayers, the son of Thomas Ayers, the dean of the Chicago financier establishment. The cover story for this tandem between Obama and Ayers was, incredibly enough, educational and juvenile justice reform, in which Ayers now paraded himself as an expert:

> The two men were involved in efforts to reform the city's education system. They appeared together on academic panels, including one organized by Michelle Obama to discuss the juvenile justice system, an area of mutual concern. Mr. Ayers's book on the subject won a rave review in *The Chicago Tribune* by Mr. Obama, who called it "a searing and timely account." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA: TERRORIST AYERS IS "COURAGEOUS"

We thus have from this time a rare published endorsement of Ayers by Obama which appears to have been overlooked by many of the opposition researchers during the spring primary campaigns. Obama's encomium of Ayers came in a review of the terrorist bomber's book on juvenile justice, a review which was published just before Christmas in 1997: "As Bloomberg News reported recently, Obama and Ayers have crossed paths repeatedly in the last decade. In 1997, Obama cited Ayers' critique of the juvenile justice system in a *Chicago Tribune* article on what prominent Chicagoans were reading."[84] The title of Ayers' work is *A Kind and Just Parent: The Children of Juvenile Court* by William Ayers (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998). Obama's full comment was: "A searing and timely account of the juvenile court system, and the courageous individuals who rescue hope from despair." (*Chicago Tribune*, December 21, 1997) Even ten years ago, Barky was long on hope.[85] One can surmise that Ayers' chances of becoming secretary of education under a future Obama regime are higher than most observers would imagine.

Obama also pursued a relentless process of political networking:

> Mr. Obama cultivated clients like Bishop Arthur M. Brazier, the influential pastor of an 18,000-member black church and founding president of the Woodlawn Organization, which focuses on improving conditions for blacks in a neighborhood adjacent to Hyde Park. The two men began talking politics over tennis games at Chicago's elite East Bank Club, Mr. Brazier recalled. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Obama also solidified his relations with the foundation world, the ambient in which he feels most at ease.

> Mr. Obama further expanded his list of allies by joining the boards of two well-known charities: the Woods Fund and the Joyce Foundation. These memberships have allowed him to help direct tens of millions of dollars in grants over the years to groups that championed the environment, campaign finance reform, gun control and other causes supported by the liberal network he was cultivating. Mr. Brazier's group, the Woodlawn Organization, received money, for instance, as did antipoverty groups with ties to organized labor like Chicago Acorn, whose endorsement Mr. Obama sought and won in his State Senate race. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

The Acorn endorsement is proving to be of significant value for Obama down to the present day.

OBAMA SLIPPERY AND SHIFTY ON THE ISSUES

During this entire phase, Obama's positions on issues go beyond the simple flip-flop to confront us with a bewildering and shimmering kaleidoscope of variegated answers. The simple attempt to catalog Obama's positions on the issues would require a task force in its own right. The Roman god Proteus was famous for his ability to assume any shape he wanted, and Obama has inherited some of this gift. Around 2000, Obama claimed to be in favor of gun control and opposed to the death penalty, whereas in 2008 these views have been transmuted into their opposites by the alchemy of the Perfect Master:

> Today, Mr. Obama espouses more centrist views [on guns and the death penalty] and says a campaign aide had incorrectly characterized his views on those issues — a shift that does not sit well with some in the group, the Independent Voters of Illinois Independent Precinct

> Organization. "We certainly thought those were his positions," said David Igasaki, the group's chairman, who noted Mr. Obama had also interviewed with the group. "We understand that people change their views. But it sort of bothers me that he doesn't acknowledge that. He tries to say that was never his view."' (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Obama was able to impress allies and observers with his matchless flexibility and ductility when it came to compromise; this was all the easier for him because in the final analysis he had no principles at all.

> His willingness to negotiate — the interrogation law ended up with a host of exceptions — gained him a reputation as a pragmatist who could sell compromise as a victory to all sides, said Peter Baroni, then the legal counsel to the Republican caucus. "He took what came into the fray as a very leftist bill, a very leftist proposal, a very non-law-enforcement bill," Mr. Baroni said, "and he appeased law enforcement and brought everyone around to support it." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Obama has demonstrably always instinctively tended to the pro-austerity position demanded by the financiers and bankers who own him and who have fostered his career. This approach is clearly evident in Obama's claims about his sponsorship of welfare to work programs, in which he claims that he reduced the welfare rolls by 80% — meaning that many needy persons were simply jettisoned by the system to preserve loot needed by the Combine and its clients. In his early years, Obama would answer the pleas of his constituents for some practical benefit with a browbeating, pedantic lecture on the tightness of the budget and the need for budget austerity. Now, Obama became more cunning. He now preferred to co-opt demands for significant material improvements in the life of the black community by delivering patronage payments to those who made themselves spokespersons for such demands. Compared to real broad-based reform, the expense of this approach for the system was trifling. An example of this is Obama's transfer of something like a quarter of a million dollars of public funds to the renegade priest Father Pfleger, who could be counted on to suppress demands that might call into question the domination of Chicago by parasitical financiers.

> Before his loss to Mr. Rush, Mr. Obama's typical response for requests for state money would be a lecture, recalled Dan Shomon, a former Obama aide. "He would say something like: 'You know what, you're not going to get your money, and you know why? Let me explain the state budget,'" Mr. Shomon said. "Then he'd give a 20-minute treatise on how the Republicans wouldn't raise taxes, so there wasn't any money to do what they wanted to do." Now, Mr. Obama more eagerly met the demands for spending earmarks for churches and community groups in his district, said State Senator Donne E. Trotter, then the ranking Democrat on the Senate Appropriations Committee. "I know this firsthand, because the community groups in his district stopped coming to me," Mr. Trotter said. Typical of Mr. Obama's earmarks was a $100,000 grant for a youth center at a Catholic church run by the Rev. Michael Pfleger, a controversial priest who was one of the few South Side clergymen to back Mr. Obama against Mr. Rush. Father Pfleger has long worked with South Side political leaders to reduce crime and improve the community. But he has drawn fire from some quarters for defending the Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan and inviting him to speak at his church. Father Pfleger, who did not return calls for comment, is one of the religious leaders whose "faith testimonials" Mr. Obama has posted on his presidential campaign Web site. David Axelrod, the chief strategist for

> the Obama presidential campaign, said that Father Pfleger was "remaking the face" of Chicago's South Side and that all of Mr. Obama's earmarks went to worthy programs like his. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA'S BID FOR THE US SENATE

With Republican Senator Peter Fitzgerald not getting along with the bosses of the Combine, Obama it now sensed that the main chance might be in the offing:

> With his black base more secure, Mr. Obama began in 2002 to contemplate a run for the United States Senate. "I had lunch with him at the Quadrangle Club, and we were discussing the different bases he had to touch. I said, 'You have to talk to the Jackson boys first,'" Mr. Mikva recalled, referring to Representative Jackson and his father, the Rev. Jesse Jackson. "Because Jesse Jackson Jr. had his eye on that seat. He said, 'I know. I'm working on that.'" Mr. Obama soon sat down with the younger Mr. Jackson at the 312 Chicago restaurant. Michelle Obama had attended high school with Mr. Jackson's sister and been close to the family for years, and the congressman had attended the Obamas' wedding. "He said, 'Jesse, if you're running for the U.S. Senate I'm not going to run,'" Mr. Jackson recalled. Mr. Jackson had already decided against it, and he gave Mr. Obama his blessing. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

With the Jesse Jackson machine neutralized, Obama had removed one significant obstacle on his way to the world's most exclusive club.

THE PHANTOM ANTI-WAR SPEECH OF OCTOBER 2002

Obama's October 2002 speech in downtown Chicago opposing the notion of a US attack on Iraq furnished the only concrete reason many of his followers could cite to justify his bid to take the presidency. Unfortunately, this speech is as hard to pin down as ectoplasm. Obama's antiwar speech is like the Dao of the old Chinese mystic Lao-Tse: it is everywhere and nowhere at the same time. There is no film of the speech. There is no audio recording. There is no authoritative text. The version of the speech that some people believe they have seen is in fact a reenactment which we can safely assume has been embellished and enhanced to a fare thee well.[86] Naturally, it was better to be against the Iraq war in October 2002 than it was to be in favor of it. But unfortunately for Obama, his claim is much broader: he claims that he has consistently opposed the Iraq war from October 2002 until the present. This is simply a big lie. Obama has gone through any number of opportunistic transmogrifications in his Iraq position, as in his other positions on virtually every issue. Most glaring in this context has been his hyper-aggressive proposals to bomb Iran, and more recently Pakistan.

As for Obama's much touted openness to the Arab world, even in his dubious allies from the Chicago Arab community have at length realized that this was a purely opportunistic pose sure to be jettisoned when expediency dictated:

> "He has a pattern of forming relationships with various communities and as he takes his next step up, kind of distancing himself from them and then positioning himself as the bridge," said Ali Abunimah, a Palestinian-American author and co-founder of the online publication *Electronic Intifada*, who became acquainted with Mr. Obama in Chicago. (Jo Becker and

Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008)

Even the fabled October 2002 Chicago antiwar speech came equipped with a series of escape hatches and emergency exits which the candidate could use to climb back on the warmonger bandwagon if that seemed to be politic:

> Even moments that supporters see as his boldest are tempered by his political caution. The forceful speech he delivered in 2002 against the impending Iraq invasion — a speech that has helped define him nationally — was threaded with an unusual mantra for a 1960s-style antiwar rally: "I'm not opposed to all wars." It was a refrain Mr. Obama had tested on his political advisers, and it was a display of his ability to speak to the audience before him while keeping in mind the broader audience to come. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008)

AN SDS PRODUCTION STARRING CRYPTO-WEATHERMAN OBAMA

We have seen in a previous chapter that Obama's speech against the Iraq war was in fact an opportunity delivered to him by his friends among the SDS veterans who seem to flock to his support at every critical juncture, as if by Trilateral magic. A key figure in organizing this performance was

> Marilyn Katz, who gave him entry into another activist network: the foot soldiers of the white student and black power movements that helped define Chicago in the 1960s. As a leader of Students for a Democratic Society then, Ms. Katz organized Vietnam War protests, throwing nails in the street to thwart the police. But like many from that era, Ms. Katz had gone on to become a politically active member of the Chicago establishment, playing in a regular poker game with Mr. Miner while working as a consultant to his nemesis, Mayor Daley. "For better or worse, this is Chicago," said Ms. Katz, who has held fund-raisers for Mr. Obama at her home. "Everyone is connected to everyone." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

COURTESY OF AN OLD CARTER NETWORK

Obama's antiwar speech, however, could hardly have taken place without crucial input from the limousine liberals of Chicago's Lakeshore Drive, North of the loop.

> Betty Lu Saltzman, a Democratic *doyenne* from Chicago's lakefront liberal crowd, convened a small group of activists, including Ms. Katz, in her living room to organize a rally to protest the United States' impending invasion of Iraq. It was late September 2002, and Mr. Obama was on the top of Ms. Saltzman's list of desired speakers. She first met him when he ran the black voter registration drive in the 1992 election, and was so impressed that she immediately took him under her wing, introducing him to wealthy donors and talking him up to friends like Mr. Axelrod. But with just a few days to go before the rally, Ms. Saltzman was having trouble reaching Mr. Obama. Finally, she said she left word with his wife. But before Mr. Obama called her back, he dialed up some advice. With his possible run for the United States Senate, he wanted to speak with Mr. Axelrod and others about the ramifications of broadcasting his reservations about a war the public was fast getting behind. An antiwar speech would play to his Chicago liberal base, and could help him in what was expected to be a hotly contested primary, they told him, but it also could hurt him in the general election. "This was a call to

> assess just how risky was this," said Pete Giangreco, who along with Mr. Axelrod described the conversation. When Mr. Obama tossed out the idea of calling it a "dumb war," Mr. Giangreco said he cringed. "I remember thinking, 'this puts us in the weak defense category, doesn't it?' (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Betty Lu Salzman is the daughter of Philip Klutznick, who was Secretary of Commerce in the final years of the Jimmy Carter regime. So it was evidently an old Carter network that gave the anointed one his golden opportunity to go on record against Bush's war.

A number of Obama critics have rightly stressed the pervasive role of Obama's old SDS networks in setting up this legendary rally. Steve Diamond, for example, writes: "…do not forget, the Anti-war speech Obama gave in 2002, was organized by former terrorists of the SDS days, Carl Davidson, Marylyn Katz and others!" And:

> As it turns out, there are other ex-SDS types around the Obama campaign as well, including Marilyn Katz, a public relations professional, who was head of security for the SDS during the disaster in the streets of Chicago in 1968. She is close (politically) to Carl Davidson, a former vice president of SDS and longtime Fidelista, who is webmaster for a group called Progressives for Obama, that is headlined by other former 60s radicals like Tom Hayden and the maoist Bill Fletcher. Davidson and Katz were key organizers of the 2002 anti-war demonstration where Obama made public his opposition to the Iraq war that has been so critical to his successful presidential campaign. Davidson apparently moved into the maoist movements of the 70s after the disintegration of SDS.' (Steve Diamond, 'Who "sent" Obama?' globallabor.blogspot.com, April 22, 2008)

Obama spoke before an undetermined number of persons, with aging SDS radicals from the Ayers-Dohrn era setting the cultural tone. The following account is from the *New York Times*, and must therefore be regarded with a dose of skepticism:

> The rally was held on Oct. 2, 2002, in Federal Plaza before nearly 2,000 people.[87] On the podium before speaking, Mr. Obama joked about the dated nature of crowd-pleasing protest songs like "Give Peace a Chance." "Can't they play something else? " Ms. Saltzman recalled his saying. The speech, friends say, was vintage Obama, a bold but nuanced message that has become the touchstone of his presidential campaign: While he said the Iraq war would lead to "an occupation of undetermined length with undetermined costs and undetermined consequences," he was also careful to emphasize that there were times when military intervention was necessary. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Obama's careful hedging could not have been more evident, and this hint of duplicity was not popular with the assembled crowd:

> Obama's refrain about supporting some wars perplexed some in the crowd. An event organizer, Carl Davidson, recalled that a friend "nudged me and said, 'Who does he think this speech is for? It's not for this crowd.' I thought, 'This guy's got bigger fish to fry.' At the time, though, I was only thinking about the U.S. Senate." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA PATRON JAMES CROWN OF GENERAL DYNAMICS AND J.P. MORGAN

Obama now began to receive more open support from the highest levels of the US ruling elite. It will be recalled that Thomas Ayers had been a member of the board of directors of General Dynamics. With the elder Ayers now ailing, Obama began to receive support from another member of the General Dynamics board, the Chicago tycoon James Crown. James Crown is a close relative of the late Colonel Henry Crown, who had become the majority stockholder in General Dynamics back in 1959. Crown, currently one of Obama's main backers, began giving the neophyte politician advice:

> As Mr. Obama moved closer to running, he paid a visit to James S. Crown and his father, Lester, billionaire investors who presided over a sprawling Chicago business dynasty and prominent leaders in the Jewish community. As the meeting ended, the younger Mr. Crown said, his father — who is "fairly hawkish" about Israel's security — was noncommittal about Mr. Obama. But, James Crown said, "I pulled him down to my office, and I said, 'Hey, look, I think you should run, and I want you to win.' (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

OBAMA A PUPPET OF GENERAL DYNAMICS, MERCHANTS OF DEATH

The Crown family were a pillar of the US industrial-military-financier complex. As we read in the open-source literature,

> James S. Crown is … is president of Henry Crown and Company, a private investment company. He is a director of J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., General Dynamics and Sara Lee as well as being the Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the University of Chicago. A member of Chicago's Crown family, James' father is billionaire Lester Crown. He earned his BA from Hampshire College in 1976 and his law degree from Stanford in 1980. It is believed his family holds ownership in the following companies: CC Industries, Inc.; General Dynamics Corp. (Resources Group); Material Service Corp.; Freeman United Coal Mining Co.; Freeman Energy Corp.; Century-America LLC; Century Steel LLC; Tishman Speyer Crown Equities; Industrial Insurance Agency, Inc.; Aspen Skiing Co. (Colorado); Citation Oil & Gas Corp.; Crown Theatres, LP; Chicago Sweeteners, Inc.; Eltek, ASA; Great Dane Trailers L.P.; Van Vlissingen & Co.; V & V Food Products, Inc.; Lakewood Homes, Inc.; Lennar Chicago; Crown Golf Properties; Wireless One Network; Active Screw & Fastener, L.P.; Plasco, Inc.; Crown Community Development; Ojai Resort Management (California); Bush Hog, LLC; Woodard, LLC.[88]

The lesson is clear: Obama is anything but an insurgent; he is the carefully tended puppet of the highest levels of finance capital and the military-industrial complex. Watch for General Dynamics (currently the sixth largest defense contractor in the world) to take the inside track in Pentagon contracts under a future Obama regime! Maybe Obama will decide that the US needs more nuclear submarines, since that is the specialty of General Dynamics' Electric Boat division.

THE CORRUPTION CROWN: A SWEETHEART MORTGAGE FOR THE OBAMAS

At the end of June 2008, a scandal emerged around the fact that Democratic senators had been receiving sweetheart mortgages with extraordinarily low interest rates from lenders like the

infamous Angelo Mozillo of Countrywide bank. The first two Democratic senators involved were Kent Conrad of North Dakota and Chris Dodd of Connecticut both of whom attempted to weasel out of the charges. But then, at the beginning of July, it was revealed that the divine Barky had also received a sweetheart mortgage when he bought the ostentatious mansion that his friend, convicted felon Tony Rezko, had helped him to acquire. The *Washington Post* reported:

> Shortly after joining the U.S. Senate and while enjoying a surge in income, Barack Obama bought a $1.65 million restored Georgian mansion in an upscale Chicago neighborhood. To finance the purchase, he secured a $1.32 million loan from Northern Trust in Illinois. The freshman Democratic senator received a discount. He locked in an interest rate of 5.625 percent on the 30-year fixed-rate mortgage, below the average for such loans at the time in Chicago. The loan was unusually large, known in banker lingo as a "super super jumbo." Obama paid no origination fee or discount points, as some consumers do to reduce their interest rates. Compared with the average terms offered at the time in Chicago, Obama's rate could have saved him more than $300 per month.' Michelle and Barky had succumbed to the insatiable greed which is typical of the parvenu in all places and in all ages, and does not vary according to whether the oligarch in question is white, black, or some other color. The tastes of the man of the people were revealed to be sybaritic: 'The couple wanted to step up from their $415,000 condo. They chose a house with six bedrooms, four fireplaces, a four-car garage and 5 1/2 baths, including a double steam shower and a marble powder room. It had a wine cellar, a music room, a library, a solarium, beveled glass doors and a granite-floored kitchen.' (Joe Stephens, "Obama Got Discount on Home Loan; Campaign Defends Lower Rate as Lender Competition for Business," Washington Post, July 2, 2008)

The question was now whether Northern Trust had given Obama the sweetheart rate because of his honest face, or in the hope of building up chits that could be used to influence legislation later on. A glance at the Board of Directors of Northern trust revealed the presence of none other than Susan Crown, a close associate of her relative James Crown, whom we have already identified as one of Obama's most important backers and controllers. Susan Crown is the vice president of the Crown family counting house, Henry Crown and Company, and has served on the Board of Directors of Northern Trust since 1997. Susan Crown is an important oligarch in her own right: she is also a trustee of Yale University.

OBAMA SELLS OUT MAYTAG WORKERS

The parasitical Crown family has played a major role in the demontage of the Maytag Corp., which was once one of the biggest appliance makers in the United States. To make the sweetheart mortgage scandal even more outrageous, we must remember that Obama lent the Crown family in the person of Lester Crown a helping hand by co-opting the protest of threatened Maytag workers into his 2004 senate campaign, and, once he had their support, selling them down the river. This particular stab in the back developed as follows:

> Crown family members have been major donors to Obama's campaigns, and serve on his elite fundraisers group for his presidential campaign. Among the most disturbing stories of Obama's many efforts to give political and legislative advantages to the Crown family's holdings, Senate candidate Barack Obama promised Illinois' Maytag workers he'd work to protect their jobs — and took campaign donations from the beleaguered workers — but then met with Lester Crown, on the board of directors of Maytag, to take his campaign donations. Crown later told the press that Obama never raised the workers' fate with him. The machinists lost their jobs to Maytag's

> Mexican plant. From [the] story, "Machinists' Union TELLS It Like It Is," quoting a must-read article at TradingMarkets.com, "Obama's fundraising, rhetoric collide: Union says senator did little to save jobs." Obama had a special connection to Maytag: Lester Crown, one of the company's directors and biggest investors whose family, records show, has raised tens of thousands of dollars for Obama's campaigns since 2003. But Crown says Obama never raised the fate of the Galesburg plant with him. These are the ties that bind: The billionaire industrialist Crown family's board memberships with Exelon Corporation, Maytag Corporation, and Northern Trust [and their close ties to] Barack Obama. Barack Obama plays the "populist" routine in his campaign speeches, but he delivers to his billionaire benefactors, not the common working stiffs who are losing their jobs and their homes. (susanunpc, noquarterusa.net, July 2, 2008)[89]

OBAMA'S LIMITLESS HYPOCRISY

Back in February 2008, susanunpc had called attention to Obama's scandalous hypocrisy, which had become an issue on the campaign trail, writing:

> Machinists Union President Tom Buffenbarger, introducing Clinton, talks about Maytag. He talks about the betrayal by Barack Obama, who only gave those Maytag workers a speech. WORDS. Baloney. But then Obama collected huge sums from the Crown family of Chicago, owners of Maytag who shipped those workers' jobs out of the country.[90] The *Chicago Tribune* commented:
>
> It is a ready applause line for the Illinois presidential hopeful, one that he has been reciting almost verbatim since he was a candidate for U.S. Senate in 2004, when appliance giant Maytag was in the process of shutting a refrigerator plant here, putting 1,600 people out of work. But the union that represented most of those Galesburg workers isn't impressed with Obama's advocacy and has endorsed his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton. Its leaders say they wish he had done more about their members' plight. What rankles some is what Obama did not do even as he expressed solidarity four years ago with workers mounting a desperate fight to save their jobs. Obama had a special connection to Maytag: Lester Crown, one of the company's directors and biggest investors whose family, records show, has raised tens of thousands of dollars for Obama's campaigns since 2003. But Crown says Obama never raised the fate of the Galesburg plant with him, and the billionaire industrialist insists any jawboning would have been futile.'[91]

OBAMA'S LEFT FLANK: ABUNIMAH, KHALIDI, AND RABBI WOLF

But at the same time that he was courting high finance and the military-industrial complex, Obama was also at tentative to his left flank, and particularly to the interface between the US intelligence community (to which Obama belongs under Executive Order 12333 thanks to his foundation connections) and certain factions of the PLO:

> For years, the Obamas had been regular dinner guests at the Hyde Park home of Rashid Khalidi, a Middle East scholar at the University of Chicago and an adviser to the Palestinian delegation to the 1990s peace talks. Mr. Khalidi said the talk would often turn to the Middle East, and he talked with Mr. Obama about issues like living conditions in the occupied territories. In 2000, the Khalidis held a fund-raiser for Mr. Obama during his Congressional campaign. Both Mr. Khalidi and Mr. Abunimah, of the Electronic Intifada, said Mr. Obama had spoken at the fund-raiser and had called for the United States to adopt a more "evenhanded approach" to the

> Palestinian-Israel conflict. Still, Mr. Khalidi said ascertaining Mr. Obama's precise position was often difficult. "You may come away thinking, 'Wow, he agrees with me,'" he said. "But later, when you get home and think about it, you are not sure." A.J. Wolf, a Hyde Park rabbi who is a friend of Mr. Obama's and has often invited Mr. Khalidi to speak at his synagogue, said Mr. Obama had disappointed him by not being more assertive about the need for both Israel and the Palestinians to move toward peace. "He's played all those notes right for the Israel lobby," said Mr. Wolf, who is sometimes critical of Israel. … Mr. Abunimah has written of running into the candidate around that time and has said that Mr. Obama told him: "I'm sorry I haven't said more about Palestine right now, but we are in a tough primary race. I'm hoping that when things calm down I can be more upfront." The Obama camp has denied Mr. Abunimah's account. Mr. Khalidi, who is now the director of the Middle East Institute at Columbia University, said, "I'm unhappy about the positions he's taken, but I can't say I'm terribly disappointed." He added: "People think he's a saint. He's not. He's a politician." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

BARUCH OBAMA, GENERAL DYNAMICS, AND RIGHT-WING JEWS

James Crown is reportedly very pleased with how Obama has handled himself since entering the US Senate; Crown's investment has paid off in spades:

> Mr. Crown, for his part, could not be more pleased. Since Mr. Obama was elected to the Senate Mr. Crown said that even his father had been won over, helping to arrange meetings for Mr. Obama in a visit to Israel. James Crown said he had "never had even the slightest glimmer of concern that Barack wasn't terrific" on Israel — a view that Mr. Obama jokingly reinforced at a meeting last year in Mr. Crown's office. As Mr. Mikva recounted it, after discussing a lukewarm response by more conservative Jews to some of Mr. Obama's comments, "I turned to Barack and said, 'Your name could be Chaim Weizmann, the founder of the Jewish state, and some of these Jewish Republicans wouldn't vote for you.'" And, Mr. Mikva said, "He joked, 'Well, you know my name is "Baruch" Obama.' (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

As he strove upwards, Obama jettisoned more and more of the trappings of a reform or anti-corruption Democrat and cultivated assiduously his ties to the notorious Chicago Democratic machine:

> …as Mr. Obama ascended to the larger stage, he also took the final step in his evolution from Hyde Park independent to mainstream Chicago politician, establishing an overt alliance with Mr. Daley. "Over the years, Senator Obama and I have been like-minded in most of the issues facing Chicago," the mayor said in a statement. His former chief of staff, Gary Chico, said the mayor's alliance with the senator was "based on mutual interest and what the mayor saw in the man. They're both pragmatic." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

The shared pragmatism was clearly of the Nietzschean variety, the antinomian kind that says that everything is allowed.

Each one of these maneuvers, expedient though it were in its own right, left behind some disillusioned reformers and good government types who began to see through Obama's opportunism.

> … Mr. Obama's closer relationship with the mayor, coupled with some of his endorsements of Democrats who championed the kind of patronage politics Mr. Obama had once denounced, left some supporters feeling as though he was straying from his roots in the reform movement. Last year, Mr. Mikva said he took Mr. Obama aside to complain about his endorsement of an alderwoman [almost certainly the infamous racist Dorothy Tillman, whom the *Chicago Sun-Times* describes as using historical involvement in slavery by companies and others to extort payments to herself and her allies] who had supported Mr. Obama in his United States Senate run and was the focus of newspaper reports about questionable spending on a $19.5 million cultural center. Mr. Mikva said Mr. Obama's response was simple: "Sometimes you pay your debts." Early last year, Mr. Obama endorsed Mr. Daley in his re-election bid, asserting that Chicago had blossomed during his tenure. Mr. Miner, the mentor who had brought Mr. Obama into his law firm in the early 1990s, said he remained an enthusiastic Obama supporter. But, when it comes to some of Mr. Obama's endorsements, "I don't know who he's listening to." (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

ACORN: FOUNDATION-FUNDED STORM TROOPERS

Another foundation-funded organization that strongly supports Obama is ACORN, a group which uses real issues like poverty and low wages as pretexts to create gangs of goons and thugs which are used to target entities various entities to which the foundations are hostile. ACORN is reportedly heavily funded by such entities as the Woods Fund and the Joyce Foundation, two left-leaning tentacles of the foundation world where Obama has personally served as a board member. For many decades, as we have seen, the foundations have used the race issue as the hinge of a divide-and-conquer strategy designed to – preserve the supremacy of Wall Street financiers in this society. Now, as the economic depression deepens, it is clear that the foundations have deployed ACORN as a means of seizing control of social ferment around issues like unemployment, low wages, poor working conditions, and the like among a broader population, and one not limited by race. ACORN resembles the old KPD, the communist party of Weimar Germany, which organized unemployed workers into goon squads and street-fighting units. It also bears more than a passing resemblance to Bob Avakian's provocateur organization, the Maoist Revolutionary Communist Party. ACORN has been specifically responsible for vote fraud actions, and is deeply implicated in the goon squad operations that were such a prominent feature of Obama's exclusion and intimidation tactics during the 2008 caucuses. Right-wing critics of Obama have a hard time understanding ACORN, since they cannot realize the validity and mass appeal of themes like a living wage, the fight against predatory lending, and restoring the social safety net provided by the Aid to Families with Dependent Children or general welfare provisions of Franklin D. Roosevelt's great Social Security Act of 1935. The reality is that, with the Democratic Party failing to act on these vital questions, the field is open for their demagogic exploitation by foundation-funded gangs like ACORN who will bring growing numbers of the poor and the jobless into action as expendable shock troops and pawns under the control of ruthless demagogues loyal to the financier ruling class.

One observer comments on ACORN:

> Obama's most questionable tie is to a leftist organization called ACORN. His connection to this group begins with a woman named Madeleine Talbot. She embraced Obama and taught him the ropes. He remained a part of this group's training cadre. Obama taught leadership conferences for the group while working for Miner, Barnhill & Galland. His connections don't end there. Obama actively sought and received the endorsement by ACORN for the US presidency….

> According to its web site ACORN (an acronym for Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now), is the nation's largest community organization of low- and moderate-income families, working together for social justice and stronger communities. At first glance, this organization seems to be benign. This is not true since it uses very aggressive tactics to get its work done. … Some recent reports about their activities include the following things. They have disrupted and blocked activities within the Chicago City Council during living wage discussions. In Baltimore, MD, they burst into the scene of a private law dinner. They bussed four loads of protesters to the site of a mayor's house, where they spewed profanities at the mayor and his family. And these are just the ones we know about. … These are not their only questionable actions. In the past they have been tied to illegal voter registration in at least three states. These three states are Washington, Missouri, and North Carolina. … In Missouri, the voter fraud case was tied to at least one campaign, the senate campaign of Claire McCaskill…. In 2004, the Washington state Secretary of State described ACORN's illegal activity as the "largest case of voter fraud in the state's history"…. They were fined $25,000 and promised to instruct their paid canvassers on the state election requirements. In 2005, according to the complaint filed with Mecklenberg County, North Carolina, the voter fraud involved the registration of homeless people. ACORN agrees they break the law but said "no one told us". In 2006, in Kansas City, MO, five low-level operatives were charged with voter fraud. Four pleaded guilty, with the fifth person released because it came out that an ACORN worker had stolen her identity. … Their national goals are municipal "living" wage laws, targeting big companies like Costco, rolling back welfare reform, and regulating banks.

If ACORN attacks COSTCO, does that mean they are paid by Wal-Mart? But the heart of the matter is this:

> ACORN as well as other groups was the recipients of foundation money from both the Woods Fund and Joyce Foundation. Why is this important? Obama sat on both boards. Through his board positions, he was able to assist in the funneling of many millions of dollars in grant money to various ultra-liberal organizations like Chicago's ACORN.[92]

Despite what right-wingers may think, the real danger posed by ACORN is that of fascism, not communism. If actual assault sections appear on the streets of America, ACORN may well be prominently involved. Only broad-based New Deal economic policies can pull the rug out from under demagogues like these by neutralizing the problems they exploit to recruit useful idiots for the ruling elite.

THE *BLACK AGENDA REPORT* EXPOSES OBAMA

One of Obama's sharpest critics over the past several years has been the distinguished black journalist Glenn Ford, a writer of real integrity who has earned the high regard of readers of the *Black Commentator*, and now of the *Black Agenda Report*. Ford's work on Obama allows us to view the senator through the eyes of a black activist who over the years has fought consistently for the real interests of the black community in the broadest sense, as distinct from the personal ambitions of individual members of the black overclass. As a result, Ford has been very tough on the members of the Congressional Black Caucus in particular. Ford tells the fascinating story of how he first began to notice Obama's tendency towards opportunism, specifically on the question of Obama's early support from the Democratic Leadership Council, the notorious nest of right-wing Democrats who were always determined to appease the Republicans in every way possible, no matter what the cost:

Although close friends and confidants had been talking up a run for national office since the early 1990s, Barack Obama in 2003 was still an Illinois state senator running in the Democratic primary for the U.S. Senate. This reporter, a longtime and former Chicago community and political organizer, had worked with Obama in 1992's highly successful Project VOTE Illinois registration drive. After moving to Georgia in 2000, I managed to keep in touch with events at home, and was well aware of Obama's run for the US Senate. While researching a story on the Democratic Leadership Council for the internet magazine *Black Commentator* in April and May of 2003, I ran across the DLC's "100 to Watch" list for 2003, in which Barack Obama was prominently featured as one of the DLC's favorite "rising stars." This was ominous news because the DLC was and still is the right wing's Trojan Horse inside the Democratic party. The DLC exists to guarantee that wealthy individuals and corporations who make large campaign donations have more say in the Democratic Party than do flesh and blood Democratic voters. The DLC achieves this by closely examining and questioning the records, the policy stands and the persons of officeholders and candidates to ensure that they are safe and worthy recipients of elite largesse. The DLC also supplies them with right-wing policy advisers beholden to those same interests, and hooks up approved candidates with the big money donors. Then as now, the DLC favors bigger military budgets and more imperial wars, wholesale privatization of government functions including social security, and in so-called "free trade" agreements like NAFTA which are actually investor rights agreements. Evidently, the giant insurance companies, the airlines, oil companies, Wall Street, military contractors and others had closely examined and vetted Barack Obama and found him pleasing. (Glenn Ford, "How We Held Obama's Feet to the Fire in 2003," *The Black Agenda Report*)

OBAMA "THE WAR HO" – "A LIAR OF THE FIRST ORDER" – "WE MUST REJECT HIM"

In a later article, Ford elaborated: 'The Senator from Illinois masquerades as a "peace candidate" – and then proposes the Americans invade Pakistan, the only Muslim nation that has The Bomb. … Obama wants to invade Pakistan, the most dangerous place in the world. Obama wants to add almost one-hundred thousand new troops to the U.S. military.' Ford went on to quote a recent speech by Obama: '"My plan would maintain sufficient forces in the region to target al Qaeda within Iraq," Obama told the fat cats at the Woodrow Wilson Center. In other words, he is not about to get out of Iraq. Barack Obama is a liar of the first order. Obama masks himself as a peace candidate, but he is really a son of war. He carries the "White Man's Burden," proudly. He will carry us into a suicidal conflict, with relish. We must reject him.' (Glenn Ford, "Barack Obama Ain't Nothin' But a War Ho'," *Black Agenda Report*)[93]

Glenn Ford proceeded to demolish the Obama mystique in a systematic refutation:

The 2008 Obama presidential run may be the most slickly orchestrated marketing machine in memory. That's not a good thing. Marketing is not even distantly related to democracy or civic empowerment. Marketing is about creating emotional, even irrational bonds between your product and your target audience. From its Bloody Sunday 2007 proclamation that Obama was the second coming of Joshua to its nationally televised kickoff at Abe Lincoln's tomb to the tens of millions of dollars in breathless free media coverage lavished on it by the establishment media, the campaign's deft manipulation of hopeful themes and emotionally potent symbols has led many to impute their own cherished views to Obama, whether he endorses them or not. To cite the most obvious example, the Obama campaign cynically bills itself as "the movement",

the continuation and fulfillment of Dr. King's legacy. But the speeches of its candidate carefully limit the application of all his troop withdrawal statements to "combat troops" and "combat brigades," omitting the six figure number of armed mercenary contractors in Iraq, along with "training," "counterinsurgency" and other kinds of troops. Obama also presses for an expansion of the US Army and Marines by more than 100,000 troops and a larger military budget even than the Bush regime. The fact that both these stands fly in the face of the legacy of Martin Luther King, and flatly contradict the wishes of most Democratic voters is utterly invisible in the establishment media, and in the discourse of established Black leaders on the Obama campaign. The average voter is ill-equipped to read Obama's statements on these and other issues as closely as one might read a predatory loan application or a jacked up insurance policy, trying to determine exactly what is covered. As we pointed out back in December: The Obama campaign is heavy on symbolism, and long on vague catch phrases like "new leadership," "new ideas," "a politics of hope," and "let's dream America again" calculated to appeal to millions of disaffected Americans without actually meaning much of anything. Corporate media actively bill Obama as "the candidate of hope," and anointed representative of the "Joshua generation." There are good reasons campaign placards at Obama rallies say "change we can believe in" instead of "stop the war - vote Obama" or "repeal NAFTA - Barack in '08." The first set of messages are hopeful and vague. The second are popular demands among the voters Obama needs, against which his past, present and future performance may be checked. When the comparison is made, the results are dismaying to many who want to support Barack Obama.[94]

2003: OBAMA DEEP SIXES HIS OWN 2002 ANTI-WAR SPEECH

As part of his research into Obama, Glenn Ford looked at the senator's website and found that Obama had gone silent on any opposition to the Iraq war, which at this point in 2003 seem to have been decisively won. Ford tells us that he

revisited Obama's primary election campaign web site, something I had not done for a month or two. To my dismay I found the 2002 antiwar speech, the same one which Barack Obama touts to this day as evidence of his antiwar backbone and prescience, which had been prominently featured before, had vanished from his web site, along with all other evidence that Obama had ever taken a plain-spoken stand against the invasion and occupation of Iraq. With the president riding high in the polls, and Illinois' Black and antiwar vote safely in his pocket, Obama appeared to be running away from his opposition to the war, and from the Democratic party's base. Free, at last. After calls to Obama's campaign office yielded no satisfactory answers, we published an article in the June 5, 2003 issue of *Black Commentator* effectively calling Barack Obama out. We drew attention to the disappearance of any indication that U.S. Senate candidate Obama opposed the Iraq war at all from his web site and public statements. We noted with consternation that the Democratic Leadership Council, the right-wing Trojan Horse inside the Democratic party, had apparently vetted and approved Obama, naming him as one of its "100 to Watch" that season. This is what real journalists are supposed to do - fact check candidates, investigate the facts, tell the truth to audiences and hold the little clay feet of politicians and corporations to the fire. Facing the possible erosion of his base among progressive Democrats in Illinois, Obama contacted us. We printed his response in Black Commentator's June 19 issue and queried the candidate on three "bright line" issues that clearly distinguish between corporate-funded DLC Democrats and authentic progressives. We concluded the dialog by printing Obama's response on June 26, 2003. For the convenience of our readers in 2007, all three of these articles can be found here. It was our June 2003 exchange with candidate Obama

> that prompted him to restore the antiwar speech on his web site, though not as prominently as before, the same antiwar speech which is now touted as evidence of his early and consistent opposition to the war. Our three "bright line" questions invited him to distinguish himself as an authentic progressive on single-payer national health care, on the war in Iraq, and on NAFTA. And it was our public exposure of the fact and implications of the DLC's embrace of Obama's career which caused him to explicitly renounce any formal ties with the Democratic Leadership Council. We didn't do it because we were haters. We were doing our duty as agitators. (Glenn Ford, "How We Held Obama's Feet to the Fire in 2003," *The Black Agenda Report*) [95]

In the fall of 2006, accompanied by the leading black journalists Bruce Dixon, Margaret Kimberley and Leutisha Sills of CBC Monitor, Glenn Ford left the *Black Commentator* which he had co-founded and edited since 2002, and launched *Black Agenda Report*. The *Black Commentator* continued under Bill Fletcher as executive editor. Fletcher is a Senior Scholar with the Institute for Policy Studies, an important focus of the left wing of the US intelligence community, and the immediate past president of TransAfrica Forum, a group linked with reparations advocate Randall Robinson. It would appear that the issue of provoking this split was specifically whether or not to support Obama for the presidency. Glenn Ford, for his part, has continued to maintain a critical stance in regard to the Illinois Senator, while Fletcher has gone as far as the traffic will bear in the direction of backing Obama. Here is Fletcher's recent quasi-endorsement of Obama:

> My conclusion, and I offer this with great caution, is that critical support for Obama is the correct approach to take. Yet this really does mean critical support. It means, among other things, that Senator Obama needs to be challenged on his views regarding the Middle East; he must be pushed beyond his relatively pale position on Cuba to denounce the blockade; he must be pushed to advance a genuinely progressive view on the rebuilding of the Gulf Coast and the right of return for the Katrina evacuees; and he must be pushed to support single payer healthcare. As I emphasized in an earlier commentary, it is up to the grassroots to keep the candidates honest. Silence, in the name of unity, is a recipe for betrayal. What we have to keep in mind is something very simple: the other side, i.e., the political Right, always keeps the pressure on. If we do not pressure, in fact, if we do not demand, the reality is that the Right will come out on top. To do the right thing, we must assess and appreciate Senator Obama for who he is and what he is - politically - rather than engage in wishful thinking. To do anything else is to be disingenuous to our friends and our base. Senator Obama, if elected President, will be unlikely to reveal himself to have been a closeted progressive. Yet, with pressure from the base, he may be compelled to do some of what is needed, despite himself and despite pressures to the contrary. (Bill Fletcher, Jr., *The Black Commentator*)

OBAMA IN 2004: BOMB IRAN – AND PAKISTAN

Already in the 2004 Senate race, Obama displayed the incongruous and bizarre combination of nominal opposition to the Iraq war, while explicitly recommending a much wider regional conflagration involving Iran and Pakistan, amounting essentially to the beginnings of a new world war. Obama expounded his war plans to the editorial board of the *Chicago Tribune* in late September 2004:

> U.S. Senate candidate Barack Obama suggested Friday that the United States one day might have to launch surgical missile strikes into Iran and Pakistan to keep extremists from getting control of nuclear bombs. Obama said the United States must first address Iran's attempt to gain nuclear capabilities by going before the United Nations Security Council and lobbying the

> international community to apply more pressure on Iran to cease nuclear activities. That pressure should come in the form of economic sanctions, he said. But if those measures fall short, the United States should not rule out military strikes to destroy nuclear production sites in Iran, Obama said. "The big question is going to be, if Iran is resistant to these pressures, including economic sanctions, which I hope will be imposed if they do not cooperate, at what point are we going to, if any, are we going to take military action?" Obama asked. Given the continuing war in Iraq, the United States is not in a position to invade Iran, but missile strikes might be a viable option, he said. Obama conceded that such strikes might further strain relations between the U.S. and the Arab world. "In light of the fact that we're now in Iraq, with all the problems in terms of perceptions about America that have been created, us launching some missile strikes into Iran is not the optimal position for us to be in," he said. "On the other hand, having a radical Muslim theocracy in possession of nuclear weapons is worse. So I guess my instinct would be to err on not having those weapons in the possession of the ruling clerics of Iran. … And I hope it doesn't get to that point. But realistically, as I watch how this thing has evolved, I'd be surprised if Iran blinked at this point." As for Pakistan, Obama said that if President Pervez Musharraf were to lose power in a coup, the United States similarly might have to consider military action in that country to destroy nuclear weapons it already possesses. Musharraf's troops are battling hundreds of well-armed foreign militants and Pakistani tribesmen in increasingly violent confrontations. Obama said that violent Islamic extremists are a vastly different brand of foe than was the Soviet Union during the Cold War, and they must be treated differently. "With the Soviet Union, you did get the sense that they were operating on a model that we could comprehend in terms of, they don't want to be blown up, we don't want to be blown up, so you do game theory and calculate ways to contain," Obama said. "I think there are certain elements within the Islamic world right now that don't make those same calculations. "… I think there are elements within Pakistan right now–if Musharraf is overthrown and they took over, I think we would have to consider going in and taking those bombs out, because I don't think we can make the same assumptions about how they calculate risks." (David Mendell, "Obama would consider missile strikes on Iran," *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 2004)

These remarks are a foreshadowing of Obama's call in the July 2007 Democratic candidates' debate in Chicago for US bombing raids to be conducted on a unilateral basis in northern Pakistan, without consultation of the Musharraf government, and thus wantonly violating the national sovereignty of a very large and very proud nation which happens to possess nuclear weapons. At that time, Clinton, McCain, and even Bush had rejected this demand on various grounds, but by January 2008 Obama's demand for the reckless and unilateral US bombing of Pakistan had become a reality, as reported by the *Washington Post* and other published sources. Naturally, Obama's motion had passed thanks to the ascendancy inside the US government of the Zbigniew Brzezinski faction, as whose puppet Obama functions. But in September 2004, even the *Chicago Tribune* could see that there was something strange about being a dove on Iraq and a hawk on the two larger countries further east:

> Obama's willingness to consider additional military action in the Middle East comes despite his early and vocal opposition to the Iraq war. Obama, however, also has stressed that he is not averse to using military action as a last resort, although he believes that President Bush did not make that case for the Iraq invasion… (David Mendell, "Obama would consider missile strikes on Iran," *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 2004)

US SENATE: THE DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY AND THE ELIMINATION OF BLAIR HULL

We must now attempt to explain how the mediocre and relatively obscure Obama was able to force his way into the United States Senate in 2004 against other candidates who were better known, better qualified, and better financed. Once again, Trilateral magic will play a central role. Most accounts of this Senate race are purely fantastic, and try to explain Obama's unlikely victory as a product of some astute machinations by the anointed one. Here is an example from a meretricious journalist whose notoriously slimy methods became a focus of attention during the Spring 2008 primaries:

> …the [Illinois] Senate race was crowded, dominated by two independently wealthy newcomers to politics: on the Democratic side, Blair Hull, a former securities trader who had made his first stake playing blackjack and pumped $29 million of his own money into the race, and for the Republicans, Jack Ryan, a former Goldman Sachs investment banker who had made a fortune and then spent time as a teacher in an inner-city Catholic school. Another Democratic contender was the state controller, Dan Hynes, from an old Chicago political family, who figured to have strong labor and organization support. But Obama had his own ace: Emil Jones, whose support had the effect of tying the hands of Mayor Richard Daley and Governor Rod Blagojevich. "He knew if he had me in the run for the Senate, it would put a block on the current mayor," Jones recalled. "The current mayor and the father of the controller, which was Dan Hynes, they were roommates in Springfield when the mayor was a state senator, so they had a relationship. Another big financial backer for the governor was Blair Hull. Barack knew if he had me it would checkmate the governor, 'cause the governor couldn't come out and go with Blair Hull, 'cause the governor needs me. Same with the mayor. So he had analyzed and figured all of that out. He knew I could help him with labor support. And I could put a checkmate on some of the local politicians that didn't know him, but they couldn't really go against me. It was just like in a football game: you got this talented running back, but without those linemen opening the holes and blocking, the running back would never get out of the backfield." Obama secured the nomination and in November 2004 won election to the Senate. (Todd Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

This is the journalism of pure hallucination. The account given is absolutely fraudulent, and makes no mention whatever of the decisive factors that determined the outcome of this Senate race: these were two huge scandals which, with perfect timing, came out of nowhere and destroyed Obama's most formidable opponents in the Democratic primary, Marson Blair Hull, and then — once again with perfect timing — brought down Jack Ryan, Obama's Republican opponent in the November election. The *New York Times* account was a little better, but still left out the main things:

> If freshman senators arrive as celebrities, it is usually because they are "dragon slayers," having ousted big-name incumbents. Mr. Obama was not one of those; two serious opponents in Illinois self-destructed, smoothing his path to election in November 2004. (*New York Times*, March 9, 2008)

What these establishment writers are trying to hide is the fact that Obama has never won election to public office in a truly contested election. The 2004 Illinois Senate race confirms this adage, since Obama faced no serious opposition in the Democratic primary or in the general election, since his most formidable opponents had been knocked out by piloted scandals.

BARKY'S FIRST FOE: MARSON BLAIR HULL, OPTIONS MILLIONAIRE

The most dangerous opponent for Obama was Blair Hull, usually considered the richest person to have ever run for statewide office in Illinois. Hull's financial resources, accumulated during a career as an investment banker with Goldman Sachs, were unusually formidable, and Hull was also determined to avoid the rich man's fallacy that everything necessary for a campaign can simply be bought with money, whereas in reality there are some things that political organizing alone can accomplish. As we read in an Internet source,

> …in early polls leading up to the March 16, 2004, primary election, candidate Blair Hull enjoyed a substantial lead and widespread name recognition resulting from a well-financed advertisement effort. He contributed over $28 million of his personal wealth to the campaign. However, Hull was soon embroiled by allegations of domestic abuse. Marson Blair Hull, Jr. (born September 3, 1942), commonly known as Blair Hull, is an American businessman and politician, notable for his attempt to win the Democratic Party nomination to serve in the United States Senate from Illinois in 2004. He is the founder and CEO of the Hull Group, an equity option market making firm that was sold to Goldman Sachs. He is currently chairman and chief executive officer of Matlock Capital a family office. In early media polls leading up to the March 16, 2004 primary election, Hull enjoyed a substantial lead and widespread name recognition resulting from a well-financed advertisement effort. He contributed over $28 million of his personal wealth for the campaign. When allegations that Hull had abused his ex-wife were made by the media, Hull's poll numbers dropped and he failed to win the nomination. Illinois State Senator Barack Obama later became the nominee. Challenger Barack Obama, an Illinois state senator, won endorsements from four Illinois congressmen and former DNC chairman David Wilhelm, increasing his name recognition among voters. In the final weeks of the campaign, Obama's primary campaign gathered support from favorable media coverage and an advertising campaign designed by David Axelrod. The ads featured images of U.S. Senator Paul M. Simon and the late Chicago Mayor Harold Washington; the support of Simon's daughter; and the endorsement of most of the state's major papers, including the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Chicago Sun-Times*. In the March primary, Obama won a majority of support, earning 52% of the vote, fueled by an overwhelming victory in Cook County, including Chicago. (Wikipedia on Blair Hull)[96]

This account captures certain features of the reality of what went on, but it stops at the superficial level of phenomenon and is unable to explain anything in terms of causation.

THE *ATLANTIC* PROFILES HULL: SELF-FINANCED CANDIDATES ARE VULNERABLE TO SCANDALS

We can begin to understand the surprising fall of Blair Hull more adequately once we recognize that Hull's campaign had been extensively observed and profiled over a period of months by a number of journalists and operatives linked to institutions that would later emerge as key centers of support for Obama. The most egregious example is that of the *Atlantic Monthly*, in many ways the flagship magazine of the Boston and New York banking establishment in the same way that the *New York Times* is their newspaper of record. The *Atlantic Monthly* became one of the first house organs of pro-Obama hysteria in December 2007, with an adulatory cover story celebrating the Perfect Master by neocon Andrew Sullivan. One suspects that the *Atlantic Monthly* has cultivated a benevolent interest in the career of Obama going back several decades, as several other financier institutions had. In any case, by the spring of 2004 the *Atlantic Monthly* had assigned an

investigative journalist to the task of profiling the hapless Blair Hull. Here is some of what this operation unearthed:

Blair Hull can afford to be cavalier about a senator's $158,000 salary, because he is the richest person ever to seek office in Illinois. He has a larger staff than any of his competitors. He pays his staffers more than any of the nine Democratic presidential candidates pay theirs. And there is a very good chance that he will spend more just on Illinois's March 16 Democratic primary than all but one or two of the Democratic presidential hopefuls will spend nationwide throughout the campaign. When I joined him for a few days in November, Hull was in the midst of the most expensive campaign in Illinois history, having pledged to spend as much as $40 million in pursuit of the seat being vacated by the Republican Peter Fitzgerald. Hull's has all the trappings of a state-of-the-art campaign: meetups, a blog, and a timeshare in a corporate jet, not to mention a red, white, and blue "Hull-on-Wheels" RV that is featured prominently in his television commercials and has become a rolling symbol of the campaign. And at least in theory Hull, who is sixty-one, is a formidable candidate: as a former high school teacher, union worker, and board member of NARAL, he appeals to important Democratic constituencies; as the lone veteran in the field, he can oppose the war in Iraq unquestioned. His unusual life story, too, sets Hull apart from the drab lawyers, state representatives, and political scions who normally pursue office in Illinois, though in fact he is less flamboyant than his campaign and personal history suggest.

> Trained in mathematics and computer science, Hull became part of a notorious card-counting ring that operated in Nevada in the 1970s. … Hull always expected future gain. As if to underscore his analytical rigor, he used his winnings to found Hull Trading Co., a computerized options firm that earned him $340 million—and the means to run for the Senate—when Goldman Sachs bought it, in 1999. … But Hull's campaign does demonstrate a shrewd understanding of what it takes to buy a Senate seat. In the past few years Corzine and Warner (this time running for Virginia governor) got elected, laying out a strategy that Hull's campaign has largely adopted. Unlike Checchi and Huffington, Corzine went beyond television advertising to build his base of support. "Any self-funded candidate who relies on mass media to carry his message in the absence of creating a warm and lasting connection with voters is going to lose," Steve DeMicco, who managed Corzine's campaign, warns. Corzine courted key state officials and built an intricate grassroots network well in advance of the election. (Hundreds of thousands of dollars in charitable donations to Jesse Jackson's Rainbow/PUSH Coalition and similar organizations didn't hurt either.) And he largely resisted the urge to overrule his advisers, though he did refuse the suggestion that he shave his beard. "For the most part," DeMicco says, "he knew what he didn't know." Hull, too, has assiduously cultivated the grass roots—particularly downstate, where he is counting on outperforming his Chicago-based competitors in the primary. Given that at least six other candidates are vying for the Democratic nomination, the winner should need only 25 to 30 percent of the vote. Though the millions Hull has spent to date have yet to make him the front-runner, his campaign is showing reasonable progress in the difficult task of turning a virtual unknown into a serious prospect for the state's 12 million citizens. Hull has already campaigned full time for more than a year, blanketing the state with television ads, joining parades in the "Hull-on-Wheels" RV, and giving endless talks in small towns similar to Orland Hills. Like other candidates, Hull supports drug re-importation from Canada. He recently took a bus trip to Windsor, Ontario, with seniors who were buying prescription drugs. Unlike other candidates, he paid for the bus, the hotel rooms, and even the doctors' visits. And just as Corzine did, he has spent an astonishing amount of money courting

state officials—donating to Rod Blagojevich's successful 2002 campaign for governor of Illinois, for instance, a total of $459,000 in loans, cash, and the use of his jet.

It turns out that Hull is that rare breed of candidate who will give an honest assessment of his chances. "At the outset," he told me, "I estimated there was about a ten percent probability" of winning. But by the time he was six months into his campaign, Hull's name recognition and poll support had risen to the point where, he said, "it is clearly above that—and rising." He emphasized his continued willingness to bet millions of dollars that he can win. Hull is most animated by those aspects of campaigning that can be quantified and formulated. "Politics is very unpredictable," he told me. "More so than blackjack." When Elliott Close, a South Carolina textile heir, ran for the Senate in 1996, his consultants thought it politically unwise for him to drive a fancy foreign car. Close dutifully swapped it for a Cadillac. Not long afterward he was ticketed for speeding, and a subsequent newspaper account emphasized his expensive choice of automobile. Exasperated, Close bought a Buick and was said to carry the newspaper clipping in his wallet for the remainder of the campaign. Other examples are not quite as harmless. The Republican businessman Michael Huffington's Senate campaign in California, in 1994, featured a get-tough-on-immigration platform unveiled in the final weeks of the campaign. A few days after the announcement the Los Angeles Times reported that Huffington employed an illegal alien as a nanny. Like Close, Huffington lost his election.

Nevertheless, there is compelling evidence that Illinois voters will accept a candidate who draws on his own fortune to run for office. They have already elected one: Peter Fitzgerald, who in 1998 spent $14 million of his personal fortune of $40 million to win the seat Hull wants. But after Hull started campaigning, Fitzgerald announced that he would not seek re-election. Spending part of a fortune to become a senator was one thing; going through the rest of it to remain one, apparently, was another.

The central finding of the profile, perhaps suggesting what would come next, was this:

Self-financed candidates are usually facing media scrutiny for the first time. They are therefore more susceptible to damaging revelations: a drunk-driving arrest, a history of domestic violence, an illegal nanny. This reality can be daunting. (Joshua Green, "Blair Hull thinks he has found the formula for how to buy a Senate seat A Gambling Man," *Atlantic Monthly,* February 2004) [97]

As it turned out, the Obama machine could do better than a nanny. They would tar Hull with domestic violence and threatening to kill his own wife.

HULL FALLS VICTIM TO AXELROD'S DIVORCE PAPERS GAMBIT

Blair Hull's world began to get turned upside down when a group of Chicago media apparently led by Axelrod's network at the reactionary and neocon *Chicago Tribune* began demanding that the sealed court papers regarding the divorce which had ended Blair Hull's marriage be revealed to the public. This procedure was highly irregular, since proceedings in Family Court are not automatically open to the public, because of the interest of the minor children. But these mere technicalities did not stop the *Chicago Tribune*, aided and prodded, as it was later learned, by the Obama campaign and quite possibly by the anointed one himself. When the papers were finally opened, they were an unmitigated disaster for poor Marson Blair Hull, including a physical beating and a death threat. Things had reached such a level of intensity between Hull and his wife that she had to ask for a special protective order to keep the allegedly violent husband away. Naturally,

these charges were all made ex parte by Hull's wife, and therefore are not necessarily true at all. However, they were just the thing that the Trilateral doctors ordered for the anemic campaign of Obama. Here is a sampling of one journalistic account:

> The divorce filings reveal a highly volatile relationship between a couple who were married and divorced twice within four years. In the second divorce, the proceedings became so bitter that each party hired a private investigator to look into the other's life, the divorce filings show. Before his first marriage to Sexton, Hull had been married for 29 years to another woman with whom he had four children. For her part, Sexton, 49, alleged a pattern of emotional and mental abuse by Hull. On March 12, 1998, she asked a Cook County Circuit Court judge to issue an order of protection against Hull, in part, because she alleged Hull had threatened her life. "I am in great fear that if this court does not enter a protective order in my favor and against Blair, as well as exclude him from my residence in which I am residing with my child ... Blair will continue to inflict mental, emotional and physical abuse upon me as he has done in the past," Sexton alleged to obtain a court order to keep Hull away from her. "At this point, I fear for my emotional and physical well-being, as well as that of my daughter." Sexton outlined several incidents in which she accused Hull of becoming violent, profane and verbally abusive. During one, she alleged that he "hung on the canopy bar of my bed, leered at me and stated, 'Do you want to die? I am going to kill you....'" Only once, however, did she accuse him of striking her, which led to his arrest. But authorities declined to press charges against Hull because they determined that "mutual combat" had occurred. Hull said he struck Sexton's shin in retaliation after she allegedly kicked him. A Cook County prosecutor "felt she would be unable to sustain a burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt" in the battery case, according to the divorce filing. But just days after she asked for the protective order, the couple reached a settlement agreement giving her $3 million and half the value of their North Side home. And despite her allegations of abusive behavior by Hull, Sexton agreed to allow the protective order to expire when the marriage was dissolved in court months later. (David Mendell, "Hull's ex-wife called him violent man in divorce file," *Chicago Tribune*, February 28, 2004)

HULL CRUSHED BY TRILATERAL SCANDAL MACHINE

The impact of these revelations on the hapless Hull's campaign can be likened to that of a thermonuclear explosion. Here is an assessment of the state of Hull's campaign on March 19, 2004 which stresses the collapse of

> … Blair Hull's extravagant quest for the Democratic nomination for U.S. Senate. Hull's campaign followed a trajectory more dramatic than Howard Dean's, with big leads in the polls preceding what the *Chicago Tribune* called "the most inglorious campaign implosion in Illinois political history." Hull finished a distant third in Tuesday's voting, with barely 10% of the vote. His campaign was financed, lavishly, from the personal fortune Hull made as the founder of an options firm he sold to Goldman Sachs for $340 million in 1999. Hull spent at least $29 million on the campaign; the Tribune estimates he paid $260 for each vote he received. Hull's undoing was a story that broke less than a month before the primary. His ex-wife had sought an order of protection against him during their divorce in 1998. Hull tried to keep the divorce records sealed, but pressure from journalists and opposing candidates forced him to release them. The papers revealed that his ex-wife alleged that Hull had threatened her life, and that a physical altercation between them had led to his arrest for battery, though no charges were filed. An established politician with a reputation and a track record might have survived such publicity. But Hull was a political novice. Not only had he never run for office before 2004, he hadn't

> bothered to vote for years at time. An article by Joshua Green on Hull, which appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* as his candidacy was cresting, was prescient: "Self-financed candidates are usually facing media scrutiny for the first time. They are therefore more susceptible to damaging revelations: a drunk-driving arrest, a history of domestic violence, an illegal nanny." The ubiquitous Hull television ads had given him far better name recognition than his obscure opponents. But the footage of him chartering a bus to take Illinois senior citizens to Canada for cheaper prescription drugs than they could buy in the U.S. did him no good once the divorce story broke. Voters now knew one thing about Hull that didn't come from his ads, and it made even the least credulous suspect that the virtues and earnestness on display in the paid spots were contrived. After the divorce story broke, Blair Hull posted a message on his campaign website: "If voters want to judge me solely on the basis of my divorce, I'm willing to allow the chips to fall where they may. However, what voters tell me they want this election to be about is who has the independence to make health care more affordable, drive down the costs of prescription drugs, get our economy moving and create jobs." Jay Gatsby realized, finally, that none of those people at his parties were his friends—they were just there for the food, the drinks and the thrills. Blair Hull now knows that only a few of those earnest voters who spoke to him were really interested in his gold-plated policy seminar. They wanted a tabloid story, and he became it. (William Voegeli, "The Rise and Fall of Blair Hull," The Claremont Institute, March 19, 2004)[98]

Note once again that the demolition of Hull followed the guidelines suggested by the profile in the *Atlantic Monthly*, which is today one of the temples of the Obama cult.

OBAMA'S CAMPAIGN "WORKED AGGRESSIVELY" TO SMEAR BLAIR HULL

> As the 2004 Senate primary neared, it was clear that it was a contest between two people: the millionaire liberal, Hull, who was leading in the polls, and Obama, who had built an impressive grass-roots campaign. About a month before the vote, *The Chicago Tribune* revealed, near the bottom of a long profile of Hull, that during a divorce proceeding, Hull's second wife filed for an order of protection. In the following few days, the matter erupted into a full-fledged scandal that ended up destroying the Hull campaign and handing Obama an easy primary victory. **The *Tribune* reporter who wrote the original piece later acknowledged in print that the Obama camp had 'worked aggressively behind the scenes' to push the story.**[99] (emphasis added)[100]

Even with the support of this profiling and scandal machine, Obama was only able to eke out 52.77% of the primary vote in a crowded field. The Obama campaign was deeply implicated in the mudslinging.

THE ELIMINATION OF JACK RYAN

Now Obama had to face the Republican candidate, who was yet another multimillionaire, this time with a glamorous actress wife who had been a star of the television series *Star Trek*. A standard Internet reference work gives the following account of what followed:

> Obama was then pitted against Jack Ryan, the winner of the Republican primary. Ryan campaigned in favor of across-the-board tax cuts, school choice, and tort reform, an effort to limit payout in medical malpractice lawsuits. Ryan spent his childhood in Wilmette, Illinois, with his five siblings, and attended New Trier High School. He graduated from high school in 1977 and went on to Dartmouth College, where he graduated summa cum laude and Phi Beta

> Kappa. He earned his MBA from Harvard Business School, and his JD from Harvard Law School. After this, he worked for Goldman Sachs as an investment banker and eventual partner, first in New York City, and then in the Chicago branch. Ryan married actress Jeri Ryan in 1991; together they have a son, Alex Ryan. They divorced in 1999 in California, and the records of the divorce were sealed at their mutual request. Five years later, when Ryan's Senate campaign began, the *Chicago Tribune* newspaper and WLS-TV, the local ABC affiliate, sought to have the records released. Both Ryan and his wife agreed to make their divorce records public, but not make the custody records public, claiming that the custody records could be harmful to their son if released. On June 22, 2004, Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Robert Schnider agreed to release the custody files. In those files, Jeri Ryan alleged that Jack Ryan had taken her to sex clubs in several cities, intending for them to have sex in public. The decision to release these files generated much controversy because it went against both parents' direct request and because it reversed the earlier decision to seal the papers in the best interest of the child.[101]

This time around, Obama assumed a stance of Pecksniffian hypocrisy, deploring that such scabrous and salacious material was coming up in a political campaign. '"I don't think it's an appropriate topic for debate," Obama said. Obama has consistently said that his campaign would not focus on Ryan's 1999 divorce from TV actress Jeri Ryan.' (*Chicago Sun-Times*, April 3, 2004)

OBAMA AND THE ART OF PORNOGRAPHIC CAMPAIGNING

The usual suspects from among Axelrod's pals at the *Chicago Tribune* intervened actively on Obama's behalf to dig up as much dirt as they could about Jack Ryan. Since divorce is now so prevalent, it is perhaps not a big surprise that Obama's journalistic myrmidons chose the tactic of attempting to open up court papers from Ryan's ugly divorce from the famous *Star Trek* actress Jeri Ryan:

> As the campaign progressed, a lawsuit brought by the *Chicago Tribune* and ABC-owned station WLS-TV led to a California court's opening of child custody files from Ryan's divorce with actress Jeri Ryan. In those files, she alleged that he had taken her to sex clubs in several cities, intending for them to have sex in public. Although the sensational nature made the revelations fodder for tabloid and television programs specializing in such stories, the files were also newsworthy because Ryan had insisted to Republican leaders that there was nothing damaging in them. As a result, many Republicans questioned Ryan's integrity following the release, and he dropped out of the race on June 25, 2004, leaving Obama without an opponent. (Wikipedia on Jack Ryan)[102]

The stunning blow for Jack Ryan came on June 22, 2004 when, contrary to most legal precedent, the divorce papers were opened and published before a candid world. An account from the gotcha website *The Smoking Gun* describes the impact of these revelations on Ryan, who had tried to portray himself as a family values conservative against the cosmopolitan and Bohemian Obama:

> In what may prove a crippling blow to his U.S. Senate campaign, divorce records reveal that Illinois Republican Jack Ryan was accused by his former wife, actress Jeri Ryan, of pressuring her to have sex at swinger's clubs in New York, Paris, and New Orleans while other patrons watched. The bombshell allegation is contained amidst nearly 400 pages of records ordered released yesterday by a Los Angeles Superior Court judge who ruled on media requests to unseal documents from the Ryan case. The salacious charge leveled at the politician was made by Jeri Ryan, who has starred in TV's "Star Trek: Voyager" and "Boston Public," in a court

filing in connection with child custody proceedings…. The performer alleged that she refused Ryan's requests for public sex during the excursions, which included a trip to a New York club "with cages, whips and other apparatus hanging from the ceiling." While Ryan, a former Goldman Sachs executive, confirmed the trips with the actress, he described them simply as "romantic getaways," denying her claims that he sought public sex. The politician has repeatedly claimed that his divorce file – portions of which were sealed in 2000 and 2001 – contained no embarrassing information that would harm his chances against Democratic nominee Barack Obama. The Ryans were married in 1991 and, in November 1998, Jeri Ryan filed for divorce citing "irreconcilable differences." Another unsealed document reveals that Jeri Ryan, as part of the divorce settlement, received about $20 million in Goldman Sachs stock, while Jack Ryan retained a $40 million stake in the investment giant.[103]

RYAN FREQUENTED "A BIZARRE CLUB WITH CAGES, WHIPS, AND OTHER APPARATUS"

Here are some excerpts from the unusually prurient statements of Jeri Ryan about her former husband's penchant for dragging her into sex clubs:

"They were long weekends, supposed 'romantic' getaways," Jeri Ryan said in the filing. "The clubs in New York and Paris were explicit sex clubs. Respondent had done research. Respondent took me to two clubs in New York during the day. One club I refused to go in. It had mattresses in cubicles. The other club he insisted I go to." In her 2000 filing, Jeri Ryan alleged that after she and Jack Ryan left the first sex club they entered in New York, he asked her to go to another. She said he told her that he had gone out to dinner with her that night even though he didn't want to and "the least I could do in return was go to the club he wanted me to go." She described the second place as "a bizarre club with cages, whips and other apparatus hanging from the ceiling." "Respondent wanted me to have sex with him there with another couple watching. I refused," Jeri Ryan continued. "Respondent asked me to perform a sexual activity upon him and he specifically asked other people to watch. I was very upset. "We left the club and respondent apologized, said that I was right and he would never insist that I go to a club again. He promised it was out of his system." "Then during a trip to Paris, he took me to a sex club in Paris, without telling me where we were going. I told him I thought it was out of his system. I told him he had promised me would never go. People were having sex everywhere. I cried, I was physically ill. Respondent became very upset with me, and said it was not a 'turn on' for me to cry." (AP, June 22, 2004) [104] Ryan could only counter weakly that "We did go to one avant garde nightclub in Paris which was more than either one of us felt comfortable with."

With the tabloids full of these sensational accounts, Jack Ryan's Republican allies began to run away from him about as fast as they ran away from Mark Foley two years later.

After the records were made public, Congressman Ray LaHood of the 18th District immediately called on Ryan to drop out of the race. By June 25, Dennis Hastert, another prominent Illinois Republican (and the House Speaker) had "made some calls," according to anonymous sources reported in the *Daily Southtown*, and the consensus was for Ryan to step aside. The *Southtown* newspaper also reported that Ryan was expected to step aside. Some commentators pointed out that the information contained in the files involved private matters between a husband and wife and should not have been grounds for the destruction of Ryan's campaign. Others pointed out that the allegations were never proven, and in fact, Ryan was awarded additional custody rights at the end of the hearing, suggesting the allegations were not deemed reliable by the judge.

> Ryan trailed Obama in early polls, with Obama opening up a 20-point lead after the media reported that Ryan had assigned Justin Warfel, a Ryan campaign worker, to track Obama's appearances. Warfel followed Obama's movements 24 hours a day, recording everything Obama did in public on videotape. Warfel also heckled Obama by yelling questions at him in public. Ryan eventually withdrew Warfel, but did not apologize. (Wikipedia on Ryan)[105]

THE CARPETBAG CAMPAIGN OF ALAN KEYES OF MARYLAND

It was now late June, and the Illinois Republican Party no longer had a credible candidate for the United States Senate. At this point, given the typical Republican mentality and voter base, it would have been natural for the Illinois Republicans to do the obvious thing and pick the best financed, best known white candidate they could find in order to at least cut their losses. The normal Republican reasoning would be that since Obama is black, a white candidate would automatically acquire support from backlash voters, especially those in the rural areas of downstate Illinois. A white candidate was the obvious choice. There was absolutely no reason to go far afield to recruit a black candidate yet for some inexplicable (and probably Trilateral) reason, this is what the Illinois Republicans did. Perhaps, after two of Obama's opponents had been knocked out by perfectly timed scandals, the Illinois GOP had detected the hand of Divine Providence and concluded that Obama's entry into the US Senate was now divinely ordained. Otherwise, there is no explanation of what the Illinois Republicans did next. They went all the way to Maryland to recruit Alan Keyes, a former State Department official under Reagan, a failed Senate candidate in his own state of Maryland, and a former Republican presidential candidate who was widely thought to have run for the White House in order to increase the standard fee he could demand for making lectures in front of groups of reactionary students on college campuses. Keyes was a widely known windbag and buffoon, and by making the trip from Maryland all the way to Illinois he compounded his problems by adding carpetbagger and interloper to the list of epithets ready to be hurled against him.

> In August 2004, with less than three months to go before election day, Alan Keyes accepted the Illinois Republican Party's nomination to replace Ryan. A long-time resident of Maryland, Keyes established legal residency in Illinois with the nomination. Through three televised debates, Obama and Keyes expressed opposing views on stem cell research, abortion, gun control, school vouchers, and tax cuts. In the November 2004 general election, Obama received 70% of the vote to Keyes's 27%, the largest electoral victory in Illinois history. (Wikipedia)[106]

Obama had received an important boost from Laurance S. Rockefeller, a senior member of the Rockefeller family, in the form of some very generous contributions to Axelrod and some issue ads designed to favor Obama's Malthusian party line. Laurance, along with David, was one of the surviving members of the Rockefeller brothers' generation, the sons of John D. Rockefeller Junior. Laurance died at the age of 94 in July 2004, so the Obama campaign was one of his last projects.[107]

OBAMA'S *VOLKSGEMEINSCHAFT* SPEECH AT THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

In the midst of these events, Obama was chosen by the party hacks and Wall Street operatives who control the Democratic Party to deliver the keynote address of the 2004 Democratic national convention in Boston, Massachusetts. This was an unmistakable symbol of the fact that Obama had a support network that went far beyond the confines of the corrupt Chicago Democratic machine: it reached to Wall Street and beyond. In an instant, the obscure mediocrity Obama became a national and indeed international celebrity, and the Chicago Democratic wheel horses with whom he had

been rubbing shoulders in the various clubhouses of the South Side for a decade and more were stunned to see the forces that were now promoting Barky's meteoric career.

> When Mr. Obama delivered a now-famous speech at the 2004 Democratic National Convention that catapulted him onto the national stage, sitting in the audience was Mayor Daley of Chicago. As Mr. Obama spoke, Mr. Daley and other Illinois officials "were just as wide-eyed as the thousands of convention goers," said James A. DeLeo, a Democratic leader in the Illinois Senate. The mayor and the senator had some ties, but they had never had a close relationship. Mr. Obama's friend Ms. Jarrett had worked for Mr. Daley, and had hired Michelle Obama into the administration in the early 1990s. Yet Mr. Obama had run multiple times as a candidate without the mayor's help. (Jo Becker and Christopher Drew, "Pragmatic Politics, Forged on the South Side," *New York Times*, May 11, 2008.)

Obama's Boston keynote address of 2004 represents essentially the same speech that he has been giving ever since: a tissue of patriotic clichés changed by New Age sensibilities, an oblique polemic against the Lee Atwater-Karl Rove use of wedge issues by the Republican party, and above all a cascade of vapid messianic slogans and Utopian rhetorical figures. The great overarching theme was the mystical unity of the American nation and people. Obama's oration had not a scintilla of originality. It was a standard Democratic Party corporatist speech in the *Volksgemeinschaft* tradition – the (at best) communitarian idea that the mystical unity of The People magically dispels all real conflicts of interest, also a staple of the fascist rejection of class conflict. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan at the 1976 Democratic National Convention had played the *Volksgemeinschaft* card against Nixon and Ford. Jordan had intoned on that occasion:

> This is the question which must be answered in 1976: Are we to be one people bound together by common spirit, sharing in a common endeavor; or will we become a divided nation? For all of its uncertainty, we cannot flee the future. We must not become the "New Puritans" and reject our society. We must address and master the future together. It can be done if we restore the belief that we share a sense of national community, that we share a common national endeavor. It can be done.

This speech had doubtless been written for Ms. Jordan by the Trilateral managers who ran both Jimmy Carter and the 1976 convention. Some of the rhetorical devices are actually echoed in Obama's boilerplate rhetoric.

"My story is part of the larger American story," Obama pontificated in a performance that the controlled corporate media uniformly touted as electrifying and inspirational. "In no other country on Earth is my story even possible." "We worship an awesome God in the blue states, and we don't like federal agents poking around our libraries in the red states," he said. "We coach Little League in the blue states, and yes, we've got some gay friends in the red states. There are patriots who opposed the war in Iraq, and there are patriots who supported the war in Iraq. We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, all of us defending the United States of America." Here again was the mystical unity of the nation, a staple of standard fascist rhetoric.

THE APOTHEOSIS OF A MEGALOMANIAC

In the standard Roman triumphs, the victorious general returning to receive the tumultuous accolades of the Senate and people was also provided with a slave whose job it was to keep repeating that he was only mortal and that all glory was fleeting; this was a kind of Roman preventive care lest megalomania ensue from too much adulation. Obama has always needed an

entire staff to try to keep his characteristic megalomania under control. In an instant, Obama had leapt from relative obscurity to bask in the klieg lights of DC fame, and it was all going straight to his head:

> Obama's good friend Martin Nesbitt, a successful black businessman in Chicago, spent the day of the speech with him, traveling from appearance to appearance. "We were walking down the street in Boston, and this crowd was growing behind us, kind of like Tiger Woods at the Masters. And I turned to Barack and I said, 'This is incredible. You're like a rock star.' And he looked at me and said, 'If you think it's bad today, wait till tomorrow.' And I said, 'What do you mean?' and he said, 'My speech is pretty good.' " It was an extraordinary display of self-confidence, and self-knowledge. (Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

We would rather call it an extraordinary display of megalomania on the part of a person who somehow believes that magical oratory can automatically be used to produce concrete effects in the real world — not a very healthy frame of mind for anyone, much less a president who will always have to fight to get the bureaucracy to do anything at all. In the November 2004 general election, Obama received 70% of the vote to Keyes's 27%, the largest electoral victory in Illinois history. Obama became only the third African-American elected to the U.S. Senate since Reconstruction, after Edward Brooke of Massachusetts and Carol Moseley Braun of Illinois. We can expect Obama to undergo acute bouts of megalomania if he should ever get the Democratic nomination, to say nothing of the Nero-style performance he will put on if he should ever reach the White House. God help us.

IN THE US SENATE: TACKING RIGHT WITH LUGAR

Despite the underlying megalomania, Obama has also developed a certain limited capacity to display a self-deprecating humor. One example:

> Senator Barack Obama stood before Washington's elite at the spring dinner of the storied Gridiron Club. In self-parody, he ticked off his accomplishments, little more than a year after arriving in town. "I've been very blessed," Mr. Obama told the crowd assembled in March 2006. "Keynote speaker at the Democratic convention. The cover of Newsweek. My book made the best-seller list. I just won a Grammy for reading it on tape. "Really, what else is there to do?" he said, his smile now broad. "Well, I guess I could pass a law or something." … He was running for president even as he was still getting lost in the Capitol's corridors. "I think it's very possible to have a Senate career here that is not particularly useful," he said in an interview, reflecting on his first year. And it would be better for his political prospects not to become a Senate insider, which could saddle him with the kind of voting record that has tripped up so many senators who would be president. "It's sort of logic turned on its head, but it really is true," said Tom Daschle of South Dakota, the former senator and Democratic leader who has been a close adviser to Mr. Obama.' (*New York Times*, March 9, 2008)

Obama appears to be preparing to go one step further in the departure from reality which the neocons have thus far so nobly advanced: in the bizarro world of Obama, no experience is better than vast experience, and no track record is far better than a voluminous track record, since only perceptions, and never reality are involved. Unfortunately for Obama, this is just not the way the world works.

THE HOPE POPE CREATES THE HOPEFUND

And then there were the kudos, the accolades which showered down on the anointed head:

> Shortly after Obama's swearing in, his beatification begins when *Time* magazine names Obama one of "The World's Most Influential People." He is listed among other leaders and revolutionaries. This same year, the British journal *New Statesman* names Obama one of "10 People Who Could Change the World." After he was on the cover of *Newsweek* the same week President Bush appeared as *Time*'s Man of the Year, his fellow Democratic senators gently ribbed him at their first weekly luncheon of the new Congress. His memoir was on *The New York Times'* best-seller list for 54 weeks. And Washington society was eager to embrace him — a Capitol Hill newspaper ranked him as No. 2 on its list of most beautiful people. Mr. Obama was also pulling in big money. He created a political action committee, the Hopefund, to increase his visibility and help other Democrats, and it raised $1.8 million the first year. He disappointed some Democrats by not taking a more prominent role opposing the war — he voted against a troop withdrawal proposal by Senators John Kerry and Russ Feingold in June 2006, arguing that a firm date for withdrawal would hamstring diplomats and military commanders in the field. His most important accomplishment was his push for ethics reform. Party leaders named him their point person in 2006, and when the Democrats assumed the majority in Congress in January 2007, Mr. Obama and Mr. Feingold, a longtime Democratic proponent of ethics reform, proposed curtailing meals and gifts from lobbyists, restricting the use of corporate planes, requiring lobbyists who bundle donations to disclose individual donors… "He folded like a cheap suit," said Senator Lindsey Graham, Republican of South Carolina and a close ally of Mr. McCain. "What it showed me is you are not an agent of change. Because to really change things in this place you have to get beat up now and then." (*New York Times*, March 9, 2008)

> Obama's betrayal of the Kerry-Feingold bill of mid-2006 is by itself enough to make his claim of consistent opposition to the Iraq war into a bitter mockery, but the Kool-Aid drinkers and lemming legions who support his cultist candidacy are epistemologically incapable of seeing this simple fact.

TOM DASCHLE, THE SENATOR FROM CITIBANK

As soon as Obama got to Washington, he immediately began recruiting a staff of classic powerbrokers and influence peddlers.

> Obama was sworn in as a senator on January 4, 2005. Although a newcomer to Washington, he recruited a team of established, high-level advisers devoted to broad themes that exceeded the usual requirements of an incoming first-term senator. Obama hired Pete Rouse, a 30-year veteran of national politics and former chief of staff to Senate Democratic Leader Tom Daschle, as his chief of staff, and economist Karen Kornbluh, former deputy chief of staff to Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin, as his policy director. His key foreign policy advisers include Samantha Power, author on human rights and genocide, and former Clinton administration officials Anthony Lake and Susan Rice. Obama holds assignments on the Senate Committees for Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; and Veterans' Affairs, and he is a member of the Congressional Black Caucus. The U.S. Senate Historical Office lists him as the fifth African-American Senator in

> U.S. history, the third to have been popularly elected, and the only African-American currently serving in the Senate.' (Wikipedia entry on Obama)[108]

Especially sinister is the presence of Tom Daschle, notorious as the senator from Citibank, which happens to be one of the largest employers in the state of South Dakota because of the presence of some of its back-office facilities there. Daschle embodies in the cringing appeasement and milquetoast opposition which was typical of the Democratic Party during Bush's first term. He lost his seat to the upstart Thune because of his numerous betrayals and he is now attempting to reinvent himself thanks to the Hope Meister.

STRIPPING THE RUSSIAN NUCLEAR DETERRENT WITH DICK LUGAR

Naturally, everybody in Washington is in favor of stripping away as much of the Russian nuclear deterrent as can be managed, so this was a very noncontroversial choice for Obama, and happened by some coincidence to also coincide perfectly with the anti-Russian priorities of his longtime mentor and controller, Zbigniew Brzezinski. Soon after he was sworn into office on January 4, 2005, Obama partnered with Republican Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana to craft a bill that attempted to undermine the Russian deterrent under the pretext of destroying weapons of mass destruction in Eastern Europe and Russia. The choice of the reactionary Lugar was significant, since this is a figure whom Obama is known to be considering either for the vice presidency or for a post like secretary of state.

> Lugar was one of Obama's first mentors in the Senate, and was at that time the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Lugar later invited Obama on a trip through the former Soviet Union, inspecting projects to decommission Cold War-era weapons. The two joined hands to pass legislation to control the spread of weapons. "I like him, and I appreciate working with him," Lugar said. "It seems to me that he was adept in finding partners and coalitions and actually was able to achieve results." In addition to a legislative accomplishment teaming with Lugar, the partnership gave Obama the added credibility he sought in an association across party lines. A former presidential candidate who has seen many fellow senators launch White House bids during his 30-year Senate career, Lugar offers unusually strong praise for Obama. "He does have a sense of idealism and principled leadership, a vision of the future," Lugar said. "At certain points in history, certain people are the ones that are most likely to have the vision or imagination or be able to identify talent and to manage other people's ideas. And I think he does this well." (*New York Times*, March 9, 2008)

AUSTERITY FANATIC TOM COBURN AND WARMONGER JOE LIEBERMAN

Obama also gravitated to another notorious reactionary, Republican Sen. Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, with whom he created a website that tracks all federal spending. Radical right-wingers were intrigued by Obama's ability to camouflage proposals for brutal austerity and savage cuts in the standard of living under the fatuous cloud of utopian babbling. By now, these reactionaries also had a pretty good idea that Obama was a candidate with a glass jaw, and much less formidable in the 2008 election than Senator Clinton would be.

> "…nobody should imagine that the right-wing media whose voices now praise Obama will continue to do so if he wins the Democratic nomination, or that the mainstream media, which still takes so many cues from the right, will do likewise." This article also talks about Obama's "free ride" that I have been talking about for the longest time along with his "mentor"

> relationship to Joe Lieberman: "Should Obama hope to continue to enjoy his free ride, he should consult his old mentor Joe Lieberman, the senator from Connecticut who used to be a Democrat. Conservative commentators and right-wing media outlets always loved Lieberman for his willingness to echo their talking points on subjects such as school vouchers and Social Security privatization." And in March 2006, Obama went out of his way to travel to Connecticut to campaign for Senator Joseph Lieberman who faced a tough challenge by anti-war candidate Ned Lamont. At a Democratic Party dinner attended by Lamont, Obama called Lieberman "his mentor" and urged those in attendance to vote and give financial contributions to him. This is the same Lieberman who Alexander Cockburn called "Bush's closest Democratic ally on the Iraq War." Why would Obama have done that if he was truly against the war? (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

Obama's antics during his first months in Washington, DC before he left the Senate to go on the presidential campaign trail give us some idea of what he means by bipartisan cooperation, which is a blanket capitulation to reactionaries on virtually every issue, especially the economic ones. Observers were astounded or a poll:

> When Obama first got to Washington, he wanted to be a wonk, to keep his head down and concentrate on small issues. "The plan was: Put Illinois first," one of his aides tells me. Obama himself admits that his initial agenda had a "self-conscious" modesty. His early legislative accomplishments have been useful and bipartisan — he has even sponsored bills with ultraconservative Sen. Tom Coburn, who believes that high school bathrooms breed lesbianism — but they have been small-scale and off the headlines: a plan to make it easier for citizens to find out about government spending, increased research into ethanol, more job training and tax credits for "responsible fathers." This is the kind of head-down diligence that plays well in the Senate. "I am amazed by his sheer stamina," says Sen. Dick Lugar, a Republican from Indiana who has become something of a mentor to Obama. [109]

Now even poor Tom Coburn has been thrown under the bus by Obama as a result of the Philadelphia debate in which the anointed one cited Coburn as an example of a right-wing extremist who wanted the death penalty for abortions as part of a rhetorical trick to seemingly balance his decades-long friendship with the Weatherman terrorist bomber Bill Ayers. Obama's concept of friendship is clearly a very ephemeral one.

RECTOR OBAMA SNIFFS AT "THE MANUEVERINGS, THE CHICANERY, THE SMALLNESS" OF THE US SENATE

Fundamentally, Obama is an apolitical and anti-political candidate who is opposed to a form of government in which economic questions are decided primarily by the give and take and haggling inherent in the parliamentary and legislative processes. Obama thinks that these decisions ought to be made by bankers speaking among themselves in the measured tones of the corporate boardroom. His entire campaign therefore has a decidedly anti-parliamentary thrust, a characteristic that it shares with the early Italian fascism of Mussolini between 1919 in 1922. The *Duce* once described the Italian parliament as a cattle pen, and his contempt for parliamentary methods was always flagrant. Obama offers the same attitude in a somewhat laid-back postmodern or new age form, but it is the same attitude, as we can see from this:

> …Washington has plenty of wonks, and Obama wasn't going to distinguish himself through diligence alone. He came to the Capitol equipped with his own, swelling celebrity; the Senate was not a perfect fit. Beyond his considerable charm, Obama can be righteous and cocky. He

> came to Washington pushing the hope that politics could be better — but now he can give the impression that he'd rather be just about anywhere other than in Washington. "It can be incredibly frustrating," he tells me. "The maneuverings, the chicanery, the smallness of politics here." Listening to a bloviating colleague at his first meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Obama slipped a three-word note to a member of his staff: "Shoot. Me. Now." On a recent day, as Obama made his way through the Capitol's corridors, his fellow senators seemed like good-natured sportscasters, jolly and easy with their power, bantering about the fortunes of baseball teams in their home states... Obama is aloof and quiet. He prefers to listen, attentive as a rector, not quite of this world, silently measuring it. "The typical politician pushes himself on people to get them to pay attention," says Frank Luntz, the Republican campaign strategist. "Obama is quieter. He doesn't push — he has a laid-back feel that pulls you in. That is so rare." (Wallace Wells, "Destiny's Child," *Rolling Stone*, February 27, 2007)

But no matter what the issue, Obama will always take any opportunity he is offered to pontificate, lecture, hector, and talk down to his interlocutors:

> The lesson the senator took from the meeting, he says, was this: "Politics is not a sport. The debates we have in Washington are not about tactical advantages. They are about who we are as people, what we believe in and what we are willing to do to make sure we have a country that our children deserve." Afterward, he signs autographs in the crowd for what seems like hours: He can't, he won't, get away. (Wallace Wells, "Destiny's Child," *Rolling Stone*, February 27, 2007)

US SENATE: MEDDLING IN KENYAN DESTABILIZATION NECKLACING

As part of Obama's efforts to demonstrate his continuing usefulness to Zbigniew Brzezinski and the rest of the Rockefeller-Trilateral policy faction as they strive to reject the Chinese from Africa and thus cut off the flow of African oil, raw materials, and minerals to the Middle Kingdom, Obama — puffed up by his new senatorial dignity — now undertook a second roots trip back to Kenya. This time it was no longer a matter of discovering inconvenient truths about his father and the rest of his relatives; it was now a matter of documenting his ability to help destabilize Kenya with the help of his murderous cousin, the Anglo-American provocateur Ryan Odinga: During Obama's trip to Kenya in August 2006, he openly meddled in tribal politics against the majority Kikuyu ethnic group, which controlled the government, and in favor of his own Luo tribe, which had become identified to some extent with the cause of Islam. It must be stressed that the motivation for Obama as illegitimate interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state was not dictated by religious considerations, but had everything to do with the desire of the Zbigniew Brzezinski faction of the US elite to overthrow the Kenyan government because it was open to cooperation with the People's Republic of China, which Brzezinski is targeting in the first phase of his final apocalyptic assault on Russia. Under the Brzezinski strategy, all of Africa is to become a battlefield between the United States and the Chinese, with the goal of denying Beijing access to oil, minerals, and other strategic raw materials. Obama made his meddling so blatant and so obvious that the existing Kenyan government labeled him in blunt terms as a "stooge" for the Luo-based and US-backed opposition forces, who were led by his cousin, the murderous Raila Odinga. (Mike Flannery, "[Kenyan] Government Says Obama is a Stooge for Political Opposition," CBS2.com, August 2006)

KENYAN GOVERNMENT: OBAMA "A STOOGE"

Seeing Obama's eagerness to meddle and interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign and independent African states, some African leaders already began to understand what breed of cat this Obama what is. As one right-wing Internet site comments,

> There are signs of tension between Sen. Barack Obama and African leaders. On Monday, Obama stepped up his criticism of government corruption in Kenya. At the University of Nairobi, the senator offered more pointed criticism, something he's done almost every day since arriving last week. After remaining largely silent, the government of President Mwai Kibaki is beginning to respond, suggesting that Obama may have fallen under the spell of opposition leader Raila Odinga, Obama's cousin. Odinga is the son of Senior's sister, a direct first cousin and nephew of Obama's father. A potential presidential candidate himself, Odinga's been at Obama's elbow here fairly often and is a member of the Obama family's Luo tribe. "Sen. Obama has to look at critically about where he's receiving his advice from," said government spokesman Dr. Alfred Mutua. "Just because somebody, somewhere wants to run for president and is using Sen. Obama as his stooge, as his puppet to be able to get to where he wants to get to." Raila Odinga, who is Obama's first cousin, has, in his own words, a "close personal friendship" with Obama. When Obama went to Kenya in August of 2006, he was hosted by Raila and spoke in praise of him at several rallies in Nairobi…. When Raila Odinga lost the presidential election to Mwai Kibaki, he claimed the vote was rigged, whereupon his tribal followers went on murderous rampages, such as in the town of Eldoret, where on New Years' Day dozens of Christians were burned to death in a church set on fire. Throughout Kenya, hundreds of people have been politically murdered in the last few days.[110]

The problem is that the American people can have no conceivable interest in taking sides in the conflict between the Luo and the Kikuyu; the American interest is to maintain mutually beneficial relations with the government of a peaceful and united Kenya which is making forward progress in its own national economic development.

THE CIA'S LUO-ISLAM ALLIANCE WRECKS KENYA

Right-wing websites and called attention to the fact that the Odinga-Luo party inclines towards the Islamic political movements in Kenya. This may presently be the case, but no one should mistake the underlying strategy, which is that the Kenyan government must be destroyed because it is willing to conclude development accords with the People's Republic of China. Odinga is not a Moslem jihadi; when traveling overseas, he is in practice a CIA asset. Nevertheless, the details of these operations show how cynically the Christian populations of Africa are being sacrificed by Brzezinski in the service of his obsessive anti-Chinese and anti-Russian designs. We find on the Internet that, for example,

> the Evangelical Alliance of Kenya has posted on its website a photograph copy of a Memorandum of Understanding, dated and signed on August 29, 2007, between Raila Odinga and Shiekh Abdullah Abdi, chairman of the National Muslim Leaders Forum of Kenya. Here is a summary on the agreement which was signed: It pledges the support of Kenyan Moslems for Raila's election. In return, as President of Kenya, Raila agrees to 14 actions, listed a) through n) on page two. Within 6 months re-write the Constitution of Kenya to recognize Shariah as the only true law sanctioned by the Holy Quran for Muslim declared regions. Within one year facilitate the establishment of a Shariah court in every Kenyan divisional headquarters. (Note:

> everywhere in Kenya, not just in "Muslim declared regions.") Popularize Islam, the only true religion… by ordering every primary school in Kenya in the regions to conduct daily Madrassa classes. Impose a total ban on open-air gospel crusades by worshippers of the cross… Outlaw gospel programs… on KBC, the National Broadcaster. Impose a total ban on the public consumption of alcoholic beverages…Impose an immediate ban on women's public dressing styles that are considered immoral and offensive to the Muslim faith…[111]

OBAMA'S COUSIN ODINGA: NECKLACING IN THE FAMILY AND THE TRIBE

There is little doubt that Raila Odinga is no champion of either democracy or Islam, but rather a brutal and power-hungry thug who happens to have hitched his wagon to US-British imperialism. One observer writes that

> Obama's involvement in Kenyan politics, whether tribal or religious, is bothersome. On January 2nd, in classic Marxist tradition, Obama's Kenyan 1st cousin, Raila Odinga, accused President Mwai Kibaki of stealing the Dec. 27 election, and rallied his Luo followers in western Kenya, demanding a new election. Kibaki "must step down or there must be a re-election — in this I will not be compromised. You cannot steal my cow, and I catch you red-handed, and then expect me to share the milk because the cow is mine." More than 1,000 people, mostly Kikuyu Christians, have been killed and 300,000 forced from their homes by Odinga's followers.[112]

To some this may look like Marxism, but the method is that of the classical National Endowment for Democracy people power coup or color revolution. An interesting side light to all this is that "Raila Odinga named his daughter after Winnie Mandela, who championed the act of necklacing – murdering an opponent by putting a burning rubber tire around his neck — in South Africa some years back. His son is named for Fidel Castro."[113]

BRZEZINSKI: KICK THE CHINESE OUT OF AFRICA

The calculation being made by Brzezinski and other diehard defenders of US-UK world domination is that the novelty of Obama's black face can be used to refurbish their own image to the point where a counteroffensive against the Chinese in Africa will become possible in the short run. Think first of George Bush attempting to convince African leaders that they should join in the campaign of London and Washington to impose economic sanctions on Zimbabwe, because — irony of ironies — Bush is offended by the alleged fact that Mugabe uses vote fraud to maintain his hold on power! Clearly, Bush's chances of prevailing in such requests would be minimal. But now imagine that it is Barack Hussein Obama who is making the appeal to the African states to join in the latest imperialist campaign. Now, the imperialist chances, although still low, have decidedly improved. Obama went to Africa in large part to show that he could appeal directly to the African masses, but once again the inherent professorial elitism and pedantry of this haughty Luo got in the way. Here is a first-person account:

> In late August, for the third time in his life, he traveled to Kogelo, the tiny, grassless village in western Kenya where his father had grown up the son of a Muslim goat herder and where the senator's grandmother still lives. There is something absurd about the collision of Obama's worlds, right now, dozens of microphones thrust in the face of this eighty-five-year-old woman who has spent her life in this amazingly obscure place and barely knows her grandson. But this is part of the Obama legend, the globalized Abe Lincoln: This is his log cabin, a generation removed. When his caravan pulls into the village, thousands of people are waiting for him, a

> vast and disciplined crowd standing in long, silent lines, like those old photos of British colonials reviewing the Zulus. They are rooting for him to say something big, something feeling, about Africa, about the relation between America and Kenya, about the way history is beginning to shift. Obama, instead, backs away. "I don't come here as a grandson but as a U.S. senator," he tells them. "My time is not my own. Don't expect me to come back here very often." And then again: "I'm not going to be here all the time." He goes on in this vein: He wants to help Kenyans, but he also wants them to help themselves. He begins to sound like any other politician, a deputy to the trade commissioner. The crowd, full of hope, almost visibly deflates. (Wallace Wells, "Destiny's Child," *Rolling Stone*, February 27, 2007)

Not a very promising beginning, but also perhaps a fair reflection of the predicament of Anglo-American imperialism in Africa today.

GETTING RICH IN THE MILLIONAIRE'S CLUB

Obama and his wife are trying to cultivate the public image of an anti-materialist power couple were urging young people to choose the path of idealism and not pecuniary aggrandizement. This is a public relations ploy doubtless invented by Axelrod, and it is a cruel sham. One of Obama's first preoccupations upon arriving in the Senate was how to begin amassing wealth into a considerable fortune as soon as he could:

> Less than two months after ascending to the U.S. Senate, Barack Obama bought more than $50,000 worth of stock in two speculative companies whose major investors included some of his biggest political donors. One of the companies was a biotech concern that was starting to develop a drug to treat avian flu. In March 2005, two weeks after buying about $5,000 of its shares, Obama took the lead in a legislative push for more federal spending to battle the disease. He also bought more than $50,000 in stock in a satellite communications business whose principal backers include four friends and donors who had raised more than $150,000 for his political committees. A spokesman for Obama says the senator did not know that he had invested in either company.[114]

The perfect Master was too much involved in his idealistic meditations to ever think about all that filthy lucre he was amassing by means of classical graft.

OBAMA REFUSES TO HELP END THE IRAQ WAR

Obama's elusive October 2002 antiwar speech has remained for many years an isolated and impotent gesture, clearly conceived and executed as part of a cynical marketing strategy as a means of jumpstarting Barky's Senate campaign by mobilizing a brigade old SDS leftists. in 2005 in 2006, Bush could count on Obama as a reliable vote in favor of the continued funding of the Iraq war and against impeachment, which by late 2006 had become a genuine mass movement, especially in the middle class. Even Obama's allies in the controlled corporate media began to take notice of his duplicity:

> Campaigning for the Illinois Senate seat in 2003 and 2004, Obama scolded Bush for invading Iraq and vowed he would "unequivocally" vote against an additional $87 billion to pay for it. Yet since taking office in January 2005, he has voted for four separate war appropriations, totaling more than $300 billion. Last June [2006], Obama voted no to Senator John F. Kerry's proposal to remove most combat troops from Iraq by July 2007, warning that an "arbitrary deadline" could "compound" the Bush administration's mistake. And now he's voted for a Republican-sponsored resolution that stated the Senate would not cut off funding for troops in

> Iraq. He left it to others to lead public opinion. Sen. Russ Feingold (D-Wis.) and Rep. John Murtha (D-Pa.) emerged as the strongest voices against the war. Those critics all spoke out before Obama gave his first major policy speech on the war — 11 months after he took office.' (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

JULY 2004: "NOT MUCH OF A DIFFERENCE" BETWEEN BUSH AND OBAMA ON IRAQ

In July of 2004, Obama, replied to a question about his differences with Bush regime regarding the Iraq war with this: "I'm not privy to Senate intelligence reports**.** What would I have done? I don't know." He added: "There's not much of a difference between my position on Iraq and George Bush's position at this stage**."** ("Meet the Press," 2004, MyDD, Nov. 11, 2007) The senator himself tries to portray his many pro-war votes as being the result of his recognition of the nuanced complexity of the situation in Iraq, rather than as the cynical sellouts that they are:

> Obama defended his reluctance to call for withdrawal during most of his first year in the Senate. "At the time, my view was that the [Iraqi] government was still forming and it would be important to not give the impression, prior to the formation of that government, that we were already on the way out," Obama said. "Now, what changed? We have the breaking out of a complete civil war, at least a significant low-grade civil war." Feingold offers Obama mixed reviews for his handling of Iraq. "I've been pleased that his opposition has intensified over time. I was not that happy with his initial opposition to a timeline," Feingold said. (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

NADERITE MATT GONZALEZ: OBAMA FAILS ON THE ISSUES

Matt Gonzalez is a former president of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and is currently (2008) running on Ralph Nader's ticket as a vice presidential candidate. Before declaring his candidacy, he contributed an excellent overview of Obama on the issues. The first thing that Gonzalez notices is the point we have just been stressing, namely that Obama's self-portrait as a consistent and reliable antiwar vote is, to use President Clinton's term, a "fairy tale." Generally speaking, Obama is running away from his own voting record as fast as his legs will carry him, preferring to pose as the purveyor of hope and change in the most vacuous and generic terms. Gonzalez notes:

> Let's start with his signature position against the Iraq war. Obama has sent mixed messages at best. First, he opposed the war in Iraq while in the Illinois state legislature. Once he was running for US Senate though, when public opinion and support for the war was at its highest, he was quoted in the July 27, 2004 *Chicago Tribune* as saying, "There's not that much difference between my position and George Bush's position at this stage. The difference, in my mind, is who's in a position to execute." The *Tribune* went on to say that Obama, "now believes US forces must remain to stabilize the war-ravaged nation a policy not dissimilar to the current approach of the Bush administration." Obama's campaign says he was referring to the ongoing occupation and how best to stabilize the region. But why wouldn't he have taken the opportunity to urge withdrawal if he truly opposed the war? Was he trying to signal to conservative voters that he would subjugate his anti-war position if elected to the US Senate and perhaps support a lengthy occupation? Well as it turns out, he's done just that. Since taking office in January 2005 he has voted to approve every war appropriation the Republicans have put forward, totaling over $300 billion. He also voted to confirm Condoleezza Rice as Secretary

> of State despite her complicity in the Bush Administration's various false justifications for going to war in Iraq. Why would he vote to make one of the architects of "Operation Iraqi Liberation" the head of US foreign policy? Curiously, he lacked the courage of 13 of his colleagues who voted against her confirmation. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch) [115]

Then there is the little matter of civil liberties, where Obama is actually looking more and more like a crypto-totalitarian. In any case, it is certain that Obama was a supporter of renewal of the Patriot Act in midsummer 2005, a time when anti-Bush sentiment was clearly the wave of the future: "Obama voted to reauthorize the Patriot Act in July 2005, easily the worse attack on civil liberties in the last half-century. It allows for wholesale eavesdropping on American citizens under the guise of anti-terrorism efforts." (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch)

Now, in the 2008 primary season, we have had another cycle of promises and betrayals inflicted on us by Obama, who strutted as an implacable enemy of the Iraq war during 2007, but who, by mid 2008, is signaling more and more that he is open to prolonging the Iraq war virtually indefinitely.

> Recently, with anti-war sentiment on the rise, Obama declared he will get our combat troops out of Iraq in 2009. But Obama isn't actually saying he wants to get all of our troops out of Iraq. At a September 2007 debate before the New Hampshire primary, moderated by Tim Russert, Obama refused to commit to getting our troops out of Iraq by January 2013 and, on the campaign trail, he has repeatedly stated his desire to add 100,000 combat troops to the military.' (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch) 'At the same event, Obama committed to keeping enough soldiers in Iraq to "carry out our counter-terrorism activities there" which includes "striking at al Qaeda in Iraq." What he didn't say is this continued warfare will require an estimated 60,000 troops to remain in Iraq according to a May 2006 report prepared b y the Center for American Progress. Moreover, it appears he intends to "redeploy" the troops he takes out of the unpopular war in Iraq and send them to Afghanistan. So it appears that under Obama's plan the US will remain heavily engaged in war. This is hardly a position to get excited about. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch)

At some points during the 2007 debates, Obama spouted vaguely anti-imperialist rhetoric, but this was clearly yet another hoax: when all is said and done, Obama, like Kerry, is basically claiming to be a smarter imperialist than Bush, and that is nothing to write home about.

OBAMA VOTES AGAINST CLASS ACTION LAW SUITS

These days in Washington, when a lobbyist wants to take some important right away from the American people, it is customary to cloak such operation under the edifying term of "reform." Obama's own parlance is rich in many examples of this kind of doubletalk. A good case study is Obama support of what the corporate lobbyists like to call "class action reform," which is no reform at all but rather a high-handed outrage by the malefactors of great wealth.

> 'In 2005, Obama joined Republicans in passing a law dubiously called the Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) that would shut down state courts as a venue to hear many class action lawsuits. Long a desired objective of large corporations and President George Bush, Obama in effect voted to deny redress in many of the courts where these kinds of cases have the best chance of surviving corporate legal challenges. Instead, it forces them into the backlogged Republican-judge dominated federal courts. By contrast, Senators Clinton, Edwards and Kerry joined 23 others to vote against CAFA, noting the "reform" was a thinly-veiled "special interest

> extravaganza" that favored banking, creditors and other corporate interests. David Sirota, the former spokesman for Democrats on the House Appropriations Committee, commented on CAFA in the June 26, 2006 issue of *The Nation*, "Opposed by most major civil rights and consumer watchdog groups, this Big Business-backed legislation was sold to the public as a way to stop "frivolous" lawsuits. But everyone in Washington knew the bill's real objective was to protect corporate abusers." *Nation* contributor Dan Zegart noted further: "On its face, the class-action bill is mere procedural tinkering, transferring from state to federal court actions involving more than $5 million where any plaintiff is from a different state from the defendant company. But federal courts are much more hostile to class actions than their state counterparts; such cases tend to be rooted in the finer points of state law, in which federal judges are reluctant to dabble. And even if federal judges do take on these suits, with only 678 of them on the bench (compared with 9,200 state judges), already overburdened dockets will grow. Thus, the bill will make class actions, most of which involve discrimination, consumer fraud and wage-and-hour violations all but impossible. One example: After forty lawsuits were filed against Wal-Mart for allegedly forcing employees to work "off the clock," four state courts certified these suits as class actions. Not a single federal court did so, although the practice probably involves hundreds of thousands of employees nationwide." Why would a civil rights lawyer knowingly make it harder for working-class people (Or the people of Hunter Point suing Lennar) to have their day in court, in effect shutting off avenues of redress? (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

Washington is full of corrupt congressmen who are experts in this kind of flimflam; but the truly galling thing about Obama is the sanctimonious hypocrisy with which he envelops each and every criminal sellout of the public interest.

Obama has always been the trimmer, and has sought to avoid above all things an irrevocable, clear, and principled stand on any major issue. One of his favorite tricks in the Illinois Senate was to constantly vote present when he needed to take evasive action:

> These seemingly unusual votes wherein Obama aligns himself with Republican Party interests aren't new. While in the Illinois Senate, Obama voted to limit the recovery that victims of medical malpractice could obtain through the courts. Capping non-economic damages in medical malpractice cases means a victim cannot fully recover for pain and suffering or for punitive damages. Moreover, it ignored that courts were already empowered to adjust awards when appropriate, and that the Illinois Supreme Court had previously ruled such limits on tort reform violated the state constitution. In the US Senate, Obama continued interfering with patients' full recovery for tortious conduct. He was a sponsor of the National Medical Error Disclosure and Compensation Act of 2005. The bill requires hospitals to disclose errors to patients and has a mechanism whereby disclosure, coupled with apologies, is rewarded by limiting patients' economic recovery. Rather than simply mandating disclosure, Obama's solution is to trade what should be mandated for something that should never be given away: namely, full recovery for the injured patient. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

OBAMA BLOCKS REFORM OF THE MINING LAW OF 1872

An entire separate detailed study would be necessary to fully cover the extent of Obama's involvement with been ruthless corporate barons who run the mining industry. Some Southern

Illinois coal mine owners clearly own a time share of Obama, and he has been shameless in delivering on their demands:

> In November 2007, Obama came out against a bill that would have reformed the notorious Mining Law of 1872. The current statute, signed into law by Ulysses Grant, allows mining companies to pay a nominal fee, as little as $2.50 an acre, to mine for hardrock minerals like gold, silver, and copper without paying royalties. Yearly profits for mining hardrock on public lands is estimated to be in excess of $1 billion a year, according to Earthworks, a group that monitors the industry. Not surprisingly, the industry spends freely when it comes to lobbying: an estimated $60 million between 1998-2004, according to The Center on Public Integrity. And it appears to be paying off, yet again. The Hardrock Mining and Reclamation Act of 2007 would have finally overhauled the law and allowed American taxpayers to reap part of the royalties (4 percent of gross revenue on existing mining operations and 8 percent on new ones). The bill provided a revenue source to clean up abandoned hardrock mines, which is likely to cost taxpayers over $50 million, and addressed health and safety concerns in the 11 affected western states. Later it came to light that one of Obama's key advisors in Nevada is a Nevada-based lobbyist in the employ of various mining companies. (CBS News "Obama's Position on Mining Law Questioned. Democrat Shares Position with Mining Executives Who Employ Lobbyist Advising Him," November 14, 2007).

NUCLEAR REGULATION: THE SENATOR FROM EXELON (AKA TOM AYERS' COMM EDISON)

Naturally, Obama's deepest loyalties (if that is the word) go to the late Thomas Ayers of Commonwealth Edison, now known as Exelon. Thomas Ayers is one of the principal figures who lifted Obama up out of nothingness and made him. Not surprisingly, Obama has done yeoman service for the Ayers interests:

> The *New York Times* reported that, while campaigning in Iowa in December 2007, Obama boasted that he had passed a bill requiring nuclear plants to promptly report radioactive leaks. This came after residents of his home state of Illinois complained they were not told of leaks that occurred at a nuclear plant operated by Exelon Corporation. The truth, however, was that Obama allowed the bill to be amended in Committee by Senate Republicans, replacing language mandating reporting with verbiage that merely offered guidance to regulators on how to address unreported leaks. The story noted that even this version of Obama's bill failed to pass the Senate, so it was unclear why Obama was claiming to have passed the legislation. The February 3, 2008 *The New York Times* article titled "Nuclear Leaks and Response Tested Obama in Senate" by Mike McIntire also noted the opinion of one of Obama's constituents, which was hardly enthusiastic about Obama's legislative efforts: "Senator Obama's staff was sending us copies of the bill to review, and we could see it weakening with each successive draft," said Joe Cosgrove, a park district director in Will County, Ill., where low-level radioactive runoff had turned up in groundwater. "The teeth were just taken out of it." As it turns out, the *New York Times* story noted: "Since 2003, executives and employees of Exelon, which is based in Illinois, have contributed at least $227,000 to Mr. Obama's campaigns for the United States Senate and for president. Two top Exelon officials, Frank M. Clark, executive vice president, and John W. Rogers Jr., a director, are among his largest fund-raisers." (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

CORN-BASED ETHANOL GENOCIDE FOR THE THIRD WORLD

Obama is also fully committed to the monstrosity of turning corn into gasoline at extravagant expense while a hungry world starved to death. This is, after all, a strange way to appeal for the friendship of the developing countries, where cheap corn often means the difference between life and death. González notes that

> …on energy policy, Obama is a big supporter of corn-based ethanol which is well-known for being an energy-intensive crop to grow. It is estimated that seven barrels of oil are required to produce eight barrels of corn ethanol, according to research by the Cato Institute. Ethanol's impact on climate change is nominal and isn't "green" according to Alisa Gravitz, Co-op America executive director. "It simply isn't a major improvement over gasoline when it comes to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions." A 2006 University of Minnesota study by Jason Hill and David Tilman, and an earlier study published in BioScience in 2005, concur. (There's even concern that a reliance on corn-based ethanol would lead to higher food prices.) So why would Obama be touting this as a solution to our oil dependency? Could it have something to do with the fact that the first presidential primary is located in Iowa, corn capital of the country? In legislative terms this means Obama voted in favor of $8 billion worth of corn subsidies in 2006 alone…. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

OBAMA REJECTS UNIVERSAL HEALTH CARE

Wall Street commentators have made no secret of the fact that they prefer Obama because he is the only Democrat not to demand national, universal health care. Here it is extremely clear that Obama has chosen to champion the financier interest while mortifying and betray the obvious public interest of all Americans, and indeed of all persons under US jurisdiction. González has drawn up the following catalog of Obama's betrayals in this department:

> Obama opposed single-payer bill HR676, sponsored by Congressmen Dennis Kucinich and John Conyers in 2006, although at least 75 members of Congress supported it. Single-payer works by trying to diminish the administrative costs that comprise somewhere around one-third of every health care dollar spent, by eliminating the duplicative nature of these services. The expected $300 billion in annual savings such a system would produce would go directly to cover the uninsured and expand coverage to those who already have insurance, according to Dr. Stephanie Woolhandler, an Associate Professor of Medicine at Harvard Medical School and co-founder of Physicians for a National Health Program. Obama's own plan has been widely criticized for leaving health care industry administrative costs in place and for allowing millions of people to remain uninsured. "Sicko" filmmaker Michael Moore ridiculed it saying, "Obama wants the insurance companies to help us develop a new health care plan-the same companies who have created the mess in the first place."' (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch)

Michael Moore, no man of principle, did not let the little matter of universal health care get in the way of a slobbering public embrace of Obama as soon as he thought that would represent a career enhancing move. In the meantime, a 40 to 50 million Americans have no health care insurance, and prospects for any improvement in the refuge or Obama regime are exceedingly grim.

OBAMA STRADDLES ON FREE TRADE SELLOUTS

During the Ohio and Pennsylvania primaries, Obama postured as a sharp critic of free trade sellouts like NAFTA, CAFTA, and others. At the same time, Obama sent his top economic controller, Skull and Bones alumnus Austin Goolsbee of the Friedmanite Chicago school, to reassure the Canadians that Obama was simply bloviating for electoral purposes. Obama has flipped on this issue literally countless times:

Regarding the North American Free Trade Agreement, Obama recently boasted, "I don't think NAFTA has been good for Americans, and I never have." Yet, Calvin Woodward reviewed Obama's record on NAFTA in a February 26, 2008 Associated Press article and found that comment to be misleading: "In his 2004 Senate campaign, Obama said the US should pursue more deals such as NAFTA, and argued more broadly that his opponent's call for tariffs would spark a trade war. AP reported then that the Illinois senator had spoken of enormous benefits having accrued to his state from NAFTA, while adding that he also called for more aggressive trade protections for US workers.'" (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

After Goolsbee's secret contacts with the Canadians were revealed, Obama indignantly denied that these talks had taken place. Nevertheless, at the close of the primary season, in June 2008, Obama told *Fortune* magazine that he was indeed a friend free trade agreements and a dedicated apostle of the supremacy of market forces. But, just as in the case of Obama's warmongering against Pakistan and other countries, the lemming legions loyal to Barky are epistemologically incapable of seeing the reality before their eyes, meaning that they are hysterical in the strict sense of the word.

By now, Obama has learned to recite the standard Democratic Party litany that labor and environmental guarantees must be included in any future free trade sellouts — as if these trivial and minimalist requirements would do anything to stop or even slow the destruction of the US economy by the sinister forces of economic globalization. But when it comes to actually voting for something concrete in this direction, Obama is as totally impotent and feckless as he usually is:

> Putting aside campaign rhetoric, when actually given an opportunity to protect workers from unfair trade agreements, Obama cast the deciding vote against an amendment to a September 2005 Commerce Appropriations Bill, proposed by North Dakota Senator Byron Dorgan, that would have prohibited US trade negotiators from weakening US laws that provide safeguards from unfair foreign trade practices. The bill would have been a vital tool to combat the outsourcing of jobs to foreign workers and would have ended a common corporate practice known as "pole-vaulting" over regulations, which allows companies doing foreign business to avoid "right to organize," "minimum wage," and other worker protections. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

OBAMA THE WIMP

One of the issues discussed in the Democratic candidates debates in the early part of the primary season was the need to fight the entrenched powers of Washington in order to make any progress at all of the People's agenda. Senator Edwards talked a very good game of fighting, and promised to fight all the way to the convention, but then suddenly dropped out even before the Super Tuesday primaries. Senator Clinton promised to fight, and then won wide admiration by actually delivering on that promise, showing considerable courage in the process. Obama's method was to take the capitulation policy of someone like his mentor Tom Daschle, and raise that cowardice and

appeasement to the theoretical level of positive virtue. It was clear to many that Obama is a wimp far worse than Bush the Elder, an incurable wuss and whiner. González senses the seriousness of this problem and asks:

> Why should we believe Obama has courage to bring about change? He wouldn't have his picture taken with San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom when visiting San Francisco for a fundraiser in his honor because Obama was scared voters might think he supports gay marriage (Newsom acknowledged this to Reuters on January 26, 2007 and former Mayor Willie Brown admitted to the San Francisco Chronicle on February 5, 2008 that Obama told him he wanted to avoid Newsom for that reason.) (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

We need to point out here that anything impinging on homosexuality evokes palpable terror on the part of Obama, quite evidently because of his own bisexual practices, as Larry Sinclair has pointed out. Another case in point is the death penalty, which Obama supports, for obvious demagogic reasons. A politician who was willing to sacrifice human lives as the rhetorical props for his own ambition is beneath contempt, and this fits the anointed one:

> Obama acknowledges the disproportionate impact the death penalty has on blacks, but still supports it, while other politicians are fighting to stop it. (On December 17, 2007 New Jersey Governor Jon Corzine signed a bill banning the death penalty after it was passed by the New Jersey Assembly.)' (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

So far, Obama has proven undecided about how to play the Mexophobia card. Here his maneuvering is complicated by the contradictory situation in which he desperately needs Latinos to vote for him, while these Hispanic voters have shown that they simply cannot stomach Obama and are against him by at least a two to one margin.

On September 29, 2006, Obama joined Republicans in voting to build 700 miles of double fencing on the Mexican border (The Secure Fence Act of 2006), abandoning 19 of his colleagues who had the courage to oppose it. But now that he's campaigning in Texas and eager to win over Mexican-American voters, he says he'd employ a different border solution. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

Gonzalez is surely on firm ground when he concludes: 'It is shocking how frequently and consistently Obama is willing to subjugate good decision making for his personal and political benefit.' (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," Counterpunch)

If Nader and González can develop an anti-Obama critique of the necessary depth and intensity, they will be performing an important public and patriotic service in helping to disorganize and demoralize the left wing of Obama's movement of fanatical cultists.

OBAMA OPPOSES CAPS ON CREDIT CARD INTEREST, FAVORS USURY

One of the issues which was raised against Obama during the course of the Democratic candidates' debates was his vote against a mandatory federal limit on credit card interest rates. It was clear to everyone that the interest rate cap included in the bill in question was far too high, but on the other hand passing the bill meant regulating credit card rates at the federal level for the first time in living memory. Obama predictably voted in favor of maintaining limitless usury in the tradition of Jeremy Bentham, and at the same time retreated behind a pedantic, professorial smokescreen about how the legislation had failed to meet his high standards. One might say that

Obama's trick is to make the perfect the enemy of the good, thus blocking any concrete and practical benefit that might actually be within reach. As Gonzalez points out,

> Obama has a way of ducking hard votes or explaining away his bad votes by trying to blame poorly-written statutes. Case in point: an amendment he voted on as part of a recent bankruptcy bill before the US Senate would have capped credit card interest rates at 30 percent. Inexplicably, Obama voted against it, although it would have been the beginning of setting these predatory lending rates under federal control. Even Senator Hillary Clinton supported it. Now Obama explains his vote by saying the amendment was poorly written or set the ceiling too high. His explanation isn't credible as Obama offered no lower number as an alternative, and didn't put forward his own amendment clarifying whatever language he found objectionable. Why wouldn't Obama have voted to create the first federal ceiling on predatory credit card interest rates, particularly as he calls himself a champion of the poor and middle classes? Perhaps he was signaling to the corporate establishment that they need not fear him. For all of his dynamic rhetoric about lifting up the masses, it seems Obama has little intention of doing anything concrete to reverse the cycle of poverty many struggle to overcome. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

OBAMA AS THE LEADING SABOTEUR OF IMPEACHMENT

Given the way the 2008 primaries worked, Obama was able to attract a very large part of the left liberal wing of the Democratic Party into his camp. These left liberals had been the leading force calling for the impeachment and removal from office of Bush and Cheney, and action which is not a mere matter of opinion, but rather an objective necessity if we want to wipe the slate clean of all the liberticide precedents and entrenched totalitarian practices of the Bush Cheney regime. There is in fact an ample window for the impeachment of Bush and Cheney by the new Democratic Congress during the 17 days between the convening of the two chambers on January 3, 2009, and Bush's departure from office (in so far as the law is observed) on January 20, 2009 at noon. But, by early February 2008, it was clear that the left liberals supporting Obama were dropping impeachment like a hot potato, evidently because it conflicted with the Perfect Master's pledge to usher in a new golden age of harmonious bipartisan cooperation, thanks to the beatific and transfiguring power of Barky's radiant personality. Impeachment, by contrast, is a very messy and a very partisan affair indeed, but it happens to be necessary to preserve constitutional government in this country. One of the reasons that the Trilateral financiers deployed Obama in the first place was because of their desire to divert and deflect a very strong mass resentment against Bush, Cheney, the neocons, and much of what they stand for. Obama has largely succeeded in fulfilling this task, since his candidacy has coincided with the collapse of momentum in favor of impeachment up and down the line. By sending forth Obama, the Trilateral banking faction is attempting to set in motion a process of organizing masses of the American people against themselves with the help of a ruthless demagogue financed by an avalanche of cash — a process which has all the essential characteristics of fascism. González shows that

> Obama aggressively opposed initiating impeachment proceedings against the president ("Obama: Impeachment is not acceptable," *USA Today*, June 28, 2007) and he wouldn't even support Wisconsin Senator Russ Feingold's effort to censure the Bush administration for illegally wiretapping American citizens in violation of the 1978 and Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. In Feingold's words "I'm amazed at Democrats cowering with this president's numbers so low." Once again, it's troubling that Obama would take these positions

> and miss the opportunity to document the abuses of the Bush regime. (Matt Gonzalez, "The Obama Craze," *Counterpunch*)

In the final analysis, Obama emerges as a demagogue and word monger of a new and dangerous type. González concludes:

> Once I started looking at the votes Obama actually cast, I began to hear his rhetoric differently. The principal conclusion I draw about "change" and Barack Obama is that Obama needs to change his voting habits and stop pandering to win votes. If he does this he might someday make a decent candidate who could earn my support. For now Obama has fallen into a dangerous pattern of capitulation that he cannot reconcile with his growing popularity as an agent of change.

OBAMA IN THE POCKET OF THE COAL LOBBY

One of the most grotesque contradictions which has emerged from Obama is relentless pursuit of corporate sponsorship has been the Perfect Master's relationship with the coal industry in Illinois and beyond. After the primaries were over, Obama announced that an energy policy capable of dealing with the pseudo-problem of global warming and climate change would represent one of his three top priorities, and this is precisely what we would expect from such a deeply Malthusian mentality. But, at the same time, Obama continues his loyal service to the holding companies that control the coal industry, even though it is by now clear that coal is much more valuable when used as an indispensable feedstock for the modern petrochemical production, rather than being used as a fuel, where it is hopelessly outclassed by nuclear power. Nevertheless, Obama has attempted to straddle this issue as well:

> Reflecting the interests of southern Illinois coal producers, he sponsored legislation to provide tax breaks and other incentives for refineries that turn coal into liquid fuel, generating criticism from environmental groups that say the coal-based technology would contribute to global warming. (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

The *Washington Post* has attempted to make a mockery of this important issue and get Barky off the hook that way:

> "Who, but who," writes the *Post*, 'would soil the environmental reputation of Barack Obama? The Democratic senator from Illinois gets stellar marks from greens. Just a few months ago he was calling global warming "real," saying: "It is here.... We couldn't just keep burning fossil fuels and contribute to the changing atmosphere without consequence." Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) has reintroduced the Coal-to-Liquid Fuel Promotion Act of 2007. It's a development that has the coal crowd cheering. (Charles Dharapak, AP)
>
> So why then, environmentalists ask, is Obama backing a law supporting the expanded use of coal, whose emissions are cooking the globe? It seems the answer is twofold: his interest in energy independence — and his interest in downstate Illinois, where the senator's green tinge makes the coal industry queasy... (Elizabeth Williamson, "The Green Gripe With Obama: Liquefied Coal Is Still . . . Coal," *Washington Post*, January 10, 2007[116]

One way to make sense of this picture is to recall that the Rockefeller-Trilateral interests that controlled the Carter administration were obsessed at that time with the notion of increasing US coal production, and indeed with making domestic coal the central element of a national energy policy for many decades to come. This lunatic project, like so many others, disappeared in the

general shipwreck of Carter's ship of fools, but look for it to reemerge if Obama is able to seize power over the coming months.

A FECKLESS AND CALLOW YOUTH BLINDED BY MEGALOMANIA AND EASY SUCCESS

It was in October 2006 that Obama published a new edition of his memoir, *The Audacity of Hope*. As is now widely known, the title is borrowed from a line which appears in one of his sermons of the foundation-funded racist provocateur, the raving Reverend Jeremiah Wright, who served as Obama as mentor and spiritual adviser for more than two decades, with Obama paying through the nose for this dubious privilege with the majority of his charitable contributions year-over-year. The original edition of this book first appeared in 1995. What kind of a man writes his own autobiography when he has not yet reached the age of 35, and has accomplished virtually nothing in life? The ominous answer may well be, a megalomaniac, a person suffering from delusions of grandeur, like the stock inmate of a mental hospital who imagines that he is the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte. Obama appears to be aware of the megalomania which for him is always nearby, and appears to be at pains to dispel the cold glare of these delusions with a kind of frivolous and superficial, but also nervous and high-strung, attempt at humor:

> When asked to speak in 2006 at the Gridiron Dinner — a white-tie-and-tails gathering that brings together Washington's political and media elites — he reached for humor to show a bit of humility and deflate expectations. "Most of all," he told reporters gathered for the function, "I want to thank you for all the generous advance coverage you've given me in anticipation of a successful career. When I actually do something, we'll let you know." (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

The American people are still waiting.

CHAPTER VII: THE HOPE POPE AND HIS TRILATERAL MONEY MACHINE

> A new political alliance is being forged in this country between the super-rich and the super-poor– especially the alienated and activist members of minority groups. The Ford Foundation, under the aggressive leadership of McGeorge Bundy, is providing the major thrust for this power bloc ... This is a dangerous game but it doesn't seem to worry those members of the 'Eastern Establishment' who are involved. They're sure that no matter what happens they'll still be on top. Vincent J. Salandria, 1971.
>
> "I serve as a blank screen on which people of vastly different political stripes project their own views . . ." - Obama

Obama, as we have seen thus far, is the puppet candidate of an unparalleled combination of institutions representing the Anglo-American ruling financier elite: his family traditions of those of the Ford Foundation and of its satellite foundations. He enjoys the backing of the Rockefeller, family, of George Soros, and now of Rupert Murdoch. His career has been fostered by the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderberger group at the highest levels. His controllers, advisors, handlers, and entourage come from the Council on Foreign Relations, the RAND Corporation, Skull and Bones, and the Chicago school of reactionary economics. Many of these institutions had already collaborated in the most elaborate previous attempt to create an entire presidential administration around a candidate as the puppet of these financiers — the CFR 1980s Project, and the resulting Jimmy Carter regime. Obama might be called the candidate of pan-oligarchy, that is to say of an attempt to unite the warring factions of the US-UK elite for the purpose of securing another century of world domination for London and Washington. Brzezinski, Huntington, and the other members of the Trilateral brain trust had been expecting the domestic political upheaval inside the United States to begin sometime after 2010, but the disasters of the Bush presidency had accelerated the timetable. A suitable puppet demagogue was now urgently required for the 2008 contest. Accordingly, after just a few months in the US Senate, Barky was given the go-code to begin his presidential campaign, and the Rockefeller-Soros-Trilateral-Bilderberg-CFR-RAND-Skull and Bones-Chicago Boys-foundation network went into high gear.

This unparalleled combination of financier factions and interest groups is prepared to spend something approaching half a billion US dollars for the purpose of creating an Obama regime. These are admittedly depreciated dollars, but this is still an impressive investment. Obama has now emerged as the greatest Pluto-candidate in all of American history, a figure who is leading historical characteristic may appear to future observers in the form of the unprecedented money machine which his wealthy backers have assembled around the vapid utopian slogans and hollow messianic rhetoric of the Hope Pope. Obama's rich supporters, it should be obvious, are not paying through the nose in this way because they find these demented slogans compelling. Rather, they are paying top dollar for direct access to political power – naked, brutal, crushing, pitiless political power. In this they are like Fritz Thyssen, a friend of Prescott Bush and the author of a book entitled *I Paid Hitler*, a man who was not interested in Hitler's idiotic and primitive views about race and history, but was rather looking for a steady supply of slave laborers for the factory complexes that grow up around the concentration camps. Obama, it must be added, is a far more degraded and abject puppet then Jimmy Carter ever was, if only because he has been indoctrinated for a much longer time. With Obama in the White House, and large Democratic majorities in both houses of Congress standing ready to rubber-stamp his crimes, the financiers will be in a position to pursue their

fantastic design for permanent world domination, even as they flay the American people alive by forms of austerity and sacrifice that will reduce the standard of living to perhaps one half or one third of the current depressed levels. This is what Obama means when he pontificates about his future regime: "I know I haven't spent a lot of time learning the ways of Washington, but I've been there long enough to know that the ways of Washington must change." (Quoted in "Raising Obama," Todd Purdum, *Vanity Fair*, March 2008)

OBAMA AS PLUTOCRAT

The necessary fuel for this monstrous and cynical project is money, money in vast quantities. *De l'argent, encore de l'argent, toujours de l'argent.* During the 2008 primaries, Obama distinguished himself from most of the other candidates by his unparalleled hypocrisy on precisely this score. Obama has tried to portray himself as an opponent of corruption, a candidate of good government and clean government, a foe of the preponderant role of money in political campaigns, a supporter of campaign finance reform and strict ethics requirements for government officials, and as the implacable enemy of lobbyists, pork barrel spending, and earmarks of all sorts. But, upon closer examination, this entire profile is revealed as a chimera, an illusion, a mirage. Obama bids fair to become the most corrupt presidential candidate of all time. This is a corruption that goes far beyond even the horrendous practices of the Alsammarae-Auchi-Rezko axis which we have already discussed. The phalanx of plutocratic financier interests which is now uniting around the figurehead candidacy of Obama reaches from Chicago to Wall Street for London and far beyond, and includes some of the wealthiest banks, investment banks, brokerage firms, defense contractors, and law firms in the entire world.

During the primaries, Obama had promised that he would find a compromise with Senator McCain so as to allow the fall presidential campaign to be governed by the public financing rules of the Federal Elections Commission, with each candidate pledging to use only public funds and to respect the various rules inherent in the system. This commitment by Obama was one of the most essential and qualifying parts of his entire campaign. In June 2008, however, Obama pompously announced that this promise was no longer operational, and that he would become the first candidate in United States history to reject the public financing system for the fall campaign, and would rely exclusively on the contributions that he would gather from the backers. This showed, for anyone who was still keeping score, that Obama is a liar and a scoundrel.

Obama's hypocrisy and duplicity concerning campaign finance reform are matched by his deceptive public pledge never to receive campaign contributions from lobbyists. Here, once again, the Perfect Master is duping his gullible following. Obama knows very well that, in a law firm that has lobbying the federal government as one of its primary objectives, the number of registered lobbyists is generally a limited minority of the lawyers who own the firm. There are always lots and lots of other partners, to say nothing of administrators, and even clerical personnel, plus innumerable spouses, children, and other relatives who can be coerced into contributing $2,300 each to the Obama campaign. Indeed, it is clear enough that many such law firms make contributions in this sort a condition for keeping one's job in the first place. This practice is known as bundling, and it makes a mockery of the austere limits to fundraising which Obama is so fond of parading in his inimitable self-righteous way. If we were able to determine the amount of cash that Barky has raked in at law firms and others engaged in lobbying, using the broad definition to suggest that, we would probably find that Obama is the all-time champion when it comes to cashing in with lobbyists.

DECLARING FOR PRESIDENT WITH SOROS AND MOVEON.ORG

One of Obama's most important supporters is the classic ultra left financier George Soros. Soros has long-standing ties to the leadership clique of the New York branch of the Federal Reserve, the flagship of the entire system. Soros is also deeply involved in the US intelligence community, controlling a set of foundations whose activity has been key for subversion operations into with the former Warsaw Pact and Soviet space. Soros is also the sugar daddy for many US left liberal and ultra left activists, particularly in the antiwar movement. Without the sponsorship of Soros, Moveon.org could hardly have gotten off the ground. The characteristic profile of those groups that are on the Soros gravy train is that they demand an end to the Iraq war, but say nothing about getting the US out of Afghanistan, since the Afghanistan component is fully coherent with Brzezinski's plan for bringing down China and Russia. Soros is also associated with a series of projects designed to assault traditional moral values, such as his championing of legalized narcotics to be made freely available, inevitably to young people as well. Soros endorsed Obama at the Davos confab of global oligarchs in January 2007, just after Barky had announced his bid for the White House:

> "As for the U.S. 2008 presidential race, Mr. Soros, who gave $18 million to Democratic advocacy groups seeking to defeat President Bush in 2004, said he supported Barack Obama. But he also said he would support Hillary Clinton if she won the Democratic nomination."[117]

Soros is acutely aware of the fact that the entire Anglo-American financial system is now descending into a chaotic breakdown crisis. In this crisis, Soros knows what he wants, and that is savage austerity, sacrifice, and a reduction of the living standards of working people across the board. Since Soros is well aware that Obama nurses a hate-filled grudge against American blue-collar workers, he is looking to Barky to serve as the exterminating angel of the austerity he wants to institute. Here is Soros' diagnosis of the present world economic depression:

> The current financial crisis was precipitated by a bubble in the US housing market. In some ways it resembles other crises that have occurred since the end of the Second World War at intervals ranging from four to 10 years. However, there is a profound difference: the current crisis marks the end of an era of credit expansion based on the dollar as the international reserve currency. The periodic crises were part of a larger boom-bust process. The current crisis is the culmination of a super-boom that has lasted for more than 60 years. (George Soros, *Financial Times*, January 23, 2008)

Now that the boom is over, Soros wants to clear the decks for austerity, with Obama as his chosen left-cover enforcer. Soros is the kingpin of Moveon.org, but he is also joined by a phalanx of other limousine liberals eager to use a left-wing demagogue to obtain a new phase of aggressive foreign policy, and a new round of austerity and sacrifice at home. This process started in the 2004 election, and it is Barky who is now the beneficiary, since the financier community feels they cannot rely on Senator Clinton to deliver the kind of bone crushing reductions in the standard of living which they know they will require: According to the March 10, 2004, *Washington Post*,

> The Democratic 527 organizations have drawn support from some wealthy liberals determined to defeat Bush. They include financier George Soros who gave $1.46 million to MoveOn.org Voter Fund (in the form of matching funds to recruit additional small donors); Peter B. Lewis, chief executive of the Progressive Corp., who gave $500,000 to MoveOn.org Voter Fund; and Linda Pritzker, of the Hyatt hotel family, and her Sustainable World Corp., who gave $4 million to the joint fundraising committee.

OBAMA'S NIGHT OF THE LONG KNIVES FOR LEFT FANATICS

It was of course Moveon.org who attacked General Petraeus with the famous "General Betray Us" ads of September 2007 – hardly an act of great courage, since this was already the safe majority view. When the Republicans tried to ram through a resolution condemning these ads, Obama did not defend his friends, but characteristically ran like a rabbit. By June-July 2008, Obama would be sniping at his own ultra-left storm troopers. The dynamic here is similar to Hitler's Night of the Long Knives in June-July 1934, when the brown shirts of the SA and their ideas of a second revolution were liquidated. Obama needed the ultra leftist lemmings of moveon.org as shock troops against the Clinton machine. Once he thought he had the nomination in his grasp, it was time to dump the ultra lefts, whose hysterical fanaticism could easily become a liability. Soros understands these tactics perfectly, since his goal is mainly to put his puppet Obama in the White House so Obama can implement the policies that Soros wants.

MoveOn.org executive director Eli Pariser said the country needs a president to "change business as usual in Washington." Soros' 34-year-old son Jonathan Soros, an attorney and financier, recently promoted to deputy manager of Soros Fund Management LLC, is heavily involved with MoveOn.org's activities. Obama's much touted opposition to the war helped him pick up the backing of MoveOn.org, which claims to have 3.2 million members. Pariser claimed that Obama had won the referendum by a vote of 70 percent to 30 percent for Clinton, but there were some who saw vote fraud at work. 'The group claimed that it had 1.7 million members in the 22 states scheduled to vote in the primaries, that it would immediately begin a campaign to get them behind Obama…'[118]

Worldly asceticism has no place in Obama's method of operations. Obama is not shy about accepting rides on corporate jets, especially when he is in a hurry to get to one of his own well-heeled fund raising events.

> Senator Barack Obama flew at least nine times on corporate jets last year, traveling to fund-raisers in New York and San Francisco, home to Chicago and to Rosa Parks' funeral in Detroit. Each time, he reimbursed the plane's owners at first-class rates, as Senate rules require. But Mr. Obama, freshman Democrat from Illinois, felt queasy about this perk of Senate life, so he said he gave it up. "This is an example where appearances matter," he said. "Very few of my constituents have a chance to travel on a corporate jet." ("Obama accepts rides on corporate jets, some to attend his own fundraisers," *New York Times*, March 7 2006)

Has he kept his pledge? In any case, he now has his own corporate jet.

OBAMA'S MONEY CARTEL

But flights in corporate jets are only the beginning. Obama's money cartel is so immense that we can only indicate some of its major components. A good starting point is Exelon, the former Commonwealth Edison, and the company dominated for decades by Thomas Ayers, the father of Obama's close friend, the former Weatherman terrorist bomber, Bill Ayers.

> Exelon's executives and employees were big backers of Obama's 2004 Senate bid and gave his presidential campaign nearly $160,000 in the first quarter of this year, second only to UBS-Americas, according to the Center for Responsive Politics, a watchdog group. (*Chicago Tribune*, June 12, 2007)

Pam Martens, a researcher with considerable Wall Street experience, has provided a useful exposé of Obama's money cartel. It turns out that some of Obama's biggest donors are also among the most predatory and parasitical jackals that the financial community has to offer. A case in point involves the subprime and adjustable rate mortgage gang, who have victimized the black community to an even greater degree than they have looted the rest of the US population. Obama is the beneficiary of the largesse of these same predatory lenders:

> Seven of the Obama campaign's top 14 donors consist of officers and employees of the same Wall Street firms charged time and again with looting the public and newly implicated in originating and/or bundling fraudulently made mortgages. These latest frauds have left thousands of children in some of our largest minority communities coming home from school to see eviction notices and foreclosure signs nailed to their front doors. Those scars will last a lifetime. These seven Wall Street firms are (in order of money given): Goldman Sachs, UBS AG, Lehman Brothers, JP Morgan Chase, Citigroup, Morgan Stanley and Credit Suisse. There is also a large hedge fund, Citadel Investment Group, which is a major source of fee income to Wall Street. There are five large corporate law firms that are also registered lobbyists; and one is a corporate law firm that is no longer a registered lobbyist but does legal work for Wall Street. The cumulative total of these 14 contributors through February 1, 2008, was $2,872,128, and we're still in the primary season. (Pam Martens, Obama's Money Cartel: How he's fronted for the most vicious firms on Wall Street, *CounterPunch*, February 23, 2008)

> Martens notes the hypocrisy of Obama's repeated lie that he does not take money from lobbyists: 'But hasn't Senator Obama repeatedly told us in ads and speeches and debates that he wasn't taking money from registered lobbyists? Hasn't the press given him a free pass on this statement? Barack Obama, speaking in Greenville, South Carolina, on January 22, 2008: "Washington lobbyists haven't funded my campaign, they won't run my White House, and they will not drown out the voices of working Americans when I am president". Barack Obama, in an email to supporters on June 25, 2007, as reported by the *Boston Globe*: "Candidates typically spend a week like this – right before the critical June 30th financial reporting deadline – on the phone, day and night, begging Washington lobbyists and special interest PACs to write huge checks. Not me. Our campaign has rejected the money-for-influence game and refused to accept funds from registered federal lobbyists and political action committees." The Center for Responsive Politics' website allows one to pull up the filings made by lobbyists registering under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 with the clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and secretary of the U.S. Senate. These top five contributors to the Obama campaign have filed as registered lobbyists: Sidley Austin LLP; Skadden, Arps, et al; Jenner & Block; Kirkland & Ellis; Wilmerhale, aka Wilmer Cutler Pickering. Is it possible that Senator Obama does not know that corporate law firms are also frequently registered lobbyists? Or is he making a distinction that because these funds are coming from the employees of these firms, he's not really taking money directly from registered lobbyists? That thesis seems disingenuous when many of these individual donors own these law firms as equity partners or shareholders and share in the profits generated from lobbying. Far from keeping his distance from lobbyists, Senator Obama and his campaign seems to be brainstorming with them. (Pam Martens, Obama's Money Cartel: How he's fronted for the most vicious firms on Wall Street, *CounterPunch*, February 23, 2008)

Obama is most eager to take money from law firms that are chock-full of registered lobbyists; only the most naïve gulls and dupes can believe his repeated posturing that he will not be the creature of lobbyists if he ever gets into power.

OBAMA AS CORPORATE MERCENARY AGAINST CLASS ACTION LAWSUITS

Martens analyzes Obama's vote in favor of the outrageous and reactionary anti-class-action legislation of some years back. Here there is a direct link between the money of Obama took and his vote against the rights of ordinary people to seek recourse against corporate abuses through the courts when they have been victimized:

> On February 10, 2005, Senator Obama voted in favor of the passage of the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005. Senators Biden, Boxer, Byrd, Clinton, Corzine, Durbin, Feingold, Kerry, Leahy, Reid and 16 other Democrats voted against it. It passed the Senate 72-26 and was signed into law on February 18, 2005. …
>
> Three days before Senator Obama expressed that fateful yea vote, 14 state attorneys general, including Lisa Madigan of Senator Obama's home state of Illinois, filed a letter with the Senate and House, pleading to stop the passage of this corporate giveaway. The AGs wrote: "State attorneys general frequently investigate and bring actions against defendants who have caused harm to our citizens... In some instances, such actions have been brought with the attorney general acting as the class representative for the consumers of the state. We are concerned that certain provisions of S.5 might be misinterpreted to impede the ability of the attorneys general to bring such actions..."
>
> The Senate also received a desperate plea from more than 40 civil rights and labor organizations, including the NAACP, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Human Rights Campaign, American Civil Liberties Union, Center for Justice and Democracy, Legal Momentum (formerly NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund), and Alliance for Justice. They wrote as follows:
>
> "Under the [Class Action Fairness Act of 2005], citizens are denied the right to use their own state courts to bring class actions against corporations that violate these state wage and hour and state civil rights laws, even where that corporation has hundreds of employees in that state. Moving these state law cases into federal court will delay and likely deny justice for working men and women and victims of discrimination. The federal courts are already overburdened. Additionally, federal courts are less likely to certify classes or provide relief for violations of state law."
>
> This legislation, which dramatically impaired labor rights, consumer rights and civil rights, involved five years of pressure from 100 corporations, 475 lobbyists, tens of millions of corporate dollars buying influence in our government, and the active participation of the Wall Street firms now funding the Obama campaign. "The Civil Justice Reform Group, a business alliance comprising general counsels from Fortune 100 firms, was instrumental in drafting the class-action bill", says Public Citizen.
>
> One of the hardest-working registered lobbyists to push this corporate giveaway was the law firm Mayer-Brown, hired by the leading business lobby group, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, the Chamber of Commerce spent $16 million in just 2003, lobbying the government on various business issues, including class action reform. (Pam Martens, Obama's Money Cartel: How he's fronted for the most vicious firms on Wall Street, *CounterPunch*, February 23, 2008)[119]THE SENATOR FROM CITIBANK

The role of Citigroup, where former Clinton Secretary of the Treasury Robert Rubin is one of the leading personalities, is very instructive. We should remember that former Senator Tom

Daschle, one of Obama's leading surrogates, is notorious as the Senator from Citibank, since this dubious financial institution was long one of the largest single employers in South Dakota. Obama's newest economics controller, Jason Furman, comes from Rubin's reactionary Hamilton Project, a nest of monetarists attempting to camouflage their intentions under a few shreds of center-left cover. Martens asks:

> So, how should we react when we learn that the top contributors to the Obama campaign are the very Wall Street firms whose shady mortgage lenders buried the elderly and the poor and minority under predatory loans? How should we react when we learn that on the big donor list is Citigroup, whose former employee at CitiFinancial testified to the Federal Trade Commission that it was standard practice to target people based on race and educational level, with the sales force winning bonuses called "Rocopoly Money" (like a sick board game), after "blitz" nights of soliciting loans by phone? How should we react when we learn that these very same firms, arm in arm with their corporate lawyers and registered lobbyists, have weakened our ability to fight back with the class-action vehicle? (Pam Martens, Obama's Money Cartel: How he's fronted for the most vicious firms on Wall Street, *CounterPunch*, February 23, 2008)

Martens goes on to ask, in despair:

> Should there be any doubt left as to who owns our government? The very same cast of characters making the Obama hit parade of campaign loot are the clever creators of the industry solutions to the wave of foreclosures gripping this nation's poor and middle class, effectively putting the solution in the hands of the robbers. The names of these programs (that have failed to make a dent in the problem) have the same vacuous ring: Hope Now; Project Lifeline. (Pam Martens, Obama's Money Cartel: How he's fronted for the most vicious firms on Wall Street, *CounterPunch*, February 23, 2008)

The answer to this problem is quite simply the necessity of opposing Obama by exposing his actual role as a servant of the financier elite.

LOBBYISTS: BUNDLERS FOR BARKY

Martens is not the only one to notice the glaring contradiction between Obama's "no lobbyists" pledge, and a veritable river of swag that runs from the lobbying offices on K Street into the coffers of the Obama campaign. A major article in *USA Today* noted:

> Barack Obama often boasts he is "the only candidate who isn't taking a dime from Washington lobbyists," yet his fundraising team includes 38 members of law firms that were paid $138 million last year to lobby the federal government, records show. Those lawyers, including 10 former federal lobbyists, have pledged to raise at least $3.5 million for the Illinois senator's presidential race. Employees of their firms have given Obama's campaign $2.26 million, a *USA Today* analysis of campaign finance data shows. Which lawyers bundle money? Thirty-one of the 38 are law firm partners, who typically receive a share of their firm's lobbying fees. At least six of them have some managerial authority over lobbyists. "It makes no difference whether the person is a registered lobbyist or the partner of a registered lobbyist, if the person is raising money to get access or curry favor," said Michael Malbin, director of the Campaign Finance Institute, a non-partisan think tank. Obama spokesman Tommy Vietor said that while Obama's refusal to take money from lobbyists "isn't a perfect solution or symbol, it does reflect Obama's record of trying to change the way that Washington does business." He declined to elaborate. Lobbyists have long played key fundraising and policymaking roles for candidates, and

lobbyists are raising money for both Hillary Rodham Clinton and John McCain. Obama fundraisers who work for law firms that lobby and share the fees include:

•Allan Katz, a Florida lawyer who chairs the government relations practice of Akerman Senterfitt. The firm took in $3.6 million for Washington lobbying last year, according to public records compiled by the non-partisan Center for Responsive Politics. The firm touts on its website "an enviable level of access" for clients.

•Mark Alderman, managing partner of Philadelphia's WolfBlock law firm. The firm's lobbying subsidiary earned $930,000 in Washington last year representing clients including defense contractor Lockheed Martin, records show.

•Scott Blake Harris, managing partner of Harris, Wiltshire & Grannis, a Washington telecommunications law firm. Harris withdrew as a lobbyist for Microsoft and Cisco in June, but his partners still lobby, he said. (Ken Dilanian, *USA Today*, April 16, 2008)

As could be expected, most of these lobbyists claimed that their hefty contributions had nothing whatsoever to do with their lobbying practice, but this was obviously eyewash. Obama is obviously living a lie. This article was accompanied by the following highly instructive chart, which ought to be required reading for the Obama cultists who still believe that their Savior is going to reform the way Washington works, despite the fact that he is beholden to an immense array of interest groups, including some of the most predatory ones in town. The chart shows contributions to the Obama campaign from law firms that also do lobbying work. Either we assume that Obama is getting all this money because of his pretty face, or else it is clear that these lobbyists are paying for access and influence in the usual Washington mode, but on a vastly expanded scale.

OBAMA FUNDRAISERS: LOBBYIST TIES

These 38 fundraisers for Barack Obama's presidential campaign work for law firms that have lobbying operations in Washington, D.C. The dollar figure reflects the minimum amount each has pledged to raise for the campaign.

Bundler	Min. pledge	Location	Firm
Scott Harris	$200,000	DC	Harris, Wiltshire and Grannis
Allan J. Katz	$200,000	FL	Akerman Senterfitt
Michael Lawson	$200,000	CA	Skadden, Arps
John Levi	$200,000	IL	Sidley Austin
Karol Mason	$200,000	GA	Alston & Bird
Thomas J. Perrelli	$200,000	VA	Jenner & Block
Thomas A. Reed	$200,000	VA	Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis
Christina Tchen	$200,000	IL	Skadden, Arps
Tony West	$200,000	CA	Morrison & Foerster
Mark L. Alderman	$100,000	PA	Wolf, Block, Schorr and Solis-Cohen
Timothy M. Broas	$100,000	MD	Winston & Strawn
Peter Bynoe	$100,000	IL	DLA Piper
Gregory B. Craig	$100,000	DC	Williams & Connolly
Norman Eisen	$100,000	DC	Zuckerman Spaeder

Nicole Lamb-Hale	$100,000	MI	Foley & Lardner
Andrew Schapiro	$100,000	NY	Mayer Brown
Charles C. Adams Jr.	$50,000	Switzerland	Hogan & Hartson
David Burd	$50,000	DC	Arnold & Porter
Tom Cole	$50,000	IL	Sidley Austin
Michael H. Dardzinski	$50,000	China	Reed Smith
Howard W. Gutman	$50,000	MD	Williams & Connolly
Jeff Horwitz	$50,000	NY	Proskauer Rose
David C. Jacobson	$50,000	IL	Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal
Hrishi Karthikeyan	$50,000	DC	Covington & Burling
Ronald Kirk	$50,000	TX	Vinson & Elkins
William T. Lake	$50,000	DC	WilmerHale
Edward Lazarus	$50,000	CA	Akin Gump
Jack Levin	$50,000	IL	Kirkland & Ellis
Kenneth G. Lore	$50,000	DC	Bingham McCutchen
Charles B. Ortner	$50,000	NY	Proskauer Rose
Susan Pravda	$50,000	MA	Foley & Lardner
Paul N. Roth	$50,000	NY	Schulte Roth & Zabel
John Schmidt	$50,000	IL	Mayer Brown
Robert M. Sussman*	$50,000	DC	Latham & Watkins
Kathryn Thomson	$50,000	VA	Sidley Austin
Barry B. White	$50,000	MA	Foley Hoag
Steven M. Zager	$50,000	TX	Akin Gump
Robert S. Litt	n/a	MD	Arnold & Porter

* Robert M. Sussman retired as a partner on December 31, 2007

Source: Obama for America, Center for Responsive Politics, Public Citizen, from *USA Today*, April 16, 2008

OBAMA A CREATURE OF GOLDMAN SACHS, TOP OIL SPECULATORS

David Brooks of the *New York Times*, an avid chronicler of oligarchical affairs, discovered with some surprise that Obama is far more venal even than his Republican rival, Senator McCain. Brooks also found that one of the most important centers of bundling for Barky was the infamous Wall Street investment house Goldman Sachs. Goldman Sachs, along with Morgan Stanley, was responsible for the creation of the London ICE exchange or IntercontinentalExchange, the offshore vehicle which now handles approximately one half of the oil futures contracts in the world. Goldman Sachs co-founded ICE as a means of escaping even the desultory regulatory regime of the US Commodity Futures Trading Commission, in favor of the nonexistent regulatory regime in Great Britain. A back of the envelope calculation suggests that Goldman Sachs alone is responsible for about 40% of the oil speculation which has doubled the price of oil for American consumers of petroleum products over the last year. With Goldman Sachs employees checking in as Obama's biggest bundlers, we leave it to the imagination of the reader whether Obama will bring much enthusiasm to the task of reining in this gang of hyenas if he ever gets to the White House. Brooks wrote:

> As in other recent campaigns, lawyers account for the biggest chunk of Democratic donations. They have donated about $18 million to Obama, compared with about $5 million to John McCain, according to data released on June 2 and available at OpenSecrets.org. People who work at securities and investment companies have given Obama about $8 million, compared with $4.5 for McCain. People who work in communications and electronics have given Obama about $10 million, compared with $2 million for McCain. Professors and other people who work in education have given Obama roughly $7 million, compared with $700,000 for McCain. Real estate professionals have given Obama $5 million, compared with $4 million for McCain. Medical professionals have given Obama $7 million, compared with $3 million for McCain. Commercial bankers have given Obama $1.6 million, compared with $1.2 million for McCain. Hedge fund and private equity managers have given Obama about $1.6 million, compared with $850,000 for McCain. When you break it out by individual companies, you find that employees of Goldman Sachs gave more to Obama than workers of any other employer. The Goldman Sachs geniuses are followed by employees of the University of California, UBS, JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, National Amusements, Lehman Brothers, Harvard and Google. At many of these workplaces, Obama has a three- or four-to-one fund-raising advantage over McCain. (David Brooks, *New York Times*, July 1, 2008)

OBAMA FINANCED BY THE MERCHANTS OF DEATH

Obama's ties with Wall Street are bad enough, and then there is the matter of his strong support from certain defense contractors who deal with the Pentagon, otherwise known as the merchants of death. Among Obama's strongest backers in the defense contractor community, we must of course again mention the Crown family of General Dynamics fame, who belong to Obama's intimate circle of Chicago supporters. General Dynamics builds nuclear submarines and some light tanks that have not given a very good account of themselves in Iraq. The *Washington Post* pointed to crown is a key component of the Obama lucre cartel:

> The Chicago contingent also includes James Crown, a director of General Dynamics, the military contractor in which his family holds a large stake. The company has been the beneficiary of at least one Obama earmark, a request to spend $8 million on a high-explosive technology program for the Army's Bradley Fighting Vehicle. The program got $1.3 million. The descendants of Henry Crown, architect of a great American fortune, James Crown and his family donated more than $128,000 to Obama's U.S. Senate race in 2004. Crown was among the first people Obama approached as he contemplated a White House run Crown said he and Obama never discussed General Dynamics, which, with its focus on Army programs, is a defense contractor that has benefited directly from the Iraq war. Obama's opposition to the war never meant that he wanted the armed forces to be poorly equipped, Crown said. "I stand in agreement with what he has said [about the Iraq war.] Those who work in the defense industry are extremely focused on the national defense," he said. "That doesn't mean we want to be fighting wars."[120]

CROWN'S BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLE: AN "EXPLODING COFFIN"

Crown is one of the bosses of General Dynamics, which produces the woefully inadequate Bradley fighting vehicle. Here is the opinion of an experienced military man about what this vehicle, a cross between a light tank and armored personnel carrier, is worth.

> The M2 Bradley Infantry Fighting vehicle is a three million dollar version of the World War II Sherman tank, with room in the back for six guys. It weighs 30 tons, so it's too heavy to be picked up by any helicopter and too large to be carried by a C-130, and is not truly amphibious. It's expensive to operate, expensive to maintain, and only carries six infantrymen. Worst of all, it's a huge vehicle with little armor and packed with explosive TOW missiles. The idea of mechanized vehicles is to carry infantrymen behind tanks until they are needed. However, the US Army cannot field a vehicle to safely transport a dozen grunts, it must add every known gadget to field a golden "fighting vehicle". The M1A1 tank is a fighting vehicle, the Bradley is an exploding coffin. The Bradley is almost 10 feet tall, but can only carry six grunts who are trapped inside with explosive TOW missiles. During live fire tests of the Bradley, a hit usually ignited a stored TOW causing massive explosions. The Bradley looks good in peacetime exercises, including the invasion of Iraq, but it will not do well with an enemy who shoots back. The Army has tried to counter criticism by putting extra armor on the upgraded Bradleys, but its still a huge target with little armor slope. Upgraded Bradleys are weighted down with external armor plates, but even these can be penetrated with light infantry anti-armor weapons.[121]

Crown's General Dynamics also manufactures the Stryker troop carrier, which has been associated with heavy losses in the Iraq war because of its vulnerability to rocket propelled grenades and roadside bombs. Recent press accounts have emphasized the inadequate engineering that went into the high-priced Stryker:

> The Strykers are the first new combat vehicle in 20 years and a cornerstone in the Army's efforts to transform itself into a new, 21st-century fighting force. Critics say the eight-wheeled vehicles each costing an average of $1.5 million may be a costly misstep on that path. The Army recently discovered flaws in the Stryker's ceramic composite armor and is racing to fix it. The vehicle's remote weapon systems can't be fired accurately on the move, and soldiers must get out of the vehicle to reload, exposing them to enemy fire.[122]

As the Iraq war ground on, Stryker losses increased because they had not been designed to deal with the weapons deployed by the Iraqi national resistance:

> A string of heavy losses from powerful roadside bombs has raised new questions about the vulnerability of the Stryker, the Army's troop-carrying vehicle hailed by supporters as the key to a leaner, more mobile force. Since the Strykers went into action in violent Diyala province north of Baghdad two months ago, losses of the vehicles have been rising steadily, U.S. officials said. A single infantry company in Diyala lost five Strykers this month in less than a week, according to soldiers familiar with the losses, who spoke on condition of anonymity because they are not authorized to release the information. The overall number of Strykers lost recently is classified. In one of the biggest hits, six American soldiers and a journalist were killed when a huge bomb exploded beneath their Stryker…. It was the biggest one-day loss for the battalion in more than two years.[123]

In order to stop these unsustainable losses, the Pentagon had to invest $22 billion to set up an assembly line capable of turning out 1,200 Mine Resistant Ambush Protected trucks per month. But it was not General Dynamics that provided these vehicles, but International Military and Government, a subsidiary of Navistar International. These new vehicles with their characteristic V-shaped hulls were able to reduce losses significantly. How many GIs died to pad Crown's bottom line? Look for more sweetheart contracts to go to General Dynamics in any future Obama regime, independent of the merits, and look for the death rates among American troops to go up accordingly.

OBAMA FRONTS FOR RIVERBOAT GAMBLERS

A few other components of Obama's Chicago Mafia are also worth mentioning; these include notorious low-wage employers and union busters like the Pritzker family, who have made their fortune exploiting the underpaid Hispanic cleaning ladies in their hotel chains, and also gambling interests inevitably redolent of organized crime:

> The Chicago finance elite has been a major hub of Obama's fundraising, led by Pritzker. Another major figure is billionaire Neil G. Bluhm, a hotel and office building developer. But Bluhm has posed a symbolic problem for Obama in Pennsylvania, site of an April 22 primary, because his latest endeavor is a push to open a controversial casino along the Philadelphia waterfront. "Bluhm's path crossed Obama's in 2003, when Bluhm pursued a gaming license for a Chicago riverboat. That June, he gave the first $1,000 of what would become more than $78,000 in contributions from him and his family. In 2006, Pennsylvania awarded Bluhm one of two coveted Philadelphia gambling licenses. Last year, his partners in the project, called Sugar House, made $2,300 donations to Obama, including nearly $50,000 from the Philadelphia law firm Cozen O'Connor, which represents him in the deal. Bluhm said that the gaming project "has got nothing to do with" his support for Obama and that the two have never discussed it. "My interest in him is, I think he's inspirational, I think he will enormously improve our economy and our relations with other countries," he said.[124]

The impudence of a riverboat gambler who says that he is paying for inspiration, not for political influence and favors, is one of the many grim ironies of the Obama cash cartel.

THE JOSHUA SPEECH AND OBAMA'S MEGALOMANIA

During the course of 2007, Obama began to experience his delusions of grandeur in public. As he basked in the adulation of his adoring and fawning coterie, his tendency towards megalomania became exacerbated. From this point on, Obama's megalomania was destined to emerge in the wake of every significant uptick in his march towards power. A foundational document for the analysis of Obama as a case study in megalomania is provided by the speech he delivered to the commemoration of the Selma, Alabama voting rights protest on March 4, 2007. Here Obama is prepared to concede that Martin Luther King and others of his generation can be compared to the prophetic figure of Moses in the Old Testament, but at the same time he demands that he, the young whelp and upstart, be recognized as the new Joshua, the lieutenant of Moses and the civic organizer destined to lead black America into the promised land. In reality, as we have attempted to show, Obama must be considered a continuation of the anti-Martin Luther King tradition inaugurated when the Ford Foundation massively funded black power demagogues hostile to Martin Luther King during the last years of King's life. Note Obama's ritual nods to his teachers of the Reverend Jeremiah Wright cabal:

> But I got a letter from a friend of some of yours named Reverend Otis Moss Jr. in Cleveland, and his son, Otis Moss III is the Pastor at my church and I must send greetings from Dr. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr. but I got a letter giving me encouragement and saying how proud he was that I had announced and encouraging me to stay true to my ideals and my values and not to be fearful. And he said, if there's some folks out there who are questioning whether or not you should run, just tell them to look at the story of Joshua because you're part of the Joshua generation. So I just want to talk a little about Moses and Aaron and Joshua, because we are in the presence today of a lot of Moseses. We're in the presence today of giants whose shoulders

> we stand on, people who battled, not just on behalf of African-Americans but on behalf of all of America; that battled for America's soul, that shed blood , that endured taunts and torment and in some cases gave — torment and in some cases gave the full measure of their devotion. Like Moses, they challenged Pharaoh, the princes, powers who said that some are atop and others are at the bottom, and that's how it's always going to be. I'm here because somebody marched. I'm here because you all sacrificed for me. I stand on the shoulders of giants. I thank the Moses generation; but we've got to remember, now, that Joshua still had a job to do. As great as Moses was, despite all that he did, leading a people out of bondage, he didn't cross over the river to see the Promised Land. God told him your job is done. You'll see it. You'll be at the mountain top and you can see what I've promised. What I've promised to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. You will see that I've fulfilled that promise but you won't go there. We're going to leave it to the Joshua generation to make sure it happens. There are still battles that need to be fought; some rivers that need to be crossed. Like Moses, the task was passed on to those who might not have been as deserving, might not have been as courageous, find themselves in front of the risks that their parents and grandparents and great grandparents had taken. That doesn't mean that they don't still have a burden to shoulder, that they don't have some responsibilities. The previous generation, the Moses generation, pointed the way. They took us 90% of the way there. We still got that 10% in order to cross over to the other side. So the question, I guess, that I have today is what's called of us in this Joshua generation? What do we do in order to fulfill that legacy; to fulfill the obligations and the debt that we owe to those who allowed us to be here today? Now, I don't think we could ever fully repay that debt. Moses told the Joshua generation; don't forget where you came from. I worry sometimes, that the Joshua generation in its success forgets where it came from. Thinks it doesn't have to make as many sacrifices. Thinks that the very height of ambition is to make as much money as you can, to drive the biggest car and have the biggest house and wear a Rolex watch and get your own private jet, get some of that Oprah money. And I think that's a good thing. There's nothing wrong with making money, but if you know your history, then you know that there is a certain poverty of ambition involved in simply striving just for money. Materialism alone will not fulfill the possibilities of your existence. You have to fill that with something else. You have to fill it with the golden rule. You've got to fill it with thinking about others. And if we know our history, then we will understand that that is the highest mark of service. Second thing that the Joshua generation needs to understand is that the principles of equality that were set forth and were battled for have to be fought each and every day. It is not a one-time thing. I was remarking at the unity breakfast on the fact that the single most significant concern that this Justice Department under this administration has had with respect to discrimination has to do with affirmative action. That they have basically spent all their time worrying about colleges and universities around the country that are given a little break to young African-Americans and Hispanics to make sure that they can go to college, too.[125]

Obama is doubtless familiar with the Strauss-Howe theory of generations, which his campaign uses for profiling his dupes and gulls among generation Xers and the younger set.[126] If so, Obama has misread Strauss and Howe, since he and his ilk do not have the characteristics of a modern Joshua, but rather must be classed among the worshipers of the golden calf, the faction that gave Moses so much trouble as he attempted to lead the Israelites to the Promised Land. Obama's ritual acknowledgment of the foundation-funded racist provocateur Jeremiah Wright — a figure not of austerity, but sybaritic hedonism — and the Ford Foundation grant recipient Otis Moss III only make his membership in the golden calf congregation unmistakable for all. This was also the occasion when Obama attempted to convince the Selma audience that he had been conceived by his

parents, Barack Obama Sr. and Ann Dunham, because they had been inspired by the fervor following the "Bloody Sunday" voting rights demonstration that was commemorated March 4. "There was something stirring across the country because of what happened in Selma, Alabama," he said, "because some folks are willing to march across a bridge. So they got together and Barack Obama Jr. was born. So don't tell me I don't have a claim on Selma, Alabama. Don't tell me I'm not coming home to Selma, Alabama" The problem was that, as we have seen, Obama was born in 1961, and the Selma march occurred four years later, in 1965. The *New York Times* reported that when the senator was asked about the discrepancy later that day, he clarified: "I meant the whole civil rights movement.

OBAMA AS THE CONSUMMATE DIVIDER

The Joshua speech is an important document because it illustrates yet another dimension of Obama's efficacy as a divider and a splitter of the American population so as to leave them open to further attacks by the financier oligarchy. Obama says he wants to bring the American population together, but in practice the net effect of his well-financed presence, backed up by the formidable Trilateral-Bilderberg network, has been to divide the American people six ways to Sunday. Obama divides white against black, black against Hispanic, black against Asian, men against women, and elitists and affluent suburbanites against blue-collar workers. With his spurious and self-serving generational analysis, he can also play old against young in a generational conflict which can further weaken the capacity of the American people to resist what the Trilateral financiers have in store. Obama thus emerges as a fiendishly clever deployment to shatter the American people along lines of race, national origin, religion, gender, class, and generation — quite an achievement for his controllers. Bush the younger, by comparison, is a paragon of national unity. This is why the Trilateraloids were willing to pay top dollar to finance such a mediocrity and attempt to make the entire national debate revolve around his vapid and vacuous personality. One of the included benefits was the likelihood that the Democratic Party would shatter along its fairly obvious fault lines in the aftermath of a catastrophic Obama regime.

THE RACE CARD YET AGAIN

In the course of the Texas primary, it became obvious that Obama was pursuing what some called a "two-track strategy" in his rallies. The candidate of authenticity had two distinct stump speeches, one for black audiences and one for white audiences.

As he campaigns in the Lone Star State, Barack Obama has mostly stuck to his standard stump speech about the economy, health care and Iraq. But when he spoke before a mostly black audience in the coastal, working-class town of Beaumont, he talked about Popeye's fried chicken and individual responsibility. "I have a nine- and a six-year-old daughter, so I know how hard it is to get kids to eat properly," Obama told the audience of about 2000 as he broached the subject of health care at a town hall-style meeting Thursday. "But I also know that if we are, if folks are just letting kids drink eight sodas a day which some parents do. Or you know, even a bag of potato chips for lunch or Popeye's for breakfast –ya'll have Popeye's down in Beaumont? All right. I know some of you all, you get that cold Popeye's out for breakfast! I know! That's why you all laughing. I caught you out. You can't do that! Children have to have proper nutrition." The audience, many of whom waited in line five hours or more for a chance to see Obama, cheered, laughed and gave thunderous applause to the remarks, which he peppered with phrases straight from

a Texas Southern Baptist church. "Can I get an amen here?" Obama said to the cheering crowd as he compelled them to turn the TV off at home and make sure their kids hit the books. But these risks did not resurface later at a rally in Fort Worth, where the audience was decidedly more racially mixed and in a higher income bracket. Gone was the preacher-like cadence. He talked about health care and education, but only made a passing reference to individual responsibility. Political analysts say Obama is using a dual approach to win Tuesday's primaries in Texas and Ohio and the Democratic nomination beyond that — a race-neutral, rousing stump speech for most audiences and a sermon like dialogue reserved for lower-income black audiences. "I called it a two-track strategy," said University of Maryland political science professor Ron Walters, who has written extensively about blacks. "This requires two different kinds of politics and Barack Obama has been able to synthesize both of them." (Susan Ferrecchio, *Washington Examiner*, March 3, 2008)

THE MEDIA SWOON FOR BARKY, THE HOPE POPE

One of the things that Obama's money machine could be used to mobilize was of course the fawning adulation of those press whores who populated the controlled corporate media of this unhappy nation. Here is a sample from the middle phase of the 2008 primaries. Notice how the author tries to establish the unique world historical importance of Obama, and then goes on to compare him to John F. Kennedy, before deciding to throw in Lincoln as well. We can only guess how many of these hack writers were getting paid by the word for such moronic hyperbole:

> The tides of history are rising higher and faster these days. Read them right and ride them, or be crushed. And then along comes Barack Obama, with the kinds of gifts that appear in politics but once every few generations. There is a sense of dignity, even majesty, about him, and underneath that ease lies a resolute discipline. It's not just that he is eloquent — with that ability to speak both to you and to speak for you — it's that he has a quality of thinking and intellectual and emotional honesty that is extraordinary. I first learned of Barack Obama from a man who was at the highest level of George W. Bush's political organization through two presidential campaigns. He described the first-term senator from Illinois as "a walking hope machine." All this was made clearer by the contrast with Hillary Clinton, a capable and personable senator who has run the kind of campaign that reminds us of what makes us so discouraged about our politics. Her campaign certainly proved her experience didn't count for much: She was a bad manager and a bad strategist who naturally and easily engaged in the politics of distraction, trivialization and personal attack. The similarities between John Kennedy and Barack Obama come to mind easily: the youth, the magnetism, the natural grace, the eloquence, the wit, the intelligence, the hope of a new generation. But it might be more to the point to view Obama as Lincolnesque in his own origins, his sobriety and what history now demands. (Jann S. Wenner, "A New Hope," *Rolling Stone*, March 20, 2008)[127]

The hysteria of this encomium was in inverse proportion to Obama's substantive record. After spending 2005 and 2006 pretending to be a senator, but in reality planning his presidential campaign, the Illinois Messiah dropped out of his legislative functions completely, missing virtually every vote. According to one press account, Obama had missed "the most votes of any Democratic presidential hopeful in the Senate over the last two months, including a vote on an Iran resolution he has blasted Sen. Hillary Clinton for supporting." The Illinois Democrat had missed nearly 80 percent of all votes after September 2007. This was a great advantage, since no one could really know what he stood for, if anything.

REUNION OF CARTER-ERA TRILATERALS TO SUPPORT OBAMA

Given Obama's Trilateral-Rockefeller pedigree, it was not surprising to see that the supporters of the Messiah's campaign resembled nothing so much as a reunion of retreads from the catastrophic Jimmy Carter regime of 1977 to 1981, an administration which had set in motion the disastrous Great U-Turn of the United States towards deindustrialization, a low wage economy, pessimism, and collapse. Now the Carter veterans gathered around their new clone, Obama. One of these was Paul Adolph Volcker, the Trilateral boss of the Federal Reserve who had placed the United States firmly on the course of deindustrialization and decay. Volcker was clearly overcome with admiration for Obama:

> "After 30 years in government, serving under five Presidents of both parties and chairing two non-partisan Commissions on the Public Service, [said Volcker,] I have been reluctant to engage in political campaigns. The time has come to overcome that reluctance," Mr. Volcker said …. "However, it is not the current turmoil in markets or the economic uncertainties that have impelled my decision. Rather, it is the breadth and depth of challenges that face our nation at home and abroad. Those challenges demand a new leadership and a fresh approach." He concluded: "It is only Barack Obama, in his person, in his ideas, in his ability to understand and to articulate both our needs and our hopes that provide the potential for strong and fresh leadership. That leadership must begin here in America but it can also restore needed confidence in our vision, our strength, and our purposes right around the world."[128]

This is from the man who succeeded in doing what Hitler, Tojo, Stalin, and Mao failed to do, that is to say laying waste to the industrial might of the United States with interest-rate policies so disruptive that they outclassed even nuclear weapons. Volcker's endorsement was a real feather in Obama's cap.

President Carter himself had signaled a preference for Obama early on, but waited until the primaries were about over before he formally endorsed Sen. Obama, D-Ill., after the South Dakota and Montana primaries. '"The fact is the Obama people already know they have my vote when the polls close tonight," President Carter told The Associated Press earlier in the day.'[129]

The list would not be complete without the current patriarch of the Rockefeller family, John D. Rockefeller IV, who has increasingly taken over from the now decrepit David Rockefeller, the last surviving member of the Rockefeller Brothers generation.

Sen. Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) endorsed fellow Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) …. Rockefeller, chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said Obama's position on the Iraq war in 2002 was partially behind his decision to support the Illinois senator. "The indisputable fact is Barack Obama was right about Iraq when many of us were wrong," Rockefeller said in a statement. "It was a tough call and the single greatest national security question, and mistake, of our time."[130]

BRZEZINSKI'S GLOWING ENDORSEMENT OF OBAMA

The most important endorsement of all was of course that of Zbigniew Brzezinski, the cofounder of the Trilateral Commission with David Rockefeller 35 years ago, and the person whose criminal energy has only grown with the passing years when it comes to his lifelong obsession of destroying Russia. Brzezinski was effusive in his praise of the Illinois Senator:

> Obama "recognizes that the challenge is a new face, a new sense of direction, a new definition of America's role in the world," Brzezinski remarked during an interview on Bloomberg

> Television's "Political Capital with Al Hunt." "Obama is clearly more effective and has the upper hand," Brzezinski said. "He has a sense of what is historically relevant, and what is needed from the United States in relationship to the world." Brzezinski dismissed Hillary Clinton as totally inadequate: "Being a former first lady doesn't prepare you to be president. President Truman didn't have much experience before he came to office. Neither did John Kennedy," Brzezinski said. Clinton's foreign-policy approach is "very conventional," Brzezinski added "I don't think the country needs to go back to what we had eight years ago." "There is a need for a fundamental rethinking of how we conduct world affairs," he continued. "And Obama seems to me to have both the guts and the intelligence to address that issue and to change the nature of America's relationship with the world." (Bloomberg, "Zbigniew Brzezinski Endorses Barack Obama," Friday, August 24, 2007)

Serious students of history immediately recognized that this last point was an indispensable part of classic fascist political doctrine; see the final chapter of this book.

BRZEZINSKI ATTEMPTS TO CAMOUFLAGE HIS DOMINANCE OF OBAMA

The columnist Colbert I. King of the Katherine Meyer Graham stable complained about a winter 2008 report in *Newsweek* magazine that the Clinton campaign was attacking Zbigniew Brzezinski to get at Obama.

> "In a January conference call with American Jewish organization leaders, the magazine reports, Clinton senior adviser Ann Lewis attempted to denigrate Obama's pro-Israel credentials by pointing out that Zbigniew Brzezinski is Obama's "chief foreign policy adviser." Brzezinski, *Newsweek* noted, "has a reputation that is close to toxic in the American Jewish community."' That sounded fair enough; Brzezinski was after all the father of modern Islamic fundamentalism and the architect of the Khomeini regime in Iran. But for the devotees of Obama, any criticism is ipso facto illegitimate. Colbert I. King took the occasion to whine: "it mattered not to Clinton's clan that Brzezinski is not a key Obama advisor, that Obama has said he has had lunch with Brzezinski only once or that they have exchanged e-mails perhaps three times. Linking Obama to someone who is anathema to the Jewish community was the point to be scored — even if it meant committing a foul." (*Washington Post*, March 1, 2008)

Colbert I. King is a liar. As we show in this book, Zbigniew Brzezinski is more than an adviser to Obama — he is his controller, and the developer of the entire profile which Obama is using to run for president. Unless and until Obama abandons his obsessive secrecy and tells the full story of his years at Columbia University, we will persist in the suspicion that Obama was in fact recruited by Zbigniew Brzezinski at Columbia in 1981-1983 as a member of the left CIA stable of foundation-funded political assets. As far as Obama's implausible denials are concerned, they leave the door wide open to the obvious possibility that Brzezinski gives Obama his orders at breakfast or dinner, or that he gives his instructions to the candidate by instant messaging or by phone. Henry Kissinger is famous for never giving the clients of his influence peddling business even a single scrap of paper with writing on it; maybe Brzezinski operates with the same kind of secrecy. As we show elsewhere in this book, there were times during the Carter administration when Brzezinski had to be kept off the TV networks and hidden in the closet; maybe Zbig has figured out that if you are Dr. Strangelove it is best to keep a low profile. But the irrefutable fact remains that when Brzezinski introduced Obama on the occasion of his first major foreign policy speech, the Polish revanchist was unquestionably billed as the campaign's senior foreign policy adviser.

BRZEZINSKI A GROWING LIABILITY FOR OBAMA

Thanks in part to the work of the present writer, the Brzezinski connection became a serious embarrassment to Obama, just as the Polish revanchist (in 1980 arguably the most unpopular Democratic official since LBJ) had been a huge albatross around the neck of Carter. Here are some relevant excerpts from a transcript of the National Public Radio program "To the Point," in which the *Jerusalem Post* correspondent Caroline Glick and the Obama Middle East advisor Mel Levine[131] comment on who is actually running the senator's foreign policy in that part of the world:

> Warren Olney: (directed to Caroline Glick) You have expressed very severe reservations about Senator Obama and have reservations in regards to his stance on Israel. In particular his association with some of his advisors and to Jeremiah Wright. Can you speak to some of the concerns you have about Senator Obama.
>
> Caroline Glick: Senator Obama surrounds himself with people who are overtly either anti Semitic like Rev. Wright, anti-white like Rev. Wright, anti-American like Rev. Wright, or simply and viscerally anti-Israel like Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Robert Malley, and Samantha Power his former advisor, and then there are people who are messianically anti-Israel like Dan Cursor, the former US Ambassador to Israel and Egypt. And each time then it's pointed out to him (Obama) that these people have made statements and followed policies that are inherently hostile to Israel, he says, "Well, these aren't reflective of my views." And the fact is, among all of these people there are no counter balancing force among Barack's advisors or friends or Rev. Wright's that is supportive of Israel. So, I find the whole perception that he can say, I wasn't at church then, or the fact that Zbig was in Syria the same week that [Hezbollah leader] Imad Mugniyah was assassinated in Damascus, and there is no one on his team that is different from Brzezinski on Israel, so it is all but impossible not to conclude that views of ALL of his advisors are reflective of his views.
>
> Host: Mel Levine would you distinguish yourself from Mr. Zbigniew Brzezinski? And to what extent is Zbig an advisor to Barack Obama?
>
> Mel Levine: I, I, ah, I, ah, um, I'm speechless after what I heard from Ms. Glick. My views on Israel are very clear to anyone I have ever worked with in Congress. I am one of his Middle East Advisors and my views are very different from Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Zbigniew Brzezinski is NOT one his foreign policy advisors, nor one of his advisors at all. This really points out the nature of the type of distortions that have been leveled to Senator Obama for quite some time. And what Ms. Glick has said is completely false." (To the Point, NPR, April 21, 2008)

Obama's attempted sleight of hand was obvious to the world: *Moscow News* referred on April 3, 2008 to "...Zbigniew Brzezinski, who is trying to conceal his involvement with Barack Obama's team." It is worth repeating that, in the wake of the Samantha Power "monster" flap, Zbiggy had been billed in published reports as an advisor to Obama: 'In response to a request for reaction to her resignation earlier today, the office of Brzezinski—another of Obama's foreign policy advisers—relayed the following statement: "I think an expression of regret for using an inappropriate description of Senator Clinton should have sufficed. And I don't think she should have resigned."'[132]

Along with Brzezinski, a key to the entire Obama machine was Soros. House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, an abject failure who stood long ago have been ousted and sent to the back benches, distinguished herself during the primaries by her treachery against Senator Clinton on the question of sexist and misogynistic propaganda favoring Obama. Pelosi pretended to be neutral, but it was

clear that her heart beat only for Barky. In addition to her spontaneous ultra-left sympathies, it was clear that Pelosi was also acting as a servant of Soros, who had one of his top operatives in Pelosi's office:

> Let us connect the dots. In February, 2007, Nancy Pelosi hired Joseph Onek as her Chief Counsel. Mr. Onek is also a chief policy advisor for the Open Society Institute, funded by none other than George Soros. You may be curious about Felix Rohatyn. Mr. Rohatyn is a not only a major financial backer of Nancy Pelosi but he is one of her top economics advisors. Mr. Obama has called for the formation of a National Infrastructure Investment Bank (NIRB). This is a derivative of the Rohatyn-Rudman National Investment Corporation (NIC) first proposed in 2005. Essentially, Mr. Obama is a surrogate for a private investment model controlled by George Soros and those that subscribe to his world monetary monopoly model. The NIRB is nothing more than a fascist economic model.' (noquarterusa.net, June 30, 2008)

Indeed: the NIRB, as Bruce Marshall has shown in *Obama — The Postmodern Coup* would employ the methods of Hjalmar Schacht and his infamous *Mefo* bills to create a post-crash bubble in the wake of the current breakdown crisis.

SMALL DONORS AS A SCREEN FOR FATCAT BUNDLERS

In June 2008, after the Democratic primaries were over, and Obama had less need of the petit bourgeois good government activists who are so important for winning Democratic caucuses, he announced with consummate cynicism that he would not accept the restrictions inherent in public funding for his fall campaign. With exquisite demagogy, Obama and his followers argued that they are fundraising model had already fulfilled the need to democratize campaign finance contributions by mobilizing so many millions of small donors to give their modest pittances and widow's mites for the greater glory of the Perfect Master. We have already seen that the real secret of the Obama campaign was bundling on an unprecedented scale under the cover of Obama's cynical "no lobbyists" propaganda. A more granular analysis of Obama's fundraising revealed that the role of the small donors as compared to the corporate bundlers had been consistently and systematically overstated by himself and his campaign flacks. One researcher reported

> …that Obama received more than two-thirds (68 percent) of his first quarter 2007 fundraising total "from donations of $1000 or more." Obama has "played up populist themes of [campaign finance] reform," trumpeting his '"large number of small donations" and claiming (in the Senator's words) to be "launch[ing]a fundraising drive that isn't about dollars." But his astonishing first-quarter campaign [2007] finance haul of $25.7 million included $17.5 million from "big donors" ($1000 and up) - a sum higher than the much more genuinely populist John Edwards' total take ($14 million) from all donors. According to *Chicago Sun Times* columnist Lynn Sweet: "Obama talks about transforming politics and touts the donations of 'ordinary' people to his campaign, but a network of more than 100 elite Democratic 'bundlers' is raising millions of dollars for his White House bid. The Obama campaign prefers the emphasis to be on the army of small donors who are giving — and raising — money for Obama. In truth, though, there are two parallel narratives — and the other is that Obama is also heavily reliant on wealthy and well-connected Democrats. 'Bundlers' are people who solicit their networks for donations and, at the elite giving levels, often get some assistance from campaign fund-raising professionals. Each of the 138 Obama bundlers promised to raise at least $50,000, and many are from Chicago, not surprising since Chicago billionaire Penny Pritzker is the national finance chairwoman. Among those from the city are major Democratic donors Lou Sussman, who was

> John Kerry's chief of fund-raising in 2004; Betty Lu [Klutznick] Saltzman, one of Obama's biggest boosters; personal-injury attorney Bob Clifford; Capri Capital CEO Quintin Primo; activists Marilyn Katz and Michael Bauer, Ariel Capital's John Rogers and Mellody Hobson. Hollywood moguls David Geffen and Jeffrey Katzenberg; a string of Harvard Law School friends; Broadway producer Margo Lion, and Bill Kennard, managing director of the Carlyle Group, are among the other bundlers." The hypocrisy is many-sided. Last week Sweet reported that Obama had received large donations from at least eight executives at Island Def Jam, a hip-hop recording firm that markets rap artists Obama has accused of "degrading their sisters" with sexist slurs. (Paul Street, "Big (Deceptive) Talk About 'Small Donations,'" Zmag)[133]

In this interpretation, the swarms of small contributors function as a kind of screening operation for the main force units of the Obama money cartel, who are the rapacious corporate bundlers. When Obama finally turned away from public funding, many commentators joined Obama in his cynicism, speculating that this whole issue had simply been a smokescreen for Democratic attacks on their better funded Republican rivals in the first place. Prominent among the cynics was, as usual, the oligarchical apologist David Brooks:

> The media and the activists won't care (they were only interested in campaign-finance reform only when the Republicans had more money). Meanwhile, Obama's money is forever. He's got an army of small donors and a phalanx of big money bundlers, including, according to *The Washington Post,* Kenneth Griffin of the Citadel Investment Group; Kirk Wager, a Florida trial lawyer; James Crown, a director of General Dynamics; and Neil Bluhm, a hotel, office and casino developer. (David Brooks, *New York Times*, June 20, 2008)[134]

RUPERT MURDOCH SUPPORTS OBAMA, LATE MAY 2008

Obama is intrinsically a creature of what may be called in general terms the center-left side of the US-UK financier establishment. This wing of the banking community is grouped around names like David Rockefeller, George Soros, Robert Rubin, Felix Rohatyn, and Goldman Sachs. Its political spokesmen include James Baker III, former Congressman Lee Hamilton, Pelosi, the Kennedy family, and others. During 2007, it had been possible to distinguish another faction which could be associated with the names of George Shultz, Rupert Murdoch, Tony Blair, and various right-wing figures in Wall Street. During the primary season, it was significant that many of the revelations which so damaged Obama came from O'Reilly, Hannity, and other commentators employed by Rupert Murdoch's Fox News Channel. It was therefore significant when arch-reactionary Rupert Murdoch announced that he too was smitten by the Obama craze.

> "We're on the verge of a complete phenomenon," Murdoch said. "Politicians are at an all-time low and are despised by 80% of the public, and then you've got a candidate trying to put himself out above it all. He's become a rock star. It's fantastic. "There are a lot of problems. The education system in this country is a total disgrace." Murdoch heaped praise on Obama, saying he was a "highly intelligent man with a great record at Harvard", but stopped short of a full personal endorsement because he wanted "to meet him personally." The Obama phenomenon and undoubtedly the recession and everyone getting hurt... the average American family today is really financially hurting and that all bodes well for him," he said. "He may not carry Florida because the Jewish people are suspicious of him, and so are Hispanics. But he'll probably add Ohio and others. He will probably win." Despite saying he was a friend of John McCain, Murdoch said the Republican presidential nominee had "a lot of problems." "McCain has been in congress a long time and you've got to make too many compromises," he said.

> "What does he really stand for? He's a patriot - he's a friend of mine and a really decent guy - but he's unpredictable. "[He] doesn't know much about the economy and - I say this sympathetically - I think he has a lot of problems." (*London Guardian*, May 30, 2008)

In July, billionaire oligarch Warren Buffett participated in Obama's meeting of economists and financiers along with Paul Adolph Volcker, Robert Rubin, and a few token labor leaders. Now, there could be no doubt whatsoever that Obama was indeed the consensus candidate of the Wall Street financier establishment and its British cousins. This provided thinking persons with the most powerful motivation to mobilize against Obama.

THE OBAMA MONEY MACHINE SPUTTERS, JULY 2008

Yet, Obama's path to financial supremacy was not quite that simple. Senator Clinton had mobilized significant numbers of wealthy contributors. Many of these persons of considerable means had been thoroughly antagonized by the scurrilous sexism and misogyny of the Obama campaign. But, his vision clouded by his own rising megalomania, Obama assumed that at the end of the primary season, these traditional Democratic Party financial backers would fall into line and filled his coffers for the fall. A key turning point was a meeting for Democratic fatcats at the Mayflower Hotel on K Street in Washington, where Obama held forth behind closed doors before a group of deeply suspicious Hillary backers. Accounts of what had gone on in this tense and heated meeting filtered out only gradually through the media:

> "I would say he was pretty underwhelming," a longtime Democratic activist said several days after he and some 200 other big-money supporters of Hillary Clinton's failed presidential campaign met with the victor, Barack Obama, in Washington on June 26. … the tone of what really happened inside the locked ballroom was quite different once Obama and Hillary Clinton had their cordial say and the floor was opened for questions. The first "questioner," an angry woman from New York, demanded a roll call of presidential preference at the Denver convention. Next came another distraught woman who declared that Clinton's candidacy was the victim of "misogyny." One participant told me, "This is as tough a crowd as Obama is going to face the whole campaign." But, in the opinion of the Clintonites, he did not open the door to his campaign, because he asked nothing of them. Big-money Democrats who could have expected to be named U.S. ambassadors by a President Hillary Clinton realized that they would get nothing from a President Obama. The train had left the station, and they were not aboard.[135]

Any machine pol knew that patronage handouts could be used to cement an effective political apparatus, but Obama apparently had not even learned that.

SNOBBISH, ARROGANT, AND BORING: OBAMA DEMANDS TRIBUTE

Obama had promised a new politics of hope and change, but in practice he was delivering a bitter and vindictive rebuff to Hillary's supporters. The megalomania exhibited in an earlier stage in the infamous Joshua speech was now taking over more and more of the Perfect Master's personality, causing him to commit stupid and easily avoidable political blunders. Here is another insider account of Obama's wretched performance at this critical meeting:

> 'Hillary, ever the good trooper and team player, gave Barack an intro to her big dollar donors and an opportunity to start the healing. But Barack continues to play the role of petulant bore. He gave an uninspired, mechanical speech. The charm exhibited on the campaign trail that left women swooning, was missing in action. Folks from the Hillary camp described the speech as

snobbish, arrogant, and boring. But it was Barack's response to questions from Hillary's supporters that produced sour bile.

1. What about the Vice President slot? The questioner told Barack that if he named Hillary as the Vice President that the Democrats would be in a position to own the White House for the next 16 years. Barack said nothing to give Clinton supporters hope that he would consider the Senator from New York.

2. Will you help Hillary retire her debt? On this one Barack said he had written a check for $2300 (According to the AP, Michelle gave a check as well. A good first step.) but that his real interest was getting access to the phone lists of Hillary's donors and contacts. Hillary supporters at the gathering sat on their hands, their checkbooks, and their lists.

3. What will you do to stop the sexist smear of Hillary? The questioner noted that Barack did nothing to quell the rampant sexist attacks on Hillary during the campaign and that she continues to be brutalized. Barack said, "Yes, I know. But there is another woman who has been brutalized as well. The healing will take a long time to fix." So there you have it. No vision. No magnanimous gesture. It is still all about Barack and Michelle. Most of the Hillary supporters left unassuaged. Instead of a promise from Barack to tell his supporters to stop the attacks on Hillary and her supporters, he essentially put his hands in his pockets and shrugged his shoulders.' (Larry Johnson, "Breaking News: Obama Bombs," June 26, 2008)[136]

As the primary season progressed, Obama would show himself a weaker and weaker candidate, and more and more anemic as a vote-getter. The same thing occurred with Obama's fundraising, which has relentlessly declined from the peak hysteria among the lemming legions which was registered in February, 2008. In that month, Obama had raked in $55 million, an all-time record for any US presidential campaign in a single calendar month. But in March, as the Reverend Wright scandal began to hit, this had gone down to $40 million. In April, as Obama's blue-collar problems multiplied and the Bill Ayers-Bernardine Dohrn scandal surfaced, Obama declined further to $31 million. In May, as Obama was being widely pronounced as a new George McGovern, the creaking money machine was only capable of bringing in $22 million — only a half a million or so more than McCain, who was supposed to be notoriously weak in this department.

All in all, it was estimated that Obama's fundraising take in the second quarter of 2008 had come in 70% lower than he had targeted. There were reports that Obama was running out of money that he could spend before the beginning of the fall campaign around September 1. His burn rate must have been staggering. In the meantime, even the notoriously pro-Obama *Newsweek* poll plummeted from a lead of 15 points for the Perfect Master down to an advantage of a measly three, with the Gallup tracking poll showing a statistical dead heat with Obama ahead by two.

States like Ohio and Pennsylvania had seen Obama outspend Senator Clinton by margins that were variously estimated at three to one, four to one, and five to one. By July, McCain was ahead of Barky in a Gallup-USA poll. During the primaries, Obama had spent about $285 million just to eke out an outright loss in the popular vote to Senator Clinton. His handlers had boasted at the time he dropped out of public financing in June 2008 that he could raise 'hundreds of millions of dollars over the next few months," including $100 million in June alone.[137]

In reality, it was little more than half that. Obama's hard right turn and multiple flip-flops on issues from the Iraq war to FISA wiretapping to NAFTA to the death penalty to gun control and the looming privatization of Social Security had begun to disillusion even some of his most fanatical lemming legions.

CHAPTER VIII: "OUR SOULS ARE BROKEN" – "FEEL, DON'T THINK! BE VISCERAL!" – MICHELLE OBAMA, POSTMODERN FASCIST IDEOLOGUE

> "Mrs. Obama's statement is nothing less than a renunciation of democracy and an embrace of fascism. The basic idea of liberty is that people have a natural right to live their lives as usual and to be uninvolved and uninformed. And they certainly have a right to expect that their government will butt out of their souls." - (Caroline Glick, "Obama the Savior," *Jerusalem Post*, April 22, 2008)
>
> As fascism's founding father, Benito Mussolini, once said: …"Think with your blood."[138]
>
> "Denken mit eurem Blute!" - "Think with your blood!" - Hitler
>
> One of the slogans of the Nazi S.A. was "Think with your blood." We don't need that.[139]
>
> "Think with your blood." – NSDAP slogan.

On January 31 of this year, the oaf Keith Olbermann donned his most serious face and most indignant tone of voice to rail against George Bush for supporting telecom immunity and revisions to FISA. In a 10-minute "Special Comment," the MSNBC star condemned Bush for wanting to "retroactively immunize corporate criminals," and said that telecom immunity is "an ex post facto law, which would clear the phone giants from responsibility for their systematic, aggressive and blatant collaboration with [Bush's] illegal and unjustified spying on Americans under this flimsy guise of looking for any terrorists who are stupid enough to make a collect call or send a mass email." Olbermann added that telecom amnesty was a "shameless, breathless, literally textbook example of Fascism — the merged efforts of government and corporations that answer to no government." Noting the numerous telecom lobbyists connected to the Bush administration, Olbermann said: "This is no longer just a farce in which protecting telecoms is dressed up as protecting us from terrorists' conference cells. Now it begins to look like the bureaucrats of the Third Reich, trying to protect the Krupp family, the industrial giants, re-writing the laws of Germany for their benefit.[140]

Of course, this was before Obama voted in favor of the rotten compromise with FISA in June 2008. But the important idea here is the thesis about the nature of fascism that Olbermann is trying to sell. In a later chapter, we will show that the Obama campaign is the closest thing to a classic 1919-1922 fascist movement that we have ever seen here in the United States. Fascism, we must always remember, is not a top-down phenomenon; it starts with a radical, anti-establishment protest movement with many grievances – a movement that masquerades as an authentic, grass-roots, bottom-up social phenomenon, and hides the fact that it has been funded and created by bankers. The movement centers around a demagogic mob orator who makes utopian promises about overcoming despair and restoring the position of the nation in the world by refurbishing the mystical unity of the people. The fascist movement struggles for power by striving to weaken and destroy political parties, trade unions, sports groups, clubs, publications, media networks, and all other institutions which might provide support for resistance against fascism.

Later on, if it is successful, the fascist mass movement will transform itself into a totalitarian and dictatorial regime, often liquidating its own plebeian and populist tendencies in the process. As the fascist regime consolidates and solidifies, it gradually comes to resemble an old-style, top-down dictatorship or bureaucratic-authoritarian regime. But the point is that, without the destruction of

opposition institutions by the fascist mass movement, the top-down dictatorship could never have emerged. The view peddled by such figures as Olbermann is that fascism occurs when an authoritarian government becomes more and more oppressive, until it can be called fascist. This is completely anti-historical and fails to explain why a new term of fascism had to be coined just after World War I.

In the United States today, the prevalent understanding of fascist ideology is impoverished in the extreme. If people know anything at all about fascism, they are likely to think of Hitler, and to define him as someone who was a dictator, an anti-Semite, a genocidalist, and a military aggressor. But this leaves out the whole question of fascist ideology and of how a fascist movement could exercise mass appeal and take power in the first place. One of the purposes of this book is to fill in some of these blank spaces. Here we will be concerned with a few characteristic points of traditional and typical fascist ideology as they are reflected in the speeches and activities of Michelle Obama, who has emerged as a clear case of fascist ideology in her own right.

The Obamas are like a pair of onions: they have several layers of built-in deception, and several of these layers must be stripped away to get anywhere near reality. But of the two, it is Michelle who displays her ideology more openly. As the present writer concluded in January-February 2008, and as the *Jerusalem Post* has noted more recently, Mrs. Obama's ideology, as expressed on numerous occasions and in various forms, is in a very strict technical sense fascism. Not fascism in the sense of the all-purpose epithet thrown at adversaries by superficial media whores like Olbermann, but fascism as the belief structure actually embraced and preached by fascist leaders such as the young Mussolini between 1919 in 1922, when the fascist movements were just getting started. It is in this sense that Mrs. Obama qualifies without any doubt as a fascist. We should also take the warning of the *Jerusalem Post* quite seriously. There is no doubt that the Jews have suffered greatly as a result of European fascism. We should therefore take such a warning seriously, and carefully examine whether it is true. The finding here is that Michelle qualifies as the most open fascist ideologue yet seen in an American presidential campaign. But since it is left fascism, more like the young Mussolini rather than the mature and consolidated dictator, the left liberals are quite incapable of noticing this critical fact.

MICHELLE OBAMA: BROKEN SOULS

The principal document illustrating Michelle Obama's fascist world outlook is the standard stump speech which she delivered during the primaries and caucuses of January and February in particular. It was in this phase that the messianic and utopian elements of the Obama campaign were most pronounced, and Michelle appears to have been encouraged to reveal at least something of her actual worldview over audiences. Through her words, Michelle was doubtless communicating strong elements of subliminal and subconscious irrationalism to the excitable lemming legions and Kool-Aid cultists who were her audience. She was suggesting that Obama is a far more irrational and anti-rational candidate than he can afford to admit in public, with vast projects of world transformation and reform which could not yet be articulated. All of this could be read into her constant references to "broken souls" that needed to be healed and made whole; this was a construct into which individual listeners could project vast amounts of their personal fantasy lives, and could imagine themselves emerging in the form of a new species of humanity. Some might hear in Michelle's standard remarks with the veiled promise that Obama is capable of constructing a new world order in which instinctual repression will no longer be necessary, and instinctual gratification will be immediately available — in other words, the eternal antinomian promise to abolish the law and liberate the Freudian id. Exactly this has been the promise of the

false Messiahs of past centuries – the abolition of the law and instant gratification, somewhat in the mode of Herbert Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization*. Such hints were indeed present in the oratory of the irrationalist mass movements between the two world wars, especially in Europe. This is the kind of suggestion which has so often been a premonition of unspeakable horrors in the real world of politics, economics, and military affairs, as a glance at the history of the last two and a quarter centuries will confirm. Here is what Mrs. Obama had to say in her appearance at the University of California Los Angeles on February 15, 2008:

SAMPLE MICHELLE OBAMA STUMP SPEECH, MID-FEBRUARY 2008

In 2008, we are still a nation that is too divided. We live in isolation, and because of that isolation, we fear one another. We don't know our neighbors. We don't talk. We believe that our pain is our own - we don't realize that the struggles and challenges of all of us are the same. We are too isolated. And we are still a nation that is still too cynical. We look at it as them and they as opposed to us - we don't engage because we are still too cynical. Don't get sick in this country - not here. Americans are in debt not because they live frivolously but because someone got sick. And even with insurance, the deductibles and premiums are so high that people are still putting medication and treatments on credit cards. And they can't get out from under. I could go on and on and on, but his is how we're living, people, in 2008. And things have gotten progressively worse throughout my lifetime - through Democratic and Republican administrations - it hasn't gotten better for regular folks. We have lost the understanding that in a democracy, we have a mutual obligation to one another - that we cannot measure our greatness in the society by the strongest and richest of us, but we have to measure our greatness by the least of these. That we have to compromise and sacrifice for one another in order to get things done - that is why I am here, because Barack Obama is the only person in this race who understands that. That before we can work on the problems, we have to fix our souls - our souls are broken in this nation. If we can't see ourselves in one another, we will never make those sacrifices. So I am here right now because I am married to the only person in this race who has a chance at healing this nation. The first major decision he had to make in his life, after college - "Do I go to Wall Street and make money, or do I work for the people?" - Barack worked as a community organizer in some of the toughest neighborhoods on the south side of Chicago. Helping young mothers find their voice and their power - folks who had a reason to be cynical because government had forgotten them long ago. There is no one else in this race who can claim that kind of commitment to people on the ground. No one. And I would think in a nation like ours, - Barack, as Oprah said, is one of the most brilliant men you will meet in our lifetime. Barack is more than ready. He'll be ready today, he'll be ready on day one, he'll be ready in a year from now, five years from now - he is ready. That is not the question. The question is: What are we ready for? Wait, wait, wait - because we say we're ready for change, we say we're ready for change, butcha see, change is HARD. Change will always be hard, and it doesn't happen from the top down. We do not get universal health care, we don't get better schools because somebody else is in the White House. We get change because folks from the grass roots up decide they are sick and tired of other people telling them how their lives will be - when they decide to roll up their sleeves and work. And Barack Obama will require you to work. He is going to demand that you shed your cynicism, that you put down your division, that you come out of your isolation, that you move out of your comfort zones, that you push yourselves to be better, and that you engage. Barack will never allow you to go back to your lives as usual - uninvolved, uninformed...We have young kids all over the world who are looking to this nation, and they are trying to figure out who we are, and what we wanna

> become. We have a chance, not just to make history, but we can change the world. We can change the world - yes we can, yes we can, yes we can, yes we can, yes we can... (Michelle Obama at UCLA, February 15, 2008)[141]

Several sayings in this are notable here. First of all, Michelle effectively evokes the real problems of the inadequate healthcare and other material privations which have been and are the last of the American people on there for decades of overall reactionary Republican domination. But it is equally striking that she does not propose any concrete measures to deal with these problems in the real world. If anything, she rather argues that it is impossible to solve these problems in the world the way it is presently constituted. Her line is that solving social problems and economic problems is impossible, because our souls are defective. So this means that we cannot solve any problems until we proceed to a complete reformation of the human personality itself. This is what she means when she raises the issue of broken souls. How then should the human personality be reformed, in Michelle's opinion? The reference to turning away from Wall Street seems to indicate that a de-emphasis of materialism in favor of spiritual benefits is required. We need to give up our cynicism and think about the poor, she says. Naturally, all of this sententious advice stands in the sharpest contrast to the greed, rapacity, and social climbing of Michelle and Barky, who have become rich by working for the foundations, and by serving the corrupt Chicago political machine. But few of the excitable lemmings attending an Obama rally will have any idea about that. Rather, Michelle goes on to claim that Barky has an absolute monopoly on the path to salvation: he is the only anointed one whose touch can heal and repair the broken souls of the people. There is the strong implication that the process of fixing the broken souls is a painful process which will require some kind of sacrifice, most likely in the form of economic austerity. But not only austerity: Obama, she warns, will require that the population be kept in a constant state of mobilization and activity in the service of the transformation which he means to initiate. These are the main features of a process which will need to a complete utopian transformation of the world. At this point, the crowd intervenes with chanting, in the best Mussolini-D'Annunzio tradition.

Let us now illustrate some of these aspects of Michelle's standard speech by citing formulations she has used on other occasions. The standard stump speech must necessarily very slightly from place to place, and these differences of formulation will give us a further opportunity to see what Michelle has in mind. The uniqueness of Obama as a savior (or Mahdi) is a constant feature. Here is one journalistic account: 'Michelle Obama declared that her husband is a needed anecdote to a troubled nation torn by war and struggles for opportunity. "Before we can fix our problems, we have to fix our souls," she said. "Our souls are broken in this nation. We have lost our way. And it begins with leadership. It begins with inspiration." And: "Barack Obama will require you to work. He is going to demand that you shed your cynicism. That you put down your divisions. That you come out of your isolation, that you move out of your comfort zone . . . Barack will never allow you to go back to your lives as usual - uninvolved, uninformed."'[142]

Obama always appears as the source of transfiguration and beatification of the drab, isolated, and alienated individual lives of his followers, even though this process is accompanied by forms of pain and sacrifice. Here is the same motif in a slightly different form: "We need to fix our souls," she said. "Our souls are broken in this nation. We have lost our way. And it begins with inspiration. It begins with leadership." And again, in yet another variation: "Before we can fix our problems, we have to fix our souls...our souls are broken. It begins with LEADERSHIP. This race is about CHARACTER. I am married to the only person in this race who has a chance of healing this Nation." (Michelle Obama, February 3, 2008)

> The alleged uniqueness of Obama as the indispensable leader recurs again and again: Michelle Obama also urged the crowd not to overlook the importance of inspiration and hope. "Our souls are broken," she said. "And right now we need some inspiration. Inspiration and hope are not words. Everything begins and ends with hope. And the only person in this race who has a chance of getting us where we need to be is Barack Obama."

Sometimes the note of difficulty, sacrifice, and travail becomes more prominent, as here:

> "We need a leader who's going to touch our souls because you see, our souls are broken," Michelle Obama said. "The change Barack is talking about is hard, so don't get too excited because Barack is going to demand that you too be different."

In medieval Europe, there was a tradition that a true King could cure diseases such as scrofula with his mere touch alone: here we see Obama promoted to the level of such a sacral king, without the benefit of the special ancient unctions which were stored in the French case in the cathedral of Rheims. As a rule, the dominant notes of hope and change are tempered by many less prominent references to austerity and sacrifice, leaving no doubt that there is no purgation of the broken soul without pain:

> 'Obama brought her husband's message of hope and change to a standing-room-only crowd. "Our souls are broken in this nation, and we need some inspiration and a whole lot of hope," she told a packed auditorium.… though Obama's speaking style is generally more conversational than that of her husband, she has her own loftier, more rhetorically aspirational moments. "We need a different leadership because our souls are broken. We need to be inspired...to make the sacrifices that are needed to push us to a different place," she said. And, toward the climax of her speech, she said, "Dreaming does count. You need to dream to realize your possibilities.'[143]

At times, selected surrogates are permitted to join in the paean to Obama the savior, but Michelle generally plays the role of the high priestess or Pythoness of the mystery cult of Barky. One such surrogate was Caroline Kennedy, who was used to depict the apostolic succession of Obama from the martyred Kennedy brothers. As Craig Crawford put it, the Kennedys had no choice but to pass the torch to Obama, because their own kids were all in rehab. This account evokes such a liturgical moment:

> At UCLA, Caroline Kennedy called Obama a generational figure "who inspires me the way people say my father inspired them. "It's rare to have a candidate who can help us believe in ourselves and tie that belief to the highest ideals," said Kennedy, who said Obama stands for "the future of our party and the future of our country." Michelle Obama declared that her husband is a needed anecdote to a troubled nation torn by war and struggles for opportunity. "Before we can fix our problems, we have to fix our souls," she said. "Our souls are broken in this nation."[144]

Incredibly enough, the question of broken souls or, more commonly, "wounded souls" is a commonplace in the psychological and sociological literature about the genesis of mass movements and their demagogic leaders. The dialectic of such movements commonly involves the promise of the demagogue to provide solace and healing, or else violent revenge, for the damage suffered by the battered souls of the rank and file. An example of this sort of thinking can be found in Dr. Jerrold Post's book*, Leaders and Their Followers in a Dangerous World: The Psychology of Political Behavior (Psychoanalysis and Social Theory)* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).

Dr. Post had worked for two decades as the head of CIA bureau charged with developing psychological profiles of the leaders of foreign states and other targets of Langley. Ironically, Dr. Post was interviewed by Sam Litzinger on WWWT radio in Washington DC in early May 2008 at some length precisely about this question of wounded souls. Michelle Obama was thus revealed as a fascist ideologue so cynical that she introduced the technical jargon of mass brainwashing into her standard stump speech. It was clear that the intelligence community's professional mind-benders were an integral part of the Obama campaign apparatus, helping to churn out the demagogy about hope for broken souls when they were touched by the new false messiah.

"A RENUNCIATION OF DEMOCRACY AND AN EMBRACE OF FASCISM"

The older American common sense would suggest that if your soul is broken, you probably need a priest, or else a shrink. The idea that you would turn to a politician is a decidedly novel one, and by all indications a sign of decadence and degeneracy in a culture which has been made ripe for fascism by the degradation of eight years of Bush-Cheney neocon domination, false flag terrorism, and senseless wars. But, whatever the cause, fascism is fascism and it must be denounced wherever it is found. Those who call attention to the presence of fascism deserve credit, whatever their motives, and however objectionable other aspects of their own outlook might be. We must therefore thank Caroline Glick for having had the courage to write the following:

> Speaking in February of the man she knows better than anyone else does, Michelle Obama said that her husband, Illinois Senator and candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination Barack Obama, is the only candidate for president who understands that before America can solve its problems, Americans have to fix their "broken souls." She also said that her husband's unique understanding of the state of souls of the American people makes him uniquely qualified to be President. Obama can do what his opponent in the Democratic race Senator Hillary Clinton, and Senator John McCain, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, cannot do. He can heal his countrymen's broken souls. He will redeem them. But then, saving souls is hard work, and Mrs. Obama won't place the whole burden on her husband. He'll make the Americans work for him. As she put it, "Barack Obama will require you to work. He is going to demand that you shed your cynicism. That you put down your divisions. That you come out of your isolation, that you move out of your comfort zone. That you push yourselves to be better. And that you engage. Barack will never allow you to go back to your lives as usual, uninvolved, uninformed." **At base, Mrs. Obama's statement is nothing less than a renunciation of democracy and an embrace of fascism.** The basic idea of liberty is that people have a natural right to live their lives as usual and to be uninvolved and uninformed. And they certainly have a right to expect that their government will butt out of their souls.' (Caroline Glick, "Obama the Savior," *Jerusalem Post*, April 22, 2008)

Neocon or not, Ms. Glick is precisely on target. Perhaps in the near future American politics will be divided into the broken souls faction, and another faction which will demand that government butt out of their souls. It would be better to divide over real economic issues, and Obama has been deployed among us for the precise purpose of making sure that such a reality-based economic debate does not happen.

"FEEL – DON'T THINK! … BE VISCERAL!"

Another important window into Michelle Obama's fascist ideology is provided by a report of the advice she gave her husband early in the primary season. Here we read the following:

> 'On a conference call to prepare for a recent debate, Barack Obama brainstormed with his top advisers on the fine points of his positions. Michelle Obama had dialed in to listen, but finally couldn't stay silent any longer. "Barack," she interjected, "Feel — don't think!" Telling her husband his "over-thinking" during past debates had tripped him up with rival Hillary Clinton, she said: "Don't get caught in the weeds. Be visceral. Use your heart — and your head."' (Monica Langley, "Michelle Obama Solidifies Her Role in the Election," *Wall Street Journal*, February 11, 2008)

This advice spotlights another indispensable aspect of fascist ideology, and that is the rejection of reason and of thinking in general in favor of irrational intuition. In the modern US Hollywood culture, the irrational elements are so pervasive that the average person has a very hard time remembering the insistence on mass irrationality on the part of all the European fascist movements of the first half of the 20th century. In those days, fascist demagogues and international bankers recommended that the masses think with their blood; "May the Force be with you" is a more recent Hollywood version of something quite similar. German fascists lived in the world of Wagner's *Ring* cycle, and cultivated myth, superstition, astrology, and occult folklore. Over the past decades, Hollywood has churned out *The Lord of the Rings*, *Harry Potter*, and an avalanche of mummies, vampires, witches, mutants, warlocks, super-heroes, and wizards. The latest Indiana Jones movie now has the Russians as the enemy, just in time for the Brzezinski Plan. Those saturated in such irrationalist banality have a very hard time resisting irrationality when it appears in political form.

Telling somebody to be visceral means telling them to think with their bowels or with their guts, not with their head. This is very close to the classic fascist approach which is to tell them to think with their blood. "Think with your blood" has come into English-speaking culture directly through the translations of speeches by both Hitler, Mussolini, and their followers. It has also been propagated by the works of a writer who is better known as a pornographer than as a fascist, but who had very pronounced fascist sympathies which his literary promoters have found it convenient to sweep under the rug: we mean of course D.H. Lawrence, the Nietzschean and fascist sympathizer whose novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* was all the rage on American campuses a half century ago. Lawrence was interested in the theme of blood consciousness especially as it related to erotic mysticism and to his own pornographic vision in general. More important precursors of the theory of blood consciousness which Michelle Obama seems to profess include first of all the Italian ultra-nationalist provocateur and British agent Giuseppe Mazzini, who taught that the individual was in the process of disappearing from world history to be replaced by a new protagonist in the form of the ethnic or racial group, the *popolo*. Another important precursor was the German philosopher Johann Gottlieb Fichte, a contemporary of Napoleon Bonaparte. Fichte's concept of the *Volksgeist* meant that every national grouping had its own characteristic mental outlook and way of thinking which was not commensurable with the mentalities of other ethnic groups. This tended to undermine the notion of universal reason as a general human characteristic or potential. A third precursor to Michelle's outlook can be found in National Socialism, where it was claimed that the positive content of world culture was uniquely the product of the Germanic race, and that the method of thinking characteristic of all other ethnic groups was inherently inferior, destructive, and worthy of extirpation.

For the fascist ideologues, blood consciousness meant something slightly different: blood for them meant race, and blood consciousness accordingly indicated a mental outlook that was determined by one's own race-based existence. For these fascists, "think with your blood" was a way of demanding that you think like a member of your own ethnic or racial tribe. But today, the general US public knows almost nothing about the "think with your blood" side of fascism, perhaps

because it is too close for comfort to the prevailing foundation-backed racial identities which require certain groups to act black, act like *la raza*, and so forth. A few examples will be useful to show how big a role the "think with your blood" slogan played in fascist agitation, as part of the more general fascist attack on human reason and critical thinking, which the foundations continue into our own time. Here blood consciousness finds its place in any array of better known fascist slogans:

> Slogans like "Who has betrayed us, the Social Democrats," "The Jews are our Misfortune," "Think with your Blood," "One Nation, One Race, One People," are the slogans of fascist movements….(Norman Markowitz, "Tom DeLay's Kampf," political affairs.net, April 9, 2005)[145]

Markowitz observes, in a totally different context and before Obama burst upon the scene,

> Ultra-rightists and open Fascists are in effect cheap political crooks whose gaudy patter is aimed at covering up their corruption, crimes, and drive to establish dictatorial political power. Sing "God Bless America" (or "Deutschland Uber Alles," or whatever) hate Communists, Socialists, liberals, Jews, Muslims, or whomever is convenient in your political market, and "think with your blood," a Mussolini slogan that translates as think with your emotions and ethnicity, not with your head. [146]

The prominence of thinking with your blood as a fascist concept has also not been lost on competent academic writers on the subject, at least until Michelle came along. A recent academic survey notes:

> In this respect, fascism is a reactionary ideology. It took shape in the years following World War I as a reaction against the two leading ideologies of the time, liberalism and socialism. Unhappy with the liberal emphasis on the individual and the socialist emphasis on contending social classes, the fascists provided a view of the world in which individuals and classes were to be absorbed into an all-embracing whole-a mighty empire under the control of a single party and a supreme leader. Like the Reactionaries of the early 1800s, they also rejected the faith in reason that they thought formed the foundation for liberalism and socialism alike. Reason is less reliable, both Mussolini and Hitler declared, than intuitions and emotions – what we sometimes call "gut instincts." This is why Mussolini exhorted his followers to "think with your blood." (Terrence Ball and Richard Dagger, *Political Ideologies and the Democratic Ideal* (New York: Longman Publishing, 1998), chapter 7; Fascism.)[147]

Other students of fascism have stressed the pervasive irrationalism, often tinged with romanticism, of these movements, an irrationalism that is emphatically shared by Obama:

> At its best this way of thinking — or rather, of feeling — is a usually harmless romanticism. At its worst, and not uncommonly, lies the darker version of romanticism that resembles — to many scholars, is the essence of — fascism. One such scholar was the great British philosopher, Isaiah Berlin. According to this review (critical review, by the way) of his collection of essays, *The Roots of Romanticism* (Princeton, 1999), Berlin argued that Romanticism's emphasis on passion over reason represented "a rupture with the Enlightenment's commitment to reason and objectivity."[148]

Irrationalism in the United States received a huge boost 40 years ago with the failure of the political movements of the 1960s, and the arrival – during the phase of acute demoralization,

disorientation, and despair that followed during the 1970s, of a tsunami of irrationalism under the guise of the so-called counter culture:

> The counter culture's tie-in with Romanticism is important for one particular reason. In its latest stages, Romantic culture degenerated into one of the central ingredients of fascism: "Feeling is all," Goethe's Faust proclaimed: and a little more than a century later Hitler, almost paraphrasing D. H. Lawrence, provided a distorted echo: "Think with your blood." (Theodore Roszak, "Youth and the Great Refusal" (1968)[149]

Has Michelle Obama been reading the classics of fascism? And if not, where could she have gotten the specific form of the ideology she is expressing with her order to Barky to "be visceral"? Maybe we should look for the obvious: the Reverend Jeremiah Wright, foundation-funded racist provocateur. Wright offered the elements of a theory of Afrocentric or black-only irrationalism in his speech to an NAACP dinner in Detroit on April 27, 2008, just before his speech to the National Press Club which impelled Obama to dump him. Here Wright outlined a tradition of writers going back to Carter G. Woodson, and then to

> …two brilliant scholars and two beautiful sisters, both of whom hail from Detroit in the fields of education and linguistics, Dr. Janice Hale right here at Wayne State University, founder of the Institute for the Study of the African-American Child, and Dr. Geneva Smitherman formerly of Wayne State University now at Michigan State University in Lansing. Hale in education and Smitherman in linguistics. Both demonstrated 40 years ago that different does not mean deficient.[150]

Janice Hale's book *Black Children* (1986) is billed the Johns Hopkins University Press in these terms:

> As African-American children are acculturated at home and in the African-American community, they develop cognitive patterns and behaviors that may prove incompatible with the school environment. Cultural factors produce group differences that must be addressed in the educational process." Wright's reading of Hale is summarized below. Smitherman travels in the world of what the average person would possibly recognize as Ebonics, the attempt to codify an African-American dialect or ghetto language of substandard grammar and limited vocabulary (especially in the hard sciences) which would turn the black community in on itself, cut off its channels of communication with the wider world, and render children speaking Ebonics unemployable for life in the twenty-first century, when not just internationally intelligible standard English, but one or two foreign languages will be in demand.[151]

Ebonics and its variations represents yet another weapon in the foundation and ruling class armory to impose self-enforced separation, backwardness, and poverty on the black community. Here is the left brain-right brain "race science" theory as expounded by Wright to the NAACP:

> Dr. Hale's research led her to stop comparing African-American children with European-American children and she started comparing the pedagogical methodologies of African-American children to African children and European-American children to European children. And bingo, she discovered that the two different worlds have two different ways of learning. European and European-American children have a left brained cognitive object-oriented learning style and the entire educational learning system in the United States of America, back in the early '70s, when Dr. Hale did her research, was based on left brained cognitive object oriented learning style. Let me help you with fifty cent words. Left brain is logical and analytical. Object oriented means the student learns from an object. From the solitude of the

> cradle with objects being hung over his or her head to help them determine colors and shape to the solitude in a carrel in a Ph.D. program stuffed off somewhere in a corner in absolute quietness to absorb from the object. From a block to a book, an object. That is one way of learning, but it is only one way of learning. African and African-American children have a different way of learning. They are right brained, subject oriented in their learning style. Right brain that means creative and intuitive. Subject oriented means they learn from a subject, not an object. They learn from a person. Some of you are old enough, I see your hair color, to remember when the NAACP won that tremendous desegregation case back in 1954 and when the schools were desegregated. They were never integrated. When they were desegregated in Philadelphia, several of the white teachers in my school freaked out. Why? Because black kids wouldn't stay in their place. Over there behind the desk, black kids climbed up all on them. Because they learn from a subject, not from an object. Tell me a story. They have a different way of learning. Those same children who have difficulty reading from an object and who are labeled EMH, DMH and ADD. Those children can say every word from every song on every hip hop radio station half of who's words the average adult here tonight cannot understand. Why? Because they come from a right-brained creative oral culture like the (greos?) [sic] in Africa who can go for two or three days as oral repositories of a people's history and like the oral tradition which passed down the first five books in our Jewish bible, our Christian Bible, our Hebrew bible long before there was a written Hebrew script or alphabet. And repeat incredulously long passages like Psalm 119 using mnemonic devices using eight line stanzas. Each stanza starting with a different letter of the alphabet. That is a different way of learning. It's not deficient, it is just different. Somebody say different. I believe that a change is going to come because many of us are committed to changing how we see other people who are different. What Dr. Janice Hale did in the field of education, Dr. Geneva Smitherman did in the field of linguistics.[152]

When Wright says the right brain is intuitive, he means irrational. When he says the left brain is logical, he is attacking reason. Not content with destroying the unity of world history by carving it up into a multitude of hermetically sealed cultures in the manner of Oswald Spengler, modern foundation-funded "race science" also attempts to demolish the unity of human reason. In reality, human reason is the single invariant factor which can be observed at work in every society from the emergence of humans down to the present day. It is a true universal, necessary and present in every individual. It is present in Plato and in Confucius, in the Egypt of Akhnaton and in the Baghdad of Haroun al Rashid, and it is neither eastern nor western, neither northern nor southern, neither black nor white. It is present from Thales to Dr. George Washington Carver. It belongs to no race, and has no color.

To attempt to mutilate or deform this universal reason is the greatest act of vandalism against humanity that is possible, and it is likely to bring on catastrophic consequences that go far beyond the world of ideas. This is what the foundation-funded racists, obscurantists, irrationalists, and mythmongers are attempting to do. Wright is their publicist, and Barack and Michelle are the fanatical cadre they have formed. Do Hale and Smitherman know that they are converging with Gumplowitz, Houston S. Chamberlain and Alfred Rosenberg? They may or may not, but that is what they are doing. Foundation-funded race theory is a desolate path that leads into the abyss of blood consciousness. It should also be clear that the left brain-right brain mumbo-jumbo is the mirror image of the Robert Herrnstein - Charles Murray *Bell Curve* racism, but decked out in radical rhetoric to make it seem liberating and thus acceptable to the black community.

When Craig Venter went to the White House in 2000 to inform President Clinton that modern science had mastered the human genome, he told Clinton that one of the results of his research was that no such thing as race exists. President Clinton declared, "After all, I believe one of the great truths to emerge from this triumphant expedition inside the human genome is that in genetic terms all human beings, regardless of race, are more than 99.9% the same." At the same press conference, Craig Venter, president and CEO of Celera Genomics, reinforced Clinton's message, asserting that "the concept of race has no genetic or scientific basis."[153] Race is a fiction, an empty construct, a pure mystification. The neurological differences that Wright asserts are the result of poverty and exclusion, and can be dealt with by eliminating these factors.

"GNOSTIC" ELEMENTS IN THE OBAMA AGITATION

Another way of analyzing Michelle Obama's speeches about the problem of broken souls is to understand that she is claiming for political activity in government a much wider role than has usually been the case in this country. Michelle Obama is trying to sell politics as a means of reaching goals which have normally been associated with religion. The fixing or healing or making whole of broken souls is the task of Paradise or Nirvana, and not of the politically rally or the ballot box. The traditional view is the one expressed by St. Paul:

> Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.[154]

According to this, it is only in the life of the world to come that the fragmentation, mutilation, and alienation of this earthly vale of tears can be overcome. Virtuous pagans could and did have wisdom, justice, temperance, and fortitude, but faith, hope and charity are specifically Christian virtues – especially, for our purposes here, *hope*. Michelle Obama makes a radically different claim, suggesting that the magical powers possessed by her husband can realize and accomplish in the political form, on earth, and soon the sorts of deep changes that are usually reserved for heaven. The political philosopher Eric Voegelin applied the label of Gnosticism to this kind of political culture. Others suggested that the fascists could be called pagan or neopagan, but Voegelin insisted on the term Gnostic, since he saw modern politicians in Europe as holding out the promise of specifically Christian forms of Paradise or heaven (referred to as the eschaton), but brought down to earth in the form of a political utopia thought to be within reach if only state power could be seized and held.

A pre-Obama standard reference summary of Voegelin's leading concept may make these connections clear:

> Voegelin was a political philosopher known most widely in America for *The New Science of Politics,* his 1952 University of Chicago Walgreen lectures. In them Voegelin argued that modern ideological movements such as communism and fascism repeated the gnostic heresy of early Christianity. Early Christian gnosticism separated a person's "spiritual" elements—claimed to be real—from his or her "material" parts—claimed to be unreal. Jesus was perfect because his spirit—his reason and motivation—was perfect. Gnostics believed humans who grasped this truth could also achieve perfection on earth and not have to wait for the eschaton. Voegelin argued that in modern times gnosticism has become politicized. Politicized gnosticism

> asserts that personal and social perfection is possible. Such perfection, however, usually requires a few sages who understand the truths and who must sometimes rather ruthlessly and violently impose "perfection" on others. Both fascism and communism, according to Voegelin, are gnostic-like attempts to "immanentize the eschaton;" that is, to overcome the limitations, anxieties, and uncertainties of human experience for an enlightened vanguard to build a "heaven on earth." (A wonderful theory, its implementation always goes astray.) One destroys real democracy and politics in the process of imposing a "perfect" social vision. (Wikipedia)

Pope Benedict XVI Ratzinger has made the following observations about communist ideology, which are also highly relevant to our current discussion of a fascist mentality: "...where the Marxist ideology of liberation had been consistently applied, a total lack of freedom had developed, whose horrors were now laid bare before the eyes of the entire world. Wherever politics tries to be redemptive, it is promising too much. Where it wishes to do the work of God, it becomes not divine, but demonic." These remarks are included in Ratzinger's "Liberation Theology" (2007), a critique of currents in theology which share a great deal with the James Cone "Black liberation theology" taught by the foundation-funded racist provocateur Jeremiah Wright, who is evidently a special favorite of Michelle.

THE SAVIOR

The gnostic mantle of the Obama campaign envelops both Barack and Michelle, each in their assigned role. Obama supporters are often apolitical or anti-political. They are fans, groupies, cultists, enthusiasts, adepts, and they avidly crowd around the divine couple. The great violinist Yehudi Menuhin wrote that, having witnessed both modern rock concerts and Nazi party rallies, he could sense something in common between the two, and concluded that rock concerts might well represent a preparation for authoritarianism and fascism later on.

The first generations that cannot remember a world without orgiastic rock concerts and mosh pits are also the ones that provide Obama with his idolaters:

"People don't come to Obama for what he's done in the Senate," says Bruce Reed, president of the centrist Democratic Leadership Council. "They come because of what they hope he could be." What Obama stands for, if anything, is not yet clear. Everywhere he goes he is greeted by thrilled crowds, trailed constantly by a reporter from *The Chicago Tribune* who is writing a book about the senator with a preliminary title so immodest that it embarrassed even Obama's staff: *The Savior*. The danger here is that the public has committed the cardinal sin of political love, forcing Obama onto the national stage before knowing him well enough to gauge whether he's ready for it. The candidate they see before them is their own creation — or, rather, it is the scrambling of a skinny, serious, self-reflective man trying to mold his public's conflicted yearnings into something greater. "Barack has become a kind of human Rorschach test," says Cassandra Butts, a friend of the senator's from law school and now a leader at the Center for American Progress. "People see in him what they want to see." (Wallace Wells, *Rolling Stone*)

The *London Sunday Telegraph* reported: "Barack Obama criticized over 'cult-like' rallies." The article went on to report: "for a growing number of Barack Obama skeptics, there is something disturbing about the adulation with which the senator and Democratic presidential frontrunner is greeted as he campaigns for the White House – unnervingly akin to the hysteria of a cult, or the fervour of a religious revival."

A recent *London Times* story (also appearing in *The Australian*) was headlined: "Early signs of a Barack-lash." Correspondent James Bone wrote:

> The American presidential candidate who can do no wrong is experiencing the first signs of dip in popularity, called the "Barack-lash". Barack Obama has become a darling of the internet generation since he started his underdog campaign to triumph over the wife of a former president and become the first black leader of the free world. Millions downloaded a YouTube video of his "Yes We Can" speech set to music by Black Eyed Peas front man will.i.am with celebrity friends including actors Scarlett Johansson and Amber Valletta. But Obama's popularity has begun to rebound on him now that he has emerged as the Democratic frontrunner. Even supporters are questioning whether he can really deliver on all their hopes. Mathew Honan, a freelance writer and contributor to Obama's campaign, set up a website called www.obamaisyournewbicycle.com after his wife, Harper, a nurse and avid cyclist, began exhibiting symptoms of "Obama-mania". Within two weeks there were more than 2.3 million visits to the site, which carries messages such as: "Barack Obama escorted your Gramma across the street"; "Barack Obama baked you a pie"; "Barack Obama dedicated a song to you"; "Barack Obama carries a picture of you in his wallet"; and "Barack Obama remembered your birthday". Website obamamessiah.blogspot.com asks "Is Obama the Messiah?" and boasts a "transfiguration" scene of the Christ-like candidate addressing supporters from a staircase. In a section on "Obama Conversion Stories", it quotes author Deepak Chopra calling Obama's candidacy "a quantum leap in American consciousness". The SenatorObamas.com site portrays him in a variety of guises, from "Obamarama" to the nightwear-clad "Pajamabama". Before the Hollywood writers' strike, Obama won sympathy on the widely watched Saturday Night Live television comedy show on November 3, playing himself as a guest at a party thrown by the presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton and her husband, Bill. With the writers back at work, Saturday Night Live returned to lampoon the Obama media obsession. A white actor played Obama in a sketch parodying the latest Democratic debate. The moderator confessed she had been "clinically diagnosed as an Obamamaniac". The *New York Times* columnist David Brooks has diagnosed the mood swing experienced by many liberals as "Obama Comedown Syndrome". "The afflicted had already been through the phases of Obamamania — fainting at rallies, weeping over their touch screens while watching Obama videos, spending hours making folk crafts featuring Michelle Obama's face," Brooks writes. "These patients had experienced intense surges of hope-amine, the brain chemical that fuels euphoric sensations of historic change and personal salvation. But they found that as the weeks went on, they needed more and purer hope injections just to preserve the rush. "They wound up craving more hope than even the Hope Pope could provide, and they began experiencing brooding moments of suboptimal hopefulness. "Anxious posts began to appear on the Yes We Can! Facebook pages. A sense of ennui began to creep through the nation's Ian McEwan-centred book clubs." (James Bone, *London Times*, February 25, 2008)

OBAMA: "LOOK AT THESE FOLKS WHO ARE BEING DUPED"

Obama tried to fight back against the "cult" description, and NBC's Lee Cowan reported from Toledo that there was

> "…a subtle new argument that Barack Obama's been using ... that's starting to get some traction." "He says it's not so much what Hillary Clinton says about him by way of criticism," Cowan explained, "but what she's implying about his supporters that he says should get them pretty riled up." Obama first introduced this argument at Tuesday's debate in Austin, where he

stated, "The implication is, the people who've been voting for me or involved in my campaign are somehow delusional." Obama's stump speech was revamped to include the same argument. "Some of these folks make fun of y'all," he told one audience. "They say, 'Y'all look at these folks who are being duped.'" "However they're characterized, they are certainly energetic," Cowan concluded, seeming uncertain just what to make of Obama's supporters. "And the more they are criticized for that enthusiasm, the more it just seems to galvanize their cause."' There was talk of Hare Krishna and the Manson family. Obama was mentioned as both the Messiah and the anti-Christ, with elaborate web sites devoted to both themes. A slate.com editor noticed that Obama's rhetorical style was similar to that of Mussolini: 'The deputy editor of a major online magazine spent time in a weekly podcast explaining how the style of Senator Barack Obama shares much in common with the speech of fascist dictators like Benito Mussolini. "That's slightly fascistic," David Plotz, the deputy editor at Slate.com said in the magazine's weekly podcast when one of his fellow editors brought up Obama's style. "That's a very, like, let's rally the nation. I don't want to be rallied." After his fellow Slate editors lightly gibed him for his statement, he continued the point: "My brother who is an academic wrote this wonderful book about crowds, and crowd theory. And one of the sort of lessons that he's always imparted to me is just that crowds are terrifying. Crowds are horrifying for the most part because they have a will of their own, and they act independently of rationality. And I think that Obama relies hugely on that. That's not to say, I don't, I still support him, but I don't like that fascistic, I like him not for the fascistic elements of his candidacy, which I think are profound."' (Michael Roston, **"***Slate* editor calls Obama speech style 'fascistic,'" Rawstory, February 4, 2008)

Right-wing Fox News Radio host Tom Sullivan took a call from a listener who stated that when listening to Barack Obama speak, "it harkens back to when I was younger and I used to watch those deals with Hitler, how he would excite the crowd and they'd come to their feet and scream and yell." Sullivan then played a "side-by-side comparison" of a Hitler speech and an Obama speech. Sullivan mimicked the crowd during both speeches, yelling, "Yay! Yay!" Radio reactionary Michael Savage agreed. It would be easy to disregard these comments because the sources have discredited themselves so thoroughly in their support of Bush and his lunatic foreign wars. But then again, gold is sometimes where you find it.

IRRATIONALIST MASS MOVEMENTS TARGET WOMEN

No account of the success of Mussolini and his imitators as mob orators would be complete without some mention of the special hypnotic power which fascist rhetoric and the personality of the fascist leader exercised on women. Some of the most enthusiastic swooners at fascist rallies were women, many of whom had a special devotion for Il Duce. Obama seems to have acquired an instinctive awareness of this set of issues from his own mother. If we are to judge by the prominence that this episode receives in Obama's memoirs, we must conclude that one of the formative experiences of Obama's life was the moment when his mother revealed to him that she found Harry Belafonte to be sexually attractive. This experience seems to have furnished Obama with the belief that he is able to exercise an almost hypnotic appeal over middle-aged white woman, and his campaign has tried very hard to play this card, including through the use of special focus groups. Here is the episode in question, as described in a recent puff piece of adulation offered by a popular magazine to the Perfect Master:

There is an amazingly candid moment in Obama's autobiography when he writes of his childhood discomfort at the way his mother would sexualize African-American men. "More than once," he recalls, "my mother would point out: 'Harry Belafonte is the best-looking man

> on the planet.'" "What the focus groups his advisers conducted revealed was that Obama's political career now depends, in some measure, upon a tamer version of this same feeling, on the complicated dynamics of how white women respond to a charismatic black man. "I remember when we realized something magical was happening," says Obama's pollster on the campaign, an earnest Iowan named Paul Harstad. "We were doing a focus group in suburban Chicago, and this woman, seventy years old, looks seventy-five, hears Obama's life story, and she clasps her hand to her chest and says, 'Be still, my heart.' Be still, my heart — I've been doing this for a quarter century and I've never seen that." The most remarkable thing, for Harstad, was that the woman hadn't even seen the videos he had brought along of Obama speaking, had no idea what the young politician looked like. "All we'd done," he says, "is tell them the Story." From that moment on, the Story became Obama's calling card, his political rationale and his basic sale. Every American politician has this wrangle he has to pull off, reshaping his life story to fit into Abe Lincoln's log cabin. Some pols (John Edwards, Bill Clinton) have an easier time of it than others (George Bush, Al Gore). Obama's material is simply the best of all. What he has to offer, at the most fundamental level, is not ideology or even inspiration — it is the Story, the feeling that he embodies, in his own, uniquely American history, a longed-for break from the past. "With Obama, it's all about his difference," says Joe Trippi, the Democratic consultant who masterminded Howard Dean's candidacy. "We see in him this hope that the country might be different, too."' (Wallace Wood, *Rolling Stone*)

Obama's handlers have devoted much special study to enhancing their candidates appeal among women, specifically white women, and even more specifically middle-aged white women. This has included attempts to capitalize on sexual tensions across racial lines, obviously a big issue for Obama's mother, and the phenomenon evoked by one blogger who observed about Obama:

'Years later, when he's working on Wall Street, he's creeped out by his visiting mother's insistence on seeing her favorite film, the 1959 Brazilian art-house classic "Black Orpheus." He belatedly realizes that his very fair-skinned mother is sexually attracted to dark men. He pompously intones, "The emotions between the races could never be pure; even love was tarnished by the desire to find in the other some element that was missing in ourselves. Whether we sought out our demons or salvation, the other race would always remain just that: menacing, alien, and apart."'

Here is a description of the results of some of Obama's white woman focus groups:

> What the focus groups his advisers conducted revealed was that Obama's political career now depends, in some measure, upon a tamer version of this same feeling, on the complicated dynamics of how white women respond to a charismatic black man. Early in his run for the U.S. Senate in 2004, Obama's pollsters discovered that women loved him, especially nice white ladies who like personalities more than politics and definitely don't like political arguments. Then, running preliminary polls, his advisers noticed something remarkable: Women responded more intensely and warmly to Obama than did men. In a seven-candidate field, you don't need to win every vote. His advisers, assuming they would pick up a healthy chunk of black votes, homed in on a different target: Every focus group they ran was composed exclusively of women, nearly all of them white.' (Wallace-Wells, *Rolling Stone*) But these same middle aged ladies were not happy with Jeremiah Wright, Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn, and Anton Rezko, and their view of Barky began to change. By late July 2008, Dick Morris was arguing that Obama's greatest vulnerability was his failure to convince older women to vote for him. Recent national polls show Obama with just a 40% favorable ratio among white voters. "He is clearly

hitting up against some substantial sales resistance, particularly among middle aged and older white women," Morris argued.[155]

FEMINIST RENEGADES FOR OBAMA

The internet is now replete with women who are eager to recount their sexual fantasies about Obama. Here we can see some of the pathos which Obama's cynical handlers and controllers are determined to exploit in order to seize power:

> Have you ever gone through a really dry period sexually? At first you get angry that you're being neglected and ignored, and you act out. Then one day you wake up with a sense of nonchalance and you start to marvel at how much you're getting done, and how much easier it is not to care. And then... one day, maybe a stranger comes and begins to romance you and strokes your hair in a sort of contemplative way, uttering the most delightful insights. He touches your hand softly and then a little more firmly, awakening the feelings that you thought you'd left behind, and then you start speaking really poetically and hearing melodies and then suddenly you WANT IN! You want back in the game and you think 'spring is here'... YES WE CAN!' (Lili Haydn, "Why Obama is Like a Desert Lover," February 29, 2008)

Although those involved will not appreciate the suggestion, it may well be that these focus groups and the tactics developed from them have something to do with the failure of many feminist leaders to honor their most obvious commitment and support Senator Clinton for president, turning instead to the arch-manipulator Obama. One massive defection by these erstwhile feminists took place at the beginning of February, and evoked a puff piece from the Huffington web site which announced:

> "New York Feminists for Peace and Barack Obama," an organization of more than 100 New York feminist leaders released a joint statement Sunday afternoon criticizing Hillary Clinton and supporting Obama for president. Clinton's support for the war in Iraq was the leading reason she lost the support of the group. Those endorsing Obama include longtime peace activist Cora Weiss; Katha Pollitt, columnist for *The Nation*; Pulitzer-prize winning *New York Times* writer Margo Jefferson; award-winning women's rights historians Alice Kessler Harris and Linda Gordon; Barbara Weinstein, president of the American Historical Association, and Ellen P. Chapnick, Dean for Social Justice Initiatives at Columbia Law School. Susan Sarandon and Francis Fox Piven signed on Monday."

MASTERS OF VENOM: THE OBAMA ATTACK MACHINE

It should also be mentioned that female critics of Obama, starting with Senator Clinton, Chelsea Clinton, and Geraldine Ferraro, have received especially brutal treatment by the Obama aversive attack apparatus. Here is a testimonial to this effect by the well-known writer and feminist Erica Jong:

> Ever since I wrote an article in the *Washington Post* ten days ago, I've been getting love letters from women and super-smart men and brickbats from the Hillary-Haters. Unfortunately the Hillary-Haters are in charge. They monopolize the networks, the newspapers, the talk shows — both radio and TV. They are crossing their legs for fear of castration. They are wearing the body armor our troops never got. Or got too late to matter. They are determined that a woman will not prove herself competent as Commander in Chief. Patriarchy: 1000, Hillary: 0."[156]

LEFT CIA FOR OBAMA

Just as Lenin praised Mussolini from afar, all kinds of extremist political movements today have shown a fascination with Obama, if only because of the promise he holds out to them that the US will soon undergo a huge and crippling internal convulsion. One such admirer is President Danny Ortega of Nicaragua, the radical-chic former Sandinista leader who was infamous for making his shopping trips to procure designer sunglasses into his top priority, at international conferences where he was supposed to be working for his country and people. If Danny Ortega survives today, it is manifestly because he has made his deal with the CIA and has accepted the status of a radical asset operating under anti-US cover within the bounds marked out for him by the State Department. On February 14, 2008, Danny Ortega endorsed Obama, saying that the senator's presidential bid is a "revolutionary" phenomenon in the United States:

> "It's not to say that there is already a revolution under way in the U.S. ... but yes, they are laying the foundations for a revolutionary change," Ortega, described Obama as a spokesman for the millions of Central American and Mexican citizens who migrate to the U.S., and said he has "faith in God and in the North American people, and above all in the youth, that the moment of great change in the U.S. will come and it will act differently, with justice and equality toward all nations."

The radical chic Ortega is out of touch. US Hispanics, except those on the foundation payroll, have no love for Obama.

Obama also has the endorsement of the New Black Panther Party. 'His website has a link to the "New Black Panther party which has endorsed his run for the Presidency. From the website: "Why I support Barack Obama: Barack Obama represents "Positive Change" for all of America. Obama will stir the "Melting Pot" into a better "Molten America."'[157] This endorsement was expunged during one of the frequent Orwellian purges which Barky has to carry out from time to time as he morphs from one political profile into another.

MEDIA WHORES FOR OBAMA

If fascism is coming to the United States, the corrupt corporate media must bear a good deal of the responsibility. During the 2008 primaries ordinary Americas, especially women, became aware as never before that the television networks are not news organizations, but rather purveyors of mass brainwashing. Reporters became the lightning rods for outbursts of popular rage:

> ABC's Kate Snow tells me that members of the public often bear down on her when they see her TV mike, cursing her out as a stand-in for Tim Russert, even though he is at NBC. "They feel we're the people taking her down," she said. (Tina Brown, *Newsweek*, 17 March 2008) This was before the death and canonization of Russert, who was nothing more than another sleazy propagandist among many. As a result of the media vilification of Senator Clinton, the potential for a resistance to fascism on the part of women has surely increased: 'Cynthia Ruccia, a grass-roots political organizer in Columbus, told me that in these last beleaguered weeks, women started showing up in waves at Clinton headquarters—women who told her they had never volunteered in a campaign before. "There was just an outpouring about the way she was being treated by the media," Ruccia said. "It was something we hadn't seen in a long time. We all felt, as women, we had made a lot of progress, and we saw this as an attack of misogyny that was trying to beat her down."' One leading exponent of New Age and other irrationalism for consumption by women is Oprah Winfrey, whose ratings fell precipitously after she had

> conducted a public fling with Obama, especially because of resentment from women over this betrayal. One of Oprah's previous darlings had been the writer James Frey, who had marketed a fictional account as a real first person narrative of actual events. With Frey and Obama, Oprah had struck out twice in a row. Women were appalled: "Even Oprah abandoned them when she opted for Obama. Am I alone in suspecting that TV's most powerful 54-year-old woman just might have endorsed him so fast for reasons of desirable viewer demographics as much as personal inspiration? Certainly, no TV diva in her 50s who values her ratings wants to be defined by the hot-flash cohort." (Tina Brown, *Newsweek*, 17 March 2008)

Seasoned and experienced observers, including some from within the black community, could also see the negative potential of the Obama youth cult. Adolph Green is a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and notes:

> There is also something disturbingly ritualistic and superficial in the Obama camp's young minions' enthusiasm. Paul Krugman noted months ago that the Obamistas display a cultish quality in the sense that they treat others' criticism or failure to support their icon as a character flaw or sin. The campaign even has a stock conversion narrative, which has been recycled in print by such normally clear-headed columnists as Barbara Ehrenreich and Katha Pollitt: the middle-aged white woman's report of not having paid much attention to Obama early on, but having been won over by the enthusiasm and energy of their adolescent or twenty-something daughters. (A colleague recently reported having heard this narrative from a friend, citing the latter's conversion at the hands of her eighteen year old. I observed that three short years ago the daughter was likely acting the same way about Britney Spears.) (Adolph Green, "Obama No," *The Progressive*, May 17, 2008)

REPORTS OF A MICHELLE OBAMA "HATE WHITEY" TAPE

In the late spring of 2008, rumors circulated that Karl Rove was in possession of a video tape which showed Michelle Obama denouncing the white race or white people in the most violent and abusive terms. This video tape was thought to represent the "October surprise" against Obama referred to by the Clinton campaign in its conference calls, a time bomb ticking underneath the entire Obama candidacy, capable of wiping him off the political map within a few days. This may also have been what right-wing columnist Robert Novak had been referring to in the fall of 2007 when he reported that

> the Clinton campaign is spreading the word that it's holding back on dishing dirt on Barack Obama, and charged the Democratic frontrunner with playing "Nixon tricks." … Novak's initial report said: "Agents of Sen. Hillary Clinton are spreading the word in Democratic circles that she has scandalous information" about Obama, "but has decided not to use it. The nature of the alleged scandal was not disclosed."[158]

Novak's story was published on November 19, 2007. As for Michelle, her growing reputation as a race baiter was a growing liability for Obama's chances. In late May 2008, Larry Johnson reported the existence of a "hate whitey" tape depicting a racist tirade by Michelle, with vicious attacks on white America, the "white race," or just plain whitey in extreme terms. The tape was reported to be in the possession of Karl Rove, who was organizing private screenings for GOP fatcats to generate fundraising for his autumn 2008 October surprise designed to stun and defeat Obama. By now Obama had almost repudiated Wright, but what was he going to do when the racist rant came from Michelle?

There was an interesting wrinkle in the story: Johnson wrote about a right-wing Republican who hated McCain and did not want him elected to the presidency. This right-wing moneybags was offering a cool million to get the tape for himself, with the intent of showing it at once, thus sinking Obama before he ever got the Democratic nomination. That way, Hillary would get the Democratic nod in Denver, and she would of course have a much better chance of defeating McCain. It was clear that fall 2008 would see an unprecedented battle of the scandal dossiers.

In this new phase, scandal dossiers were like ICBMs in an all-out thermonuclear exchange. The watchword had to be, "Use 'em or lose 'em." If one acquired scandal material, it had to be launched into public view immediately, since otherwise the other side might strike first. The flaw in Rove's plan was that if he waited until October to unload what he had, Obama's FBI backers might strike first against McCain, leaving Rove with no candidate left standing. Obama, we stress again, had no real hope of winning except by way of piloted scandals.

There can be no doubt that Michelle Obama is a racist thinker, in addition to the elements of fascist ideology which have already been noted. Indeed, the more robust versions of fascism, like the German one, incorporate racism and "race science" (which of course means pseudo-science in reality) as a foundational element of the fascist outlook. In her Princeton thesis, Michelle already swore allegiance to a race-based outlook when she wrote that she would

> use all of my present and future resources to benefit [the Black] community *first and foremost*… Regardless of the circumstances under which I interact with whites…it often seems as if, to them, I will always be black first… there is a distinctive Black culture different from White culture…. [A] Black person may have all White friends and prefer these friends and their activities to those with Blacks without the individual believing that he/she is White….[159]

This is hardly the voice of a person prepared to help a president govern in the name of all the people.

A reported paraphrase and summary of Michelle Obama's remarks in the reported tape soon appeared on line: "Once again, the white man keeps us down, what's up with Whitey, Why'd he attack Iraq, Why'd he let Katrina happen, Why'd he leave millions of children behind. This is the legacy the white man gives us." [160] As the primaries were ending in Puerto Rico, Fox News Channel carried an interview by Geraldo Rivera with Republican operative Roger Stone in which Stone reported:

> This has little to do with the general election and a lot to do with why Hillary Clinton is staying in the race. Look, there is already a buzz in Washington at least seven news organizations have contacted me wanting to know how to get their hands on this tape, giving me more information than I had after I had spoken to each one of them. I now believe the tape exists and I believe a network has it. If this pans to out to be true, based on Michelle Obama's previous comment that this is the first time she had been proud of her country, which I think shows an attitude, it is problematic. (FNC 06/01/2008 14:43:30)[161]

MICHELLE TOGETHER WITH MRS. FARRAKHAN AND MEEKS

Soon the site HillBuzz was reporting more details about the circumstances in which Michelle had delivered her tirade:

What's on the Michelle Obama Rant Tape? Here's what's known so far: The Michelle Obama Rant Tape was filmed between June 26th - July 1st 2004 in Chicago, IL at the Rainbow/PUSH

Coalition Conference at Trinity United Church: specifically the Women's Event. Michelle Obama appeared as a panelist alongside Mrs. Khadijah Farrakhan and Mrs. James Meeks. Bill Clinton spoke during the Conference, as did Bill Cosby and other speakers, but not at the panel Michelle attended. Michelle Obama spoke at the Women's Event, but referenced Bill Clinton in her rant — his presence at the conference was the impetus for her raving, it seems. For about 30 minutes, Michelle Obama launched into a rant about the evils of America, and how America is to blame for the problems of Africa. Michelle personally blamed President Clinton for the deaths of millions of Africans and said America is responsible for the genocide of the Tutsis and other ethnic groups. She then launched into an attack on "whitey", and talked about solutions to black on black crime in the realm of diverting those actions onto white America. Her rant was fueled by the crowd: they reacted strongly to what she said, so she got more passionate and enraged, and that's when she completely loses it and says things that have made the mouths drop of everyone who's seen this. The "tape" is a DVD that Trinity United sold on its website, and possibly offered free for download up until March 2008 when Trinity's site was scrubbed and the DVDs were no longer offered for sale. This outburst happened just one month before the 2004 Democratic Convention, when Barack Obama delivered the keynote address.[162]

The trolls who make up the Obama mercenary assault sections on the Internet soon concocted an absurd explanation of what Michelle is supposed to have said. In doing this, they may have indicated more or less the formulations which are in fact on the tape in question. Larry Johnson summed up the state of the case by writing:

> Our thanks to Martin Longman over at Booman Tribune. He performed a public service last night by disseminating Barack Obama talking points even before I had published my update. Two key points–First, the Obama campaign is admitting the tape exists by ponying up a bogus explanation. Second, they don't dispute that Michelle is sitting at the table with Louis Farrakhan. So, here's what Martin posted:
>
> My old friend, Larry Johnson, knows about manipulating elections from his training with the Central Intelligence Agency. He doesn't want Obama to win the nomination for whatever reason, and he's in full propaganda mode to do everything he can to frighten the superdelegates. He claims to have a shocking tape of Michelle Obama ranting in some anti-white diatribe. He promises to produce this tape tomorrow at 9am. From what I understand, it is a tape of Michelle Obama criticizing the Bush administration.
>
> How you'd write it:
>
> Why did Bush cut folks off Medicaid?
> Why did Bush let New Orleans drown?
> Why did Bush do nothing about Jena?
> Why did Bush put us in Iraq for no reason?
>
> How you'd say it:
>
> Why'd he cut folks off Medicaid?
> Why'd he let New Orleans drown?
> Why'd he do nothing about Jena?
> Why'd he put us in Iraq for no reason?
>
> How Larry Johnson wants you to hear it:

Whitie cut folks off Medicaid?
Whitie let New Orleans drown?
Whitie do nothing about Jena?
Whitie put us in Iraq for no reason?[163]

As Johnson noted, this amounted to a confirmation of some of the internal features of the tape in question. On June 3, Bob Beckel, a Democratic Party political hack who had worked for Zbigniew Brzezinski in the Carter National Security Council before going on to help lead Walter Mondale's catastrophic election campaign in 1984, commented on the Fox and Friends morning program that he was very worried indeed about the existence of a Michelle Obama tape and about the possible political consequences if this were revealed to the public. This incident attracted wide attention and became known as "The Beckel Bombshell" on the Internet.[164]

OBAMA FAILS TO DENY EXISTENCE OF TAPE, ATTACKS QUESTIONER

On June 5, a woman reporter for the McClatchy News Service, which still tries to be a news organization, finally asked Obama whether this tape existed or not. The Perfect Master went into evasive maneuvers, and failed to deny that the tape exists. Instead, he pontificated about the pervasive presence of "dirt and lies," and then attempted to chastise the reporter for being one of the very few who was trying to do her job. One report described the incident thus:

> Sen. Barack Obama on Thursday batted down rumors circulating on the Internet and mentioned on some cable news shows of the existence of a video of his wife using a derogatory term for white people, and criticized a reporter for asking him about the rumor, which has not a shred of evidence to support it. "We have seen this before. There is dirt and lies that are circulated in e-mails and they pump them out long enough until finally you, a mainstream reporter, asks me about it," Obama said to the McClatchy reporter during a press conference aboard his campaign plane. "That gives legs to the story. If somebody has evidence that myself or Michelle or anybody has said something inappropriate, let them do it."
>
> Asked whether he knew it not to be true, Obama said he had answered the question.
>
> "Frankly, my hope is people don't play this game," Obama said. "It is a destructive aspect of our politics. Simply because something appears in an e-mail, that should lend it no more credence than if you heard it on the corner. Presumably the job of the press is to not to go around and spread scurrilous rumors like this until there is actually anything, an iota, of substance or evidence that would substantiate it."
>
> So was it even acceptable to ask the question? Before Obama could answer, communications director Robert Gibbs interjected: "You just did."
>
> "That is my point," Obama said. "I just think people have to think about it before they ask." ("Obama denies a rumor and questions the question," *Politico*, June 5, 2008)[165]

This is once again a typical Obama style to which we have become accustomed: when nailed for some outrageous action, the candidate immediately attempts to turn the tables and to transform himself from accused into accuser. He begins pontificating about some general moral or social evil which he can connect to the issue in question, and begins counterattacking those who are trying to hold him accountable. This technique of attacking the questioner is of course a favorite ploy of George W. Bush, the current tenant of the White House, as Dr. Justin Frank has pointed out in his study, *Bush on the Couch*. Since Frank concludes that Bush is a megalomaniac, and since the present study points to megalomania as one of the salient aspects of Obama's personality, we may

find that this technique of dodging questions (the recent archetype of which is the Jimmy Carter *malaise* speech on energy policy of July 1979) is rooted in the mental dynamics of megalomania itself.

Responding to this exchange, Larry Johnson pointed out:

If someone was accusing my wife of saying something racist that was not true, and you asked me in public, I would say emphatically and clearly, "it is not true." So what is Barack's problem. … Huh? Are you kidding me? If it ain't true say so. But when a politician tap dances on nuance–Baby it is true. My sources have not backed off. They maintain they have a tape and will drop it on the Dems in the fall. Now if Barack said, "No, and hell no" I would be wondering about my sources. But he punted. He went for the weasel word. The non-denial denial.[166]

So, as the summer wore on, the Michelle Obama "hate whitey" rant continued to hang over the Obama campaign like a sword of Damocles. Would it appear in September or October? Or would the Trilateral-Bilderberg scandal machine destroy McCain first?

CHAPTER IX: OBAMA'S TRIUMPH OF THE WILL: THE 2008 PRIMARIES

"Barack Obama is wheezing to the finish line." - Chris Wallace, Fox News

"My faith in the American people has been vindicated." –Obama in Florida, May 21, 2008.

PATROCLUS :Well said, adversity! and what need these tricks?

THERSITES: Prithee, be silent, boy; I profit not by thy talk:

thou art thought to be Achilles' male varlet.

PATROCLUS: Male varlet, you rogue! what's that?

THERSITES: Why, his masculine whore.

- Shakespeare, Troilus and Cressida.

The initial goal of the Obama-Trilateral forces was to stun all opposing candidates, and especially Senator Clinton and Senator Edwards, by winning decisive victories in Iowa and New Hampshire, and then setting up a clamor with the help of their brigade of media whores to demand that all opposition candidates drop out and allow the acclamation of the Perfect Master as the Democratic candidate. For Obama strategy to work optimally, it was essential that the Democratic primary process be brought to an end as soon as possible, so as to rule out any possibility that Obama's real background might be investigated. All during 2007, the controlled corporate media had failed abysmally in their normal task of informing the public about who this slick and newcomer really was, including most emphatically his past associations, his own track record in politics, and his current handlers, backers, and controllers. More accurately, the controlled corporate media had succeeded in their appointed task of preserving a seraphic aura of post-partisan, post-racial, post-political transcendence around their charismatic protégé. It was clear to all that Obama's pretensions as a messianic liberator could never stand up to even the most cursory scrutiny. Therefore, it was essential that the primaries be ended as soon as possible so that Obama could seize the nomination while most people still had no idea who he was. Obama was like a con man who went from town to town plying his trade, but was always aware that he had to fleece his dupes and move on before too long, since if he tarried, there was a good chance that his con job strategy would be diagnosed by the authorities and he would be apprehended.

Obama strategy was that of a CIA people power coup or US backed color revolution as these models have been applied in the Orange Revolution in Kiev, Ukraine in late 2004, and in the roses revolution in Tiflis, Georgia a few years earlier. The color revolution model for subverting a political process under the cover of an election included the presence of a telegenic and talented demagogue and mob orator, the use of vast sums of money and narcotics, savvy exploitation of the social networking sites on the Internet, the creation of an artificial media hysteria stoked by intelligence agents inside the controlled media, catchy slogans, colors, and emblems for branding purposes, fake polling, and rent-a-mobs and dupe-a-mobs of feckless and callow youth — the swarming adolescents who can be easily mobilized in large numbers. These were the methods which the Obama forces set in motion in Iowa during the winter of 2007-2008. At this time, Senator Clinton had unwisely accepted the advice of her corrupt and mediocre campaign manager Mark Penn, who had recently published a book arguing that there would be no more big upheavals in American politics, but only a series of micro trends which had to be exploited one by one by smart politicians aiming to win. The stupidity of Penn's thesis could not have been in greater

contrast with the predictable reality that 2008 represented a watershed year of fundamental reordering of American politics — it was a year of party realignment. Party realignment in American history have come along every three to four decades, and have been characterized by the majority and minority parties trading places, by the collapsible parties and the emergence of new parties, or by other important and lasting shifts in the political landscape. 2008 was comparable to the coming of Jacksonian Democracy in 1828, which inaugurated a time of disaster for the United States, with a sickening slide into the greatest of all conceivable calamities, civil war. 2008 was comparable to 1860, the year when the Lincoln Republican Party emerged out of the wreckage of the Whigs, the Know-Nothings, and the Free Soil party, even as the Democratic Party split into two parts thanks in large part to the treachery of Caleb Cushing, the king of the dough-faces; this cycle allowed national unity to be preserved in a civil war and slavery to be eradicated, while setting the stage for the United States to become the greatest industrial power that the world had ever seen. 2008 was in the same league with 1896, when the contest between William Jennings Bryan and William McKinley gave the Republicans another cycle of dominance, but this time under the banner of Wall Street Republicanism and the dominance of the House of Morgan, the emergence of an invisible government controlled by financiers, the creation of the Federal Reserve, and the historical vandalism of the US entry into World War I, all crowned by the beginnings of the Great Depression under Herbert Hoover. 2008 might be similar to 1932, the most successful of all party realignments in American history, which put an end to the dominance of the reactionary and pro-fascist Republican financiers, and inaugurated the New Deal state of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the most effective form of human organization ever seen in history, a force powerful enough to defeat fascism, checkmate communism, open the secrets of the atom, and put humans on the moon. A negative model for 2008 was 1968, the beginning of the Republican Southern strategy theorized by Kevin Phillips, a retrogressive regime which consolidated itself after the horrors of Jimmy Carter into the so-called Reagan coalition of white men, suburban voters, evangelical Christians, and the Southern backlash against the Civil Rights Act of 1964. By 2006, the Reagan coalition had demonstrably collapsed and this fact was announced in the current cycle by Ed Rollins, at that time running the Huckabee campaign. 2008 was therefore destined to be a year of crisis and upheaval, and the advice given by Mark Penn to Senator Clinton was the worst possible guidance she could have received. Mark Penn recommended that Mrs. Clinton begin during the Democratic primaries the phase of triangulation or moving towards the center which is normally reserved for the general election campaign in September and October. Mark Penn's premature triangulation was the key to Mrs. Clinton's defeat in Iowa. If Senator Clinton had had any competent polling, she would have seen that her excessive moderation was setting her up for defeat, but there are hints that Penn was skewing the internal polls of the campaign so that his bad advice would seen to be successful, and would therefore continued to be followed. Mark Penn had worked with Zbigniew Brzezinski in the Ukrainian Orange Revolution coup of 2004, and therefore was widely suspected of divided and conflicting loyalties. When Obama won the Iowa caucus, there was grave danger that the Democratic primaries would be over in less than a week, and that the process of politicization and political education that the primaries implied would be a boarded and brought to a premature end. This was the fervent wish of the Wall Street financiers who constitute the US ruling class, since they much prefer the American people to be kept in an apolitical stupor of apathy and resignation.

OBAMA'S COUP SLOWED BY CLINTON AND EDWARDS

To Senator Clinton above all, and to some extent to Senator Edwards, goes the merit of having foiled Obama's plan for a cold coup d'état. By bouncing back from her disappointing third-place finish in Iowa to win the New Hampshire primary, Clinton saved the Democratic Party and perhaps

the United States as a whole from the terrible consequences of having the Democratic nomination seized through a lightning campaign by a totally unknown political adventurer and con artist. Senator Clinton was doubtless helped by the fact that New Hampshire voters had already been exposed to the specific brand of demagogy which Obama was peddling. In New Hampshire, as well as in Rhode Island, the main local television channels come from Boston, and therefore reflect the internal politics of Massachusetts into these two nearby states. In 2006, Deval Patrick had been elected as the first black governor of Massachusetts. Patrick's campaign manager had been the Chicago ward heeler David Axelrod, a member of the corrupt Daley machine who had specialized in getting black candidates elected in situations where it was indispensable for them to obtain significant numbers of white votes. Axelrod had attempted to solve this problem by recommending that the black candidates he advised employee a vague and aspirational rhetoric of messianic slogans and glittering utopian generalities, making the grubby details of another cynical exercise in political hucksterism and corruption into a sublime idealistic quest. Axelrod had found that this approach would deliver sizable support from affluent white voters and college youth which, when supplemented by strong turnout from black inner-city voters, would often carry his candidates to victory. But Patrick was failing as Governor of Massachusetts and voters there had been soured by the Obama formula.

OBAMA: MANIPULATING AMERICAN VOTERS AS ETHNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Even before Obama's "Bittergate" remarks in San Francisco, the acerbic Spengler of *Asia Times* had diagnosed Obama's method of profiling and manipulating the American people: he was an anthropologist, true to his mother's method, doing field work, and reducing American voters to ethnographic material in the process: 'Obama profiles Americans the way anthropologists interact with primitive peoples. He holds his own view in reserve and emphatically draws out the feelings of others; that is how friends and colleagues describe his modus operandi since his days at the Harvard Law Review, through his years as a community activist in Chicago, and in national politics. Anthropologists, though, proceed from resentment against the devouring culture of America and sympathy with the endangered cultures of the primitive world. Obama inverts the anthropological model: he applies the tools of cultural manipulation out of resentment against America. The probable next president of the United States is a mother's revenge against the America she despised. (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008) The lesson was that if you do not have a full set economy, including nuclear energy, you risk becoming ethnographic material in today's world.

MESSIANIC AND UTOPIAN: THE IOWA TELEPROMPTER SPEECH

During and right after the Iowa caucuses, Obama began to attract attention as an orator. His preference was to deliver a speech off a teleprompter before a huge crow in a stadium or sports arena. The parallels to the Mussolini balcony speech or the later German Nuremberg party rallies were overwhelming, but were seldom pointed out by the corrupt US corporate media. As Spengler noted, 'There is nothing mysterious about Obama's methods. "A demagogue tries to sound as stupid as his audience so that they will think they are as clever as he is," wrote Karl Krauss. Americans are the world's biggest suckers, and laugh at this weakness in their popular culture. Listening to Obama speak, Sinclair Lewis' cynical tent-revivalist Elmer Gantry comes to mind, or, even better, Tyrone Power's portrayal of a carnival mentalist in the 1947 film noir *Nightmare Alley*. The latter is available for instant viewing at Netflix, and highly recommended as an antidote to having felt uplifted by an Obama speech. America has the great misfortune to have encountered Obama at the

peak of his powers at its worst moment of vulnerability in a generation. With malice aforethought, he has sought out their sore point. This reversal has provoked a national mood of existential crisis. In Europe, economic downturns do not inspire this kind of soul-searching, for richer are poorer, remain what they always have been. But Americans are what they make of themselves, and the slim makings of 2008 shake their sense of identity. Americans have no institutionalized culture to fall back on. Their national religion has consisted of waves of enthusiasm - "Great Awakenings" – every second generation or so, followed by an interim of apathy. In times of stress they have a baleful susceptibility to hucksters and conmen. Be afraid - be very afraid. America is at a low point in its fortunes, and feeling sorry for itself.' (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008)

THE DYNAMICS OF THE MASS MEETING

It was above all on the night that Obama won the Iowa caucus that the world began to see the fully developed technique of Obama's mass meetings, with hysterical crowds and teleprompter delivery. All the well-worn clichés warning that those who fail to understand history are condemned to repeat it now became operative, with a vengeance. American politics was rushing backward in time to postwar Italy and depression-era Germany: the hour of the demagogue and mob orator was at hand. Fascism had already been tried once, and it had failed. Now, American society had been schooled in top-down totalitarianism for eight years by the Bush-Cheney-neocon regime, which had brought military defeat and world economic depression. Now the ruling elite was reversing its field, and trying a bottom-up approach to the demolition of real representative democracy. American were however ignorant of the main internal features of fascist movements of the recent past. Would they fall victim so easily to postmodern fascism? The founder of National Socialism had famously argued that the masses were always and everywhere characterized by irrationalism: '"The people (*das Volk*) are in their overwhelming majority so womanly in their views and attitudes that their thought and action are much less determined by sober reflection than by emotional feelings." The goal of mass meetings of the Obama type is to attack the faculties of reason and free will in the audience. As Georg Lukacs commented, National Socialism "wants manipulation instead of convincing arguments, wants to create by any means necessary a sultry atmosphere of blind belief and hysterical gullibility on the part of despairing people. Here again the struggle of existentialist philosophy (*Lebensphilosophie*) against reason — quite apart from how much existentialism Hitler may have known — forms the basis in terms of world outlook for a pure technique of demagogy. Hitler's 'originality' consists in the fact that he was the first to apply American advertising methods in German politics and propaganda. His goal was to dumb down and swindle the masses. In his principal work he confesses that his goal is demagogy and the breaking of the free will and cognitive faculty of people. The only question that Hitler ever thoroughly and conscientiously studied is by what tricks this goal can be reached. Here he discusses all possible external details of manipulation and the manipulability of the masses." (Lukacs, *Zerstörung der Vernunft*, 630-631)

Hitler was very explicit about the goals of his mass meeting: they were cynically planned as a systematic assault on human reason and human freedom: "In all these cases we are seeking to erode the freedom of the human will. And that is true especially of meetings where there are men whose wills are opposed to the speaker and who must be brought around to a new way of thinking. In the morning and during the day it seems that the power of the human will rebels with its strongest energy against any attempt to impose upon it the will or opinion of another. On the other hand, in the evening it easily succumbs to the domination of a stronger will. Because really in such assemblies there is a contest between two opposite forces. The superior oratorical art of a man who has the compelling character of an apostle will succeed better in bringing around to a new way of

thinking those who have naturally been subjected to a weakening of their forces of resistance rather than in converting those who are in full possession of their volitional and intellectual energies." (*Mein Kampf*, vol. II, chapter 6) Lukacs comments: "Hitler's propaganda technique is closely related to one of the few honest points in his entire world outlook: he is a passionate enemy of objective truth and fights against objectivity in every aspect of his life." (Lukacs 631) Hitler also commented: "The masses are like an animal that obeys its instincts…. I have been reproached for making the masses fanatics and ecstatic. In the opinion of these wiseacres, the masses must be soothed and kept in apathy. No, gentlemen, the reverse is true. I can lead the masses only if I tear them out of their apathy. Only a fanatic mass can be swayed. A master this apathetic and dull is the greatest threat to unity." And he continued: "At a mass meeting, thought is eliminated. And because this is the state of mind I require, because it secures me the best sounding board for my speeches, I order everyone to attend the meetings, will become part of the mass whether they like it or not, 'intellectuals' and bourgeois as well as workers. I mingle with the people. I speak to them only as the mass. I am conscious that I have no equal in the art of swaying the masses, not even Goebbels…. And remember this: the bigger the crowd, the more easily it is swayed…. Don't waste time over 'intellectual' meetings and groups drawn together by mutual interests. Anything you may achieve with such folk today by means of reasonable explanation may be erased tomorrow by an opposite explanation. But what you tell the people in the mass, in a receptive state a fanatic devotion, will remain like words received under a hypnotic influence, ineradicable, and impervious to every reasonable explanation. (Hitler to Rauschning, *Voice of Destruction*, 211-212)

SUBPRIME OBAMA

At the same time, Obama continued to run to the right of the rest of the Democratic candidates, to the right of Clinton and far to the right of Edwards, if the latter's speeches could be believed. Even some writers for *The Nation* began to realize that Obama was an apostle of right-wing economics, especially in refusing to halt foreclosures; their shortcoming was that they failed to see how destructive Obama's economic approach would actually be: 'Only Obama has not called for a moratorium and interest-rate freeze. Though he has been a proponent of mortgage fraud legislation in the Senate, he has remained silent on further financial regulations. And much like his broader economic stimulus package, Obama's foreclosure plan mostly avoids direct government spending in favor of a tax credit for homeowners, which amounts to about $500 on average, beyond which only certain borrowers would be eligible for help from an additional fund. "One advantage to the tax credit is that there's no moral hazard involved," one of Obama's economic advisers explains. "There's no sense in which you're rewarding someone for taking too big a risk. If you lied about your income in order to get a bigger mortgage, then you're not qualified. Do you really want to give a subsidy to the guy who wasn't prudent?" Obama has used similar language on the campaign trail. "Innocent homeowners," he has promised, those "responsible" borrowers "facing foreclosure through no fault of their own," would get help restructuring their loans. But no such luck for those "claiming income they didn't have" or "lying to get mortgages." "There's been less emphasis from the Obama campaign on the really dysfunctional role of the financial industry in the subprime mess," says Josh Bivens of the Economic Policy Institute. "Edwards and Clinton talk much more about regulation of the financial industry going forward, and to the extent that blame is placed, they tend to place it on the lenders for steering people into loans they couldn't afford." Obama's disappointing foreclosure plan stems from the centrist politics of his three chief economic advisers and his campaign's ties to Wall Street institutions opposed to increased financial regulation. David Cutler and Jeffrey Liebman are both Harvard economists who served in the Clinton Administration, and they work on market-oriented solutions to social welfare issues. Cutler advocates improving

healthcare through financial incentives; Liebman, the partial privatization of Social Security. Austan Goolsbee, an economist at the University of Chicago who calls himself a "centrist market economist," has been most directly involved with crafting Obama's subprime agenda. In a column last March in the *New York Times*, Goolsbee disputed whether "subprime lending was the leading cause of foreclosure problems," touted its benefits for credit-poor minority borrowers and warned that "regulators should be mindful of the potential downside in tightening [the mortgage market] too much." In October, no less a conservative luminary than George Will devoted a whole column in the *Washington Post* to saluting Goolsbee's "nuanced understanding" of traditional Democratic issues like globalization and income inequality and concluded that he "seems to be the sort of fellow – amiable, empirical, and reasonable – you would want at the elbow of a Democratic president, if such there must be." … Wall Street apparently has come to a similar conclusion. Obama had received nearly $10 million in contributions from the finance, insurance and real estate sector through October, and he's second among presidential candidates of either party in money raised from commercial banks, trailing only Clinton. Goldman Sachs, which made $6 billion from devalued mortgage securities in the first nine months of 2007, is Obama's top contributor. When asked if Obama would hold these financial institutions accountable for losses incurred by homeowners and investors, his campaign refused to comment.' (Max Fraser, "Sub-prime Obama" *The Nation*, February 110, 2008) Soon Goolsbee went into eclipse because he had warned the Canadian government that Obama's criticism of free trade sellouts like NAFTA was just demagogy for the campaign trail to edify the plebs. Goolsbee was then supplanted by Jason Furman, another monetarist. Well-informed sources from Goldman Sachs reported that the word on the Street was that Furman, like Jeffrey Liebman, was on board with the idea of privatizing Social Security as a means of "saving" it – the same policy that Bush had tried and failed to impose in 2005.

OBAMA USES RACISM, HOMOPHOBIA TO WIN SOUTH CAROLINA

Desperate to rebuild the momentum of his coup after his loss to Clinton in New Hampshire, Obama turned to the most disreputable allies and methods in his bid to win South Carolina. Obama turned to Reverend McClurkin, a local Elmer Gantry, to whip up support among the black churches. One commentator noted, 'Obama's reliance on McClurkin, a homophobic black minister, to deliver the black vote in South Carolina was eye-opening. What's even worse, McClurkin is gay.' This combination of public homophobia on the part of public figures who are themselves homosexual has been one of the hallmarks of recent Republican rule, as the Mark Foley and Larry Craig scandals have underlined; Obama represents more of the same in this department. Obama also developed a coded speech with which to appeal to South Carolina black voters, using echoes of speeches by Malcolm X which would be understood by some of his listeners, but not by others. It was a two-tiered technique, and rightly merited the name of duplicity. Here is a sample: 'As the South Carolina primary campaign built to a climax, Obama addressed a largely African-American audience in Sumter. … Obama drops his eloquent Harvard accent, and says, "They're trying to bamboozle you. It's the same old okie-dokie. — Y'all know about okie dokie, right? — They try to bamboozle you. — Hoodwink ya. Try to hoodwink ya. Alright. — I'm having too much fun here...." This speech had been borrowed from one of Obama's heroes, Malcolm X, who said, "You've been hoodwinked. You've been had. You've been took. You've been led astray, led amok. You've been bamboozled." It is strange that a candidate, who belongs to an "Afrocentric" church, that bestows awards on Louis Farrakhan, would borrow from Malcolm X, who was a spokesman for the Nation of Islam, right before complaining about e-mails claiming he is Muslim.'[167]

OBAMA AND DEVAL PATRICK: CLONES OF THE TRILATERAL MOTHER SHIP

When it was discovered in New Hampshire in 1987 that Senator Joe Biden, then running for president, had lifted entire passages out of a speech by British Labour Party leader Neal Kinnock and spouted them on the campaign trail, Biden had been buffeted by a tide of ridicule so merciless that he was forced to drop out of the race in just a few days. Over the past twenty years, US political standards had deteriorated sharply. Obama has been caught spouting passages already used in the campaigns of Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick, another client of Obama's chief sophist, David Axelrod. Patrick is in all probability a clone of the same Trilateral mother ship which runs Obama. Patrick can in fact be viewed as Brzezinski's spare Obama, a fall-back option who might have been mobilized if Obama had overdosed or been apprehended in some nefarious activity.[168] But this time Obama, unlike Biden two decades ago, was not forced to drop out. Public morality, we see, had taken a massive turn for the worse.

Here is Deval Patrick on June 3, 2006, according to a YouTube video: "I am not asking anybody to take a chance on ME. I'm asking you to take a chance on your own aspirations." Here is Barack Obama on Nov. 2, 2007 in Manning, S.C., according to a YouTube video: "I'm not just asking you to take a chance on ME. I'm also asking you to take a chance on your own aspirations." Another quote from Obama, this time responding to the criticism that he is nothing but a word monger: "Don't tell me words don't matter. 'I have a dream' — just words? 'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal' — just words? 'We have nothing to fear but fear itself' — just words? Just speeches?" Here now is Patrick responding to a similar stricture: "'We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal' — just words? Just words? 'We have nothing to fear but fear itself' — just words? 'Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.' Just words? 'I have a dream' — just words?" Blogger Taylor Marsh, who would end up drinking the Kool-Aid for Obama, summed up that Obama's classic line would never be "I have a dream." Much more appropriate for the senator would be "I have a con."

OBAMA: DUMMY; ZBIGNIEW BRZEZINSKI: VENTRILOQUIST

In my book *Obama – The Postmodern Coup: The Making of a Manchurian Candidate*, I argue that presidential candidate Barack Obama is a wholly-owned puppet of Zbigniew Brzezinski and his associates of the Trilateral Commission, founded by David Rockefeller. As some have noted, Brzezinski has been attempting to conceal his actual domination of the Obama campaign, for which he is the chief guru and controller. Now a rhetorical outburst by Obama on the campaign trail in Oregon at the close of the primaries once again pointed to the reality that Obama is a ventriloquist's dummy, with the Russia-hating fanatic Brzezinski, a barbarous relic of the Cold War, acting as the ventriloquist.

At a campaign stop in Oregon, Obama intoned:

> "We can't drive our SUVs and eat as much as we want and keep our homes on 72 degrees at all times … and then just expect that other countries are going to say OK," Obama said. "That's not leadership. That's not going to happen," he added. If India and China's "carbon footprint gets as big as ours, we're gone." (AFP)

This remarkable statement reveals the true program of a future Obama administration: savage austerity, brutal economic sacrifice, and a massive further reduction in the standard of living of the depleted and exhausted US population – as demanded by David Rockefeller, George Soros, and

Obama's Wall Street backers. This will be done under left cover – through a global warming tax, a third world solidarity tax, and other demagogic frauds, with the revenue going to bail out Goldman Sachs, Citibank, and JP Morgan Chase. The tired, discredited post-9/11 "war on terror" slogans will be largely dumped. Most interesting is that Obama's sound bytes are actually a sloganized version of a key passage from Zbigniew Brzezinski's recent book *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower*.[169] This book contains Zbig's desperate strategy for preserving the crisis-ridden US-UK world empire, including by making the US "social model" more attractive to developing sector publics. Zbig writes:

> In mutually compounding ways, material self-indulgence, persistent social shortcomings, and public ignorance about the world increase the difficulty the American democracy faces in formulating a globally appealing platform for effective world leadership. Americans must recognize that their patterns of consumption will soon collide head-on with increasingly impatient egalitarian aspirations. Whether through the exploitation of natural resources, excessive energy consumption, indifference to global ecology, or the exorbitant size of houses for the well-to-do, indulgent self-gratification at home conveys indifference to the persisting deprivations of much of the world. (Just try to imagine a world in which 2.5 billion Chinese and Indians consume as much energy per capita as Americans do.) That reality the American public has yet to assimilate. To lead, America must not only be sensitive to global realities. It must also be socially attractive. That calls for a broader national consensus in favor of correcting the key failings of the American social model.

OBAMA'S OLIVER TWIST MOMENT

Obama has thus unmasked himself as the exterminating angel of super-austerity dictated by the elitist Trilateral bankers' clique. Will he cut the current US standard of living by 40%? By 50%? When he does, will he still call it the politics of hope? The rhetoric recalls the *malaise* of the earlier Trilateral puppet and austerity fanatic Jimmy Carter, but it goes much further. Is every American child to be put on rations, like Oliver Twist, and forbidden to ask for some more? Obama is eager for this kind of cruelty. Obama has been trained to hate the American people through two decades of association with hate-mongers like Reverend Wright, Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn, and Brzezinski himself. For Rockefeller and Soros, Obama's hatred of the American people is a positive guarantee that he will enforce Wall Street's austerity decrees with a vengeance. Forget the utopian platitudes and the messianic rhetoric: Obama's real economic program is now clear for all to see. It is a path that leads to genocide against the US population, among others.

Obama's Oregon outburst also needs to be read in the light of earlier unguarded statements by Michelle Obama, who, as we have seen, has said at various times in her stump speech: "…before we can work on the problems, we have to fix our souls - our souls are broken in this nation. If we can't see ourselves in one another, we will never make those sacrifices….We need a different leadership because our souls are broken. We need to be inspired...to make the sacrifices that are needed to push us to a different place…. The change Barack is talking about is hard, so don't get too excited because Barack is going to demand that you too be different." Here the theme of purification and redemption by means of sacrifice and economic austerity is clearly conveyed. Now Barack has begun to fill in the details.

Insiders have long recognized that Zbigniew Brzezinski (helped by his son Mark) owns and runs Obama. David Ignatius has pointed to *Second Chance* as a scenario for a future Obama administration. Ignatius commented over a year ago: "Zbigniew Brzezinski has written a new book

that might be a foreign policy manifesto for Barack Obama… The most intriguing part of Brzezinski's book is what I would describe as the Obama manifesto. (David Ignatius, "A Manifesto for the Next President," *Washington Post*, March 14, 2007) It has also long been known that Zbig does the thinking for Obama; the London *Economist* last year hailed "a new brain for Barack Obama! It's 78 years old and it still works perfectly. It belongs to Zbigniew Brzezinski, the peppery ex-national security adviser to Jimmy Carter." ("A New Brain for Barack Obama, Economist.com, March 14, 2007) Obama's campaign has long been attacking Bush from the right, criticizing the current regime for not exploiting 9/11 to impose savage economic austerity, as seen in Samantha Power's "monster" interview. We now have good evidence that Obama will flay the American people alive with his elitist economic policies. Obama had committed a major error by showing his hand. Would voters react in time to stop him?

OBAMAKINS AND NEOCONS SUPPORT THE SAVIOR

One area where Obama enjoyed strong support was at the arch-reactionary, Rockefeller-funded University of Chicago, and especially among the neocons of the law school there. A middleman between these neocons and the Obama campaign was evidently Cass Sunstein, who was considered something of an antiwar liberal. Sunstein expressed his support for Obama in oblique but unmistakable terms: 'The University of Chicago Law School is by far the most conservative of the great American law schools. It helped to provide the academic foundations for many positions of the Reagan administration. But at the University of Chicago, Obama is liked and admired by Republicans and Democrats alike. Some of the local Reagan enthusiasts are Obama supporters… he appreciates the virtues and power of free markets. I do not deny that skeptics are raising legitimate questions. After all, Obama has served in the Senate for a short period (less than four years) and he has little managerial experience. Is he really equipped to lead the most powerful nation in the world? Obama speaks of "change", but will he be able to produce large-scale changes in a short time? What if he fails? An independent issue is that all the enthusiasm might serve to insulate him from criticisms and challenges on the part of his own advisers — and, in view of his relative youth, criticisms and challenges are exactly what he requires.' (Cass Sunstein, *Huffington Post*, March 5, 2008)

TEXAS: OBAMA PLAYS THE RACE CARD ONCE AGAIN

Obama confesses in his memoirs that he has a very good understanding of how the race card can be used by a black candidate in an election where white votes were also important; he cites the example of Chicago's first black mayor, Harold Washington: 'Black politicians less gifted than Harold discovered what white politicians had known for a very long time: that race-baiting could make up for a host of limitations. Young leaders, eager to make a name for themselves, upped the ante, peddling conspiracy theories all over town - the Koreans were funding the Klan, Jewish doctors were injecting black babies with the AIDS virus. It was a short cut to fame, if not always fortune; like sex, or violence on TV, black rage always found a ready market.'(*Dreams* 203) Obama himself played the race card with brutality, but under a mask of moderation; he also knew the importance of letting his surrogates and backers do a lot of this dirty work. One example is Obama's response to Clinton's Texas television ad about the 3 AM phone call to the White House, which was meant to raise doubts about Obama's reliability in national security emergencies. Obama found a bizarre surrogate who was able to turn the whole thing into a race issue, where Obama thought he had the advantage: The Clinton campaign had produced a television ad which depicted a family scene with parents watching over their sleeping children. Then the camera shifted to the

White House, where Senator Clinton was shown answering an emergency telephone call at 3 AM in what was obviously some sort of national security emergency. The suggested theme was that Senator Clinton was prepared for the awesome responsibilities of the presidency, specifically in the areas of national defense and crisis management. The Obama campaign immediately screamed that this was a highly negative ad – despite the obvious fact that Obama's name was not even mentioned. Not content with this, the Obominables trotted out the Harvard sociology professor Orlando Patterson, a black man in a postmodernist Mao suit, who proclaimed that he had discovered a racist and nefarious subliminal message in Clinton's ad – the emergency implied was in his view a prowler or thief trying to break into the house, and, given, the southern state where the ad was being shown, that thief or prowler could only be a black man! It was a *salto mortale* of the worst kind, buttressed by the kind of impressionistic deconstructionism pioneered by the late Jacques Derrida. Patterson's charges were absurd, and he was exposing himself as an opportunist and charlatan. This amazing outburst was answered by Princeton historian Sean Wilentz, who was emerging as one of the most incisive critics of the Obama campaign's duplicitous hypocrisy on the race issue. Wilentz commented: 'Reading Orlando Patterson's op-ed in the *New York Times*, "The Red Phone in Black and White," is a depressing experience. Not only does the piece scurrilously accuse Hillary Clinton's campaign of cutting an ad that borrows from the filmmaker D.W. Griffith's glorification of the Ku Klux Klan. Not only is this attack based on a Clinton advertisement about national security, not domestic policy (let alone race), that required a singularly tortured and biased "close reading" by Patterson to reach its conclusions. What is truly depressing is that the essay fits what has become a troubling and familiar pattern by the Obama campaign and its fervent supporters to inject racial politics on the eve of yet another Democratic primary in a Southern state, in this case Mississippi, where African-American voters are expected to vote in large numbers. […] In Texas, Ohio, and Rhode Island on March 4, as earlier in New Hampshire, the Obama campaign did not achieve the knock-out blow it expected and predicted. Indeed, just before those primaries and since, Obama's camp started to receive serious criticism and scrutiny for the first time, over the candidate's connections to indicted Chicago fixer Tony Rezko, and over the amateurish and revealing actions of senior advisers Austan Goolsbee, Susan Rice, and Samantha Power. The campaign has turned to double-talk and to stonewalling the press. And once again, it has lashed out by playing racial politics while accusing the Clinton campaign of playing the very same game. Interpreting the Clinton 3 A.M. phone ad on preparedness and national security as a hidden appeal to white racism takes a remarkable bit of bad faith on the part of Professor Patterson. But the bad faith is not restricted to him alone. Earlier in the campaign, in speeches to black audiences, Obama mouthed lines generally believed to come from Malcolm X about how African-Americans were being "bamboozled" and "hoodwinked" by white oppressors and Uncle Toms – except that the lines were not actually Malcolm's but were scripted for Denzel Washington playing Malcolm X in Spike Lee's movie. Now, in Mississippi, Obama is talking about blacks being bamboozled and hoodwinked again. Then, after Obama conceded that Clinton had nothing to do with the ridiculous posting on the disreputable Drudge Report of a picture of Obama in ceremonial Somali dress – supposedly an appeal to racial and religious fears – he now is telling the voters of Mississippi that in fact she was responsible for the photo's appearance, and that she did it in order to scare people – a charge he well knows to be untrue. In the televised debate in Ohio on February 26, Obama said that "I take Senator Clinton at her word that she knew nothing about the photo. So I think that's something that we can set aside." But on March 10 in Jackson, Mississippi, he declared, "When in the midst of a campaign you decide to throw the kitchen sink at your opponent because you're behind, and your campaign starts leaking photographs of me when I'm traveling overseas wearing the native clothes of those folks to make people afraid ... that's not real change" The flip-flopping

is bad enough, even if the press corps does not always report it. But the cynical race politics by Obama and his passionate followers, is toxic, not just for this campaign but for American political life.' (Sean Wilentz, "Hold On--'3 A.M.' Wasn't Racist — Obama supporters cry wolf on race again," *New Republic* online, posted March 11, 2008)

CRAIG CRAWFORD: ANTI-CLINTON MEDIA BIAS "BORDERS ON MENTAL ILLNESS"

Another commentator who was capable of seeing through the Obama racist smokescreen was Craig Crawford, a veteran political operative and journalist who generally knew what he was talking about. He made the following remarks one morning on MSNBC Obamavision in response to the moronic anti-Clinton spurious spinning by Joe Scarborough and Mika Brzezinski:

> CRAWFORD: You know, I have sat down here in Florida for the last month. And I have watched the coverage, and I really think the evidence-free bias against the Clintons in the media borders on mental illness. I mean, I think when Dr. Phil gets done with Britney [Spears], he ought to go to Washington and stage an intervention at the National Press Club. I mean, we've gotten into a situation where if you try to be fair to the Clintons, if you try to be objective, if you try to say, "Well, where's the evidence of racism in the Clinton campaign?" you're accused of being a naïve shill for the Clintons. I mean, I think if somebody came out today and said that Bill Clinton — if the town drunk in Columbia [South Carolina] came out and said, "Bill Clinton last night was poisoning the drinking water in Obama precincts," the media would say, "Ah, there goes Clinton again. You can't trust him." I really think it's a problem. You know what? You guys make him stronger with this bashing. This actually is what makes the Clintons stronger.

Crawford was right in recalling that Bill Clinton's greatest gift during the 1990s was his ability to position himself in the center, making his opponents seem like extremists and haters. It was in this way that Clinton was able to defeat the Gingrich budget coup attempt of 1995 and later the impeachment coup of 1999. Would this same method finally defeat Obama?

SHELBY STEELE: OBAMA NEGLECTED TO BECOME HIMSELF

The black conservative Shelby Steele has pointed out the tremendous internal stresses and strains to which Obama is subject as he increasingly masks his own views and professes opinions which are calculated to appeal to large groups of white voters. Steele classes Obama as a bargainer who survives by making deals with the white power structure, but who avoids open challenges to oppression. This makes Obama different from types like Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton, who operate by constantly challenging the moral justifications of the white minority; these latter are seen as far more threatening. It is not a very profound analysis, but it does offer some useful insights. Steele writes: 'No matter his ultimate political fate, there is already enough pathos in Barack Obama to make him a cautionary tale. His public persona thrives on a manipulation of whites (bargaining), and his private sense of racial identity demands both self-betrayal and duplicity. His is the story of a man who flew so high, yet neglected to become himself."[170] Steele observes that Obama has embraced what he calls a black identity: "There is a price to be paid even for fellow-traveling with a racial identity as politicized and demanding as today's black identity. This identity wants to take over a greater proportion of the self than other racial identities do. It wants to have its collective truth-its defining ideas of grievance and protest-become personal truth.... These are the identity pressures that Barack Obama lives within. He is vulnerable to them because he has hungered for a

transparent black identity much of his life. He needs to 'be black.' And this hunger—no matter how understandable it may be—means that he is not in a position to reject the political liberalism inherent in his racial identity. For Obama liberalism is blackness."[171] But Steele has failed to historicize the "black identity" he is talking about. Obama's version of the black identity is the post-1965 black identity as it has been manufactured by foundation-funded intellectuals and social movements under the reign of affirmative action and multiculturalism, which have failed to solve the problems of the black inner-city ghetto. The reason this synthetic black identity is so destructive and consumes so much of the self is that it has been designed to be self-destructive and self-defeating by the foundation mind-benders. The contradictions related to the foundation-funded black identity continue to explode into public view around the demonic figure of Reverend Wright: '…nothing could be more dangerous to Mr. Obama's political aspirations than the revelation that he, the son of a white woman, sat Sunday after Sunday — *for 20 years* — in an Afrocentric, black nationalist church in which his own mother, not to mention other whites, could never feel comfortable. His pastor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright, is a challenger who goes far past Al Sharpton and Jesse Jackson in his anti-American outrage ("God damn America"). How does one "transcend" race in this church? The fact is that Barack Obama has fellow-traveled with a hate-filled, anti-American black nationalism all his adult life, failing to stand and challenge an ideology that would have no place for his own mother. And what portent of presidential judgment is it to have exposed his two daughters for their entire lives to what is, at the very least, a subtext of anti-white vitriol? What could he have been thinking? Of course he wasn't thinking. He was driven by insecurity, by a need to "be black" despite his biracial background. And so fellow-traveling with a little race hatred seemed a small price to pay for a more secure racial identity. And anyway, wasn't this hatred more rhetorical than real? But now the floodlight of a presidential campaign has trained on this usually hidden corner of contemporary black life: a mindless indulgence in a rhetorical anti-Americanism as a way of bonding and of asserting one's blackness. Yet Jeremiah Wright, splashed across America's television screens, has shown us that there is no real difference between rhetorical hatred and real hatred. No matter his ultimate political fate, there is already enough pathos in Barack Obama to make him a cautionary tale. His public persona thrives on a manipulation of whites (bargaining), and his private sense of racial identity demands both self-betrayal and duplicity….' (Shelby Steele, "The Obama Bargain,' *Wall Street Journal*, March 18, 2008) In early July, Jesse Jackson noted correctly that Obama was talking more and more about personal responsibility for the black family and the black community, and less and less about the need for government intervention to fight poverty and exclusion. Jackson was right to say that this amounted to talking down to the black community. The answer, however, was that the entire foundation race-based divide-and-conquer approach had to be junked, and replaced with class-based, color-blind New Deal programs for jobs, housing, education and health care that attacked poverty as an empirically measurable phenomenon among all groups in the US population, rather than attempting to deal with accumulated grievances, where the black overclass would always demand the lion's share of the available benefits. To tell people of any color that they have to use self-reliance and family values in the midst of a world economic depression caused by Wall Streets $1 quadrillion derivatives bubble, with dollar hyperinflation, banking panic, systemic breakdown, the death agony of the US dollar as a reserve currency, and chain-reaction bankruptcies ripping through the landscape – that is sheer genocidal madness. It was time for New Deal measures for economic recovery and the general welfare, and those were necessarily color-blind measures to help the poor of all races, creeds, and national origins. This was the very outcome that Obama had been deployed by the Trilateral financiers to prevent, so Jesse Jackson was on to something.

OBAMA CAMPAIGN: WE NEED MORE WHITE PEOPLE

Obama's campaign was relentlessly obsessed with race, in a number of directions. The following account from Gateway Pundit deals with a campaign event at Carnegie Mellon University near Pittsburgh on April 2, 2008. Michelle Obama's handlers noticed that the television framing of the speakers' platform was going to show too many non-white faces. They therefore proceeded in a blatant and ham-handed way to expel an Asian woman from the shot, while moving in a white face. 'So just as Teresa Heinz Kerry, the woman who supports the lifestyle of the man whole sold the Democrats down the river four years ago, was about to introduce the woman who took more than 40 years to be "proud of America," suddenly……. gasp!… suddenly…….somebody noticed something: While the crowd was indeed diverse, some students at the event questioned the practices of Mrs. Obama's event coordinators, who handpicked the crowd sitting behind Mrs. Obama. The *Tartan*'s correspondents observed one event coordinator say to another, "Get me more white people, we need more white people." To an Asian girl sitting in the back row, one coordinator said, "We're moving you, sorry. It's going to look so pretty, though." "I didn't know they would say, 'We need a white person here,'" said attendee and senior psychology major Shayna Watson, who sat in the crowd behind Mrs. Obama. "I understood they would want a show of diversity, but to pick up people and to reseat them, I didn't know it would be so outright."' (Gateway Pundit, "Giving Hope a Comeback," April 2, 2008) It looked rather like the old politics.

OBAMA WEAKENED IN THE COURSE OF THE PRIMARIES

In the wake of the Texas-Ohio-Rhode Island results, the Clinton campaign began to argue more in detail that the public's honeymoon with Obama had now passed its apex, and that his campaign was beginning to ebb. Their statistics were based on the inherently unreliable exit polls, but might still have indicated the beginnings of a sea-change. Clinton's people claimed that "…just a few weeks ago, Barack Obama won 68% of men in Virginia, 67% in Wisconsin and 62% in Maryland. He won 60% of Virginia women and 55% of Maryland women. He won 62% of independents in Maryland, 64% in Wisconsin and 69% in Virginia. Obama won 59% of Democrats in Maryland, 53% in Wisconsin and 62% in Virginia. And among Republicans, Obama won 72% in both Virginia and Wisconsin. But now Obama's support has dropped among all these groups. In Mississippi, he won only 25% of Republicans and barely half of independents. In Ohio, he won only 48% of men, 41% of women and 42% of Democrats. In Texas, he won only 49% of independents and 46% of Democrats. And in Rhode Island, Obama won just 33% of women and 37% of Democrats. Why are so many voters turning away from Barack Obama in state after state? In the last few weeks, questions have arisen about Obama's readiness to be president. In Virginia, 56% of Democratic primary voters said Obama was most qualified to be commander-in-chief. That number fell to 37% in Ohio, 35% in Rhode Island and 39% in Texas. So the late deciders - those making up their minds in the last days before the election - have been shifting to Hillary Clinton. Among those who made their decision in the last three days, Obama won 55% in Virginia and 53% in Wisconsin, but only 43% in Mississippi, 40% in Ohio, 39% in Texas and 37% in Rhode Island." (Clinton Campaign, "Keystone Test: Obama Losing Ground," March 12, 2008)

WAS OBAMA'S CAUCUS SUPERIORITY BASED ON HOOLIGAN DISRUPTION?

For weeks it had been assumed that Obama's superiority and caucus states had been based on the obvious advantage he held among rich elitists, affluent suburbanites, left liberal ideologues, and Obama groupies, fanatics, and personality cultists — namely that all these groups were much more

likely to spend two or three hours going to a party caucus and hobnobbing with their peers then were the low-wage hourly workers, housewives, and other working people who were far more likely to support Senator Clinton. But was there another dimension beyond this? Had the Obama people power coup developed a playbook of tactics to disrupt and subvert the caucuses? One reported commented: 'I have obtained a copy of a memo written by a Clinton campaign volunteer in Washington state intended only for other Clinton volunteers in subsequent caucus states (specifically for Texas campaign volunteers). It warns them of "caucus disruption strategies" by supporters of Sen. Barack Obama. The memo was written by a University of North Carolina professor emerita of anthropology who served as a volunteer Clinton precinct committee officer in the Washington state caucuses last month. It warned other volunteer organizers about so-called "strategies" alleged to have been observed by herself and by Clinton volunteers in Iowa and Nevada: … Individuals arriving all at once in large groups can disrupt the caucus by making it difficult to keep track of sign-in sheets, among other things…Other behaviors that can make it difficult for the caucus to run smoothly are deliberate disruptions with things like chanting, sign waving, dancing or singing. The Precinct Chair (or Caucus Chair) will need to insist on order. Individuals may arrive who are not registered to vote in a particular precinct with the story that 'they just moved there.' Some places where this has been observed, the person really didn't fit the picture of somebody who had 'just moved into' the precinct. They were allowed to register to vote and to caucus….Supporters for a particular candidate, such as Senator Clinton, have arrived at caucus sites early to decorate and organize and been told that 'the building was locked.' When they are finally allowed into the building they see that signs for other candidates had already been posted. Bottom line: know who you are dealing with in terms of the caucus coordinator ... This will usually be some volunteer for the local Democratic Party." (Bonnie Erbe, "Democratic caucus disruptions," Scripps Howard News Service, March 12, 2008)

There was also this eyewitness account from Pacific John of El Paso, Texas: 'In one example of fraud that I witnessed, one of my precinct captains, an elderly Hispanic woman, called me to report that BHO supporters had illegally seized control of the convention. During our series of phone calls, Mrs. "A." reported that the Obama people took the convention materials and did not have a legal election of officers. Like nearly all of El Paso, BHO people would have lost such an election in this majority-Hillary, Hispanic, mostly elderly precinct convention. The Obama people ordered Mrs. A. to sit across the room during the delegate calculation, and excluded Hillary supporters from the process. Mrs. A. overheard an Obama supporter call in a false delegate count to Austin. In a 13 delegate precinct where Obama should have won approximately 4 delegates, the Obama supporters attempted to award 19 delegates to Obama. This was not innocent. During my attempts at cell phone diplomacy, the Obama "chair" hung up on me, and refused to talk to the ethical Obama organizer I was paired with at another precinct convention. As with all major attempts at fraud that we identified, this delegate count was rectified in private at the county TDP headquarters, according to TDP rules, but there were no public charges or sanctions. It is my opinion that people should be in jail, but there is not a mechanism for this sort of prosecution, certainly not within TDP rules. Although I have only volunteered in one state, virtually every Clinton staffer I have talked to has similar stories from other caucus states. While the Hillary field campaign operates and feels very much like typical Democratic campaigns, the Obama campaign is something new to Democratic politics. From my perspective, it looks like it has copied the worst attributes of Republican campaigns, but with unprecedented zeal.'[172]

GENOCIDAL AUSTERITY FOR THE PLANET AND THE THIRD WORLD

The reality of a future Obama regime as an exercise in brutal austerity and draconian sacrifice for an already exhausted US population is carefully hidden by the swooning media whores in this country, but the intent is gross enough to be perceived from far away. Russian commentators, well aware that Brzezinski runs Obama, have called attention to the Polish revanchist's demands for a further lowering of the US standard of living in order to increase the attractiveness of the US social model to the rest of the world. In short, Brzezinski wants austerity for US blue collar workers and poor people of all colors in order to enhance the efficacy of his imperialist war plans A smart Russian author writing under the name of "Maksim Kalashnikov" observes: 'In his most recent book, entitled *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower*, Mr. Brzezinski is trying to inspire his nation for a strategic mobilization, using arguments that curiously recall old Soviet experience. It is more remarkable that speaking of disappointment of the international audience in the American way of life, Mr. Brzezinski concentrated on the moral aspect of the US development. To his view, the Americans have sunk into over-consumption, luxury, and hedonism. As soon as the Americans encountered domestic economic problems, their example became increasingly unattractive. The author correctly reminds us that the crisis of the Soviet Union started with the loss of attractiveness of its model. Brzezinski emphasizes that the continuing efforts to transplant democracy on a different soil degenerate into connivance to weakness of partners, and multiply to lack of knowledge of relevant societies. Meanwhile, the universal image of an American is associated with arrogant over-consumption, luxurious entertainment, along with indifference towards environment and exploitation of natural resources. To make a plausible example, Brzezinski proposes the audience to imagine a world in which every Chinese or Indian consumes as much as an ordinary American, even in the conditions of economic recession. "Our standards of consumption are going to get into a conflict with more and more intolerant egalitarian aspirations", warns Brzezinski. Therefore, to his view, the United States has to be "socially attractive" – which requires broad national accord vis-à-vis one of the major flaws of the American social model.' ("Maksim Kalashnikov, "Brzezinski Discovered America," April 3, 2008)

The last wholly-owned Trilateral puppet, Jimmy Carter, was of course thoroughly committed to as much austerity as the political traffic would bear. But even Carter had moments of conscience and reticence, scruples, and qualms when confronted with the enormity of the sacrifices the Trilaterals wanted to bail out their corrupt and bankrupt system. Carter was hampered among other things by his residual allegiance to Christianity under the Trilateral overlay. But Carter had not been indoctrinated for very long compared with Obama. Obama's attraction to the Trilateral financiers is precisely that he is the son of the Ford Foundation anthropologist Ann Dunham, a woman who flirted with Marxism and was anti-American for all the wrong reasons, and that he is a disciple of the Cone-Hopkins-Wright synthetic religion of race hatred. Under his suave and cultured veneer, Obama is boiling with resentments and hatred against the American working class, at whose hands he imagines that he has received all manner of slights and humiliations. Obama's basic tendency if he ever gets to the White House will be to take advantage of an unparalleled opportunity to flay the American people alive and leave them nothing but their eyes to weep with in a way that Bush, for all his malevolence, never dreamed of doing. And while Bush had to hide his own looting of the American people, Obama will loudly proclaim his own austerity plan, trumpeting it as the essence of social justice, as the answer to imperialism, colonialism, slavery, racism, and pollution – except that the proceeds will go into the pockets of David Rockefeller, George Soros, and the other finance oligarchs who own Obama.

THE PROCEEDS GO TO ROCKEFELLER, SOROS, RUBIN, ROHATYN

One way that Obama could show that he is better than Bush and better than McCain when it comes to imposing crushing austerity on the American population is his ability to dress up cuts in the living standard in the camouflage of leftist and humanitarian verbiage. A fiendish variant of this demagogy is Obama's plan to help the third world. In reality, the sums of money cited here will go to bail out the bankrupt banks and investment houses of Rockefeller, Soros, Rubin, and Rohatyn. But left liberals will support these measures, especially because they involve further sacrifices for blue collar workers. Obama's bill is called the Global Poverty Act, '… and could result in the imposition of a $845 billion global tax on the United States. The bill, which has the support of many liberal religious groups, makes levels of U.S. foreign aid spending subservient to the dictates of the United Nations. The U.N.'s "Millennium Project," says that the U.N. plan to force the U.S. to pay 0.7 percent of its GNP in increased foreign aid spending would add $65 billion a year to what the U.S. already spends. Over a 13-year period, from 2002, when the U.N.'s Financing for Development conference was held, to the target year of 2015, when the U.S. is expected to meet the "Millennium Development Goals," this amounts to $845 billion. And the only way to raise that kind of money is through a global tax, preferably on carbon-emitting fossil fuels. Here's an abstract of the proposed legislation: "To require the President to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to further the United States foreign policy objective of promoting the reduction of global poverty, the elimination of extreme global poverty, and the achievement of the [U.N.] Millennium Development Goal of reducing by one-half the proportion of people worldwide, between 1990 and 2015, who live on less than $1 per day." Here's how Senator Obama's website frames the bill: "With billions of people living on just dollars a day around the world, global poverty remains one of the greatest challenges and tragedies the international community faces," said Senator Obama. "It must be a priority of American foreign policy to commit to eliminating extreme poverty and ensuring every child has food, shelter, and clean drinking water. As we strive to rebuild America's standing in the world, this important bill will demonstrate our promise and commitment to those in the developing world. Our commitment to the global economy must extend beyond trade agreements that are more about increasing corporate profits than about helping workers and small farmers everywhere."' 173 The key to getting the United States and the rest of the world out of the present Bush economic depression is to gear up American factories for a campaign of exporting high technology capital goods to the developing countries, especially in the critical areas of infrastructure and nuclear energy production (Atoms for Peace). That would be a real economic recovery program. But Obama is talking about nothing of the kind: he is talking about extorting taxpayer dollars by citing the very real fact that 40,000 people die every day in the developing countries of malnutrition and starvation, and then cynically giving the money to his bankrupt Wall Street backers to prop up their rotten and doomed system.

This capability of Obama to impose sacrifice and austerity qualitatively worse than Carter depends on the fact that the force of hatred is far stronger in Obama, the foundation-funded anti-American racist and crypto-Weatherman, than it ever was in Carter, who appears benign by comparison. Even the cynical Spengler is aghast at the hatred of the American people which can be detected in Obama: '"Evil will oft evil mars", J. R. Tolkien wrote. It is conceivable that Barack Obama, if elected, will destroy himself before he destroys the country. Hatred is a toxic diet even for someone with as strong a stomach as Obama. As he recalled in his 1995 autobiography, *Dreams from My Father*, Obama idealized the Kenyan economist who had married and dumped his mother, and was saddened to learn that Barack Hussein Obama, Sr, was a sullen, drunken polygamist. The elder Obama became a senior official of the government of Kenya after earning a PhD at Harvard.

He was an abusive drunk and philanderer whose temper soured his career.' (Spengler, *Asia Times*, Feb. 26, 2008) Obama also has a powerful demagogic weapon to turn against the American people as he seeks to ram killer austerity down their throats: this is the global warming hope is, assiduously cultivated over some two decades by the oligarchical Malthusian profiteer and parasite Al Gore. The ultimate source for Obama's future austerity programs is doubtless Prince Charles, the ego ideal and master of Obama's backer Gore. Prince Charles comes from the British royal family, which supported Mussolini in the 1920s and Hitler in the 1930s. After World War II, they turned to green fascism in the form of extreme Darwinian-Malthusian zero growth, and now to global warming as the basis for their genocide policy against the third world. As Prince Charles recently stated: "We will end up seeing more drought and starvation on a grand scale. Weather patterns will become even more terrifying and there will be less and less rainfall," he said. "We are asking for something pretty dreadful unless we really understand the issues now and [the] urgency of them." The neofascist Prince claimed that the rainforests, which provide the "air conditioning system for the entire planet", releasing water vapour and absorbing carbon, were being lost to poor farmers desperate to make a living. Charles raved that every year, 20 million hectares of forest – equivalent to the area of England, Wales and Scotland – were destroyed and called for a "gigantic partnership" of governments, businesses and consumers to slow it down. This is just the kind of PPP or public-private partnership which represents the preferred expression for the fascist corporate state in the English-speaking world. "What we have got to do is try to ensure that these forests are more valuable alive than dead. At the moment, there is more value in them being dead," Charles estimated that the cost would be about £15 billion a year towards which he offered to pay nothing, but rather attempted to con his listeners by defining this as an insurance policy for the whole world. "That is roughly just under one per cent of all the insurance premiums paid in the world in any one year. It is an insurance premium to ensure the world has some rainfall and reasonable weather patterns. It is a good deal." A good deal for parasites and genocidalists, one might observe. (Andrew Pierce, "Prince Charles: Eighteen months to stop climate change disaster," *Daily Telegraph*, May 18, 2008) Prince Charles is clearly counting on Obama to break the back of the remaining industrial powers during the first year of his presidential term; this would inevitably be followed by social chaos and mass starvation.

In an article entitled "Global warming hysteria serves as excuse for world government," Daniel Taylor outlines how the exploitation of the natural phenomenon of "global warming" was a pet project of the Club of Rome and the CFR. "In a report titled 'The First Global Revolution' (1991) published by the Club of Rome, an oligarchical think tank, we find the following statement: "In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill.... All these dangers are caused by human intervention... The real enemy, then, is humanity itself."[174] With Bush, the enemy image (*Feindbild*) was concocted on the basis of the 9/11 myth. With Obama, the enemy image is humanity in general, based on the insane hoax of overpopulation, the limits of growth, and of carbon dioxide as a pollutant. The essence of fascist economics is the imposition of a state-sponsored compulsory cartel for the purpose of reducing employment and cutting production, outside of which no economic activity is permitted. Back during the Carter years, the Trilateralists concluded that the way to impose the fascist corporate state in the United States is to do it under the cover of ecological and environmentalist explanations. The Al Gore "cap and trade" swindle predicated on global warming is the chosen means to smuggle the fascist corporate state in through the back door under the cover of controlling the emissions of so-called greenhouse gases. Cap and trade represents Gore's method of creating a new financial bubble after the catastrophic collapse of

the current worldwide asset bubble. Those who do not join the compulsory cartel by entering the market for carbon offsets will be shut down by the Green Corps Gestapo.

This approach is now the basis of an emerging pan-oligarchical consensus among the US-UK financiers. '…attendees at the recent Trilateral meeting raised the specter of climate change as a tool to force through tax hikes. Calling on the United States government to adopt a "carbon monoxide control policy," former CIA boss and long term champion of creating a domestic intelligence agency to spy on Americans John Deutch, argued that America should impose a $1-pergallon increase in the gasoline tax under the pretext of fighting pollution. During the secretive Trilateral Commission group meeting in March 2007, elitists gathered to formulate policy on how best they could exploit global warming fear-mongering to ratchet up taxes and control over how westerners live their lives. At the confab, European Chairman of the Trilateral Commission, Bilderberger and chairman of British Petroleum Peter Sutherland, gave a speech to his cohorts in which he issued a "Universal battle cry arose for the world to address "global warming" with a single voice." Echoing this sentiment was General Lord Guthrie, director of N.M. Rothschild & Sons, member of the House of Lords and former chief of the Defense Staff in London, who urged the Trilateral power-brokers to "Address the global climate crisis with a single voice, and impose rules that apply worldwide.'[175] So far, China, Russia, and India have refused to accept economic strangulation and the shutdown of their economic development plans by the global warming charlatans. Instead, 50-60 countries around the world are demanding a rapid shift to nuclear energy, and the International Atomic Energy Agency has advanced a workable plan for 1,400 new nuclear reactors to guarantee the future of humanity. One of Obama's first tasks will be to attempt to sabotage these efforts in favor of an endless stagnation and neo-colonial underdevelopment. Any country which accepts the Gore cap and trade insanity is committing moral and economic suicide, and will not survive. Ever the hypocrite, Obama is oblivious to all this: he has just bought a Chrysler with a big 5.7-liter engine from them, probably with a sweetheart discount from the Cerberus hedge fund which is now demolishing Chrysler.

CAMOUFLAGE FOR OBAMA'S SCHACHTIAN ECONOMICS

Obama's economic handlers, advisers, and controllers were assigned to him from the ranks of the University of Chicago monetarist school, the home of the infamous hyper-austerity economics which reached its fullest flowering when the bloody-handed military dictator of Chile Agusto Pinochet, who had been installed in a violent coup by Kissinger, called in Milton Friedman to superintend the "liberal reforms" need to crush the working class of Chile, roll back a century of social and economic gains by the labor movement, and drastically reduce the standard of living in order to enhance the looting rate enjoyed by US-UK multinational corporations. Naturally, it would be something of an embarrassment to the Perfect Master if he were exposed as following in the footsteps of Pinochet and Thatcher in his economic policy, even though it is exactly that which his controllers intend him to do. One short-term palliative is to pretend that Obama's top adviser, Austan Goolsbee of the University of Chicago free market, free trade, neoliberal looting temple is not really a full-fledged member of the Chicago School – he is just a fellow who happens to teach at the University of Chicago. Obviously, this threadbare subterfuge will not be very effective. What is therefore required is to concoct a more ambitious plan for smokescreen and camouflage, inevitably in the form of yet another "third way" between authentic FDR New Deal economics (which the monetarists fear so much that they prefer to apply to it the very misleading label of Keynesianism) and the Friedman-von Hayek monetarist looting theory. This operation emerged in the late spring of 2008 in the form of the Richard H. Thaler and Cass R. Sunstein, *Nudge: Improving Decisions about*

Health, Wealth, and Happiness (New Haven CN: Yale University Press, 2008). As Art Laffer once remarked, "You want to prove that Milton Friedman is a fascist? It's easy – quote him."

DON'T NOODGE ME, BRO'

The cynical gambit here is that Obama represents a third way capable of transcending the New Deal and monetarist clash, and that this third way is not the same as the deeply flawed third way that had been embraced by Bill Clinton in 1993 after his lecture from Greenspan on how bad things really were – a lecture which submerged Clinton's populist instincts under a toxic tide of Wall Street pro-globalization ideology. The new buzz word is paternalistic libertarianism, meaning in practice the Friedmanite anti-state, pro-monopoly, pro-cartel ("pro-market") vision, but now seasoned with a heady dose of coercion, which masquerades under the guise of a helpful "nudge." If we switch into Yiddish, we can see that both Thaler and Sunstein indeed qualify as full-fledged *nudges* or *noodges*. In good Yiddish, nudzh or noodge works as substantive meaning one who persistently pesters, annoys, or complains, a transitive verb meaning to annoy persistently or pester, and even as an intransitive verb meaning to complain or carp persistently. The etymology goes back to the Yiddish *nudyen*, to pester, bore, from Polish *nudzi*.'[176] Soon we are likely to hear calls to Obama saying "Don't noodge me, bro'" – because of the candidate's propensity to complain and blame his failures on the American people.

Obama's economic policies can be classified as neo-liberal tending towards Schachtian – going back to Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's first Finance Minister, a figure widely recognized by his contemporaries as the chief German asset of the House of Morgan. What Thaler and Sunstein have come up with is a not so clever pastiche based on the fake argument that Obama is "a behavioralist—the term economists use to describe those who subscribe to the tenets of behavioral economics, an increasingly popular discipline that seeks to marry the insights of psychology to the rigor of economics." As soon as we hear the term behaviorism applied to human affairs, it is time to run for our lives. Behaviorism is the bankrupt, discredited, and sinister complex of crude and cruel doctrines associated with the names of John B. Watson and B. F. Skinner. Skinner was the inventor of the Skinner box, a torture chamber into which little white rats were placed so they could receive alternating electrical shocks and pellets of food and candy in order to shape their behavior according Skinner's notion of operant behavior modification. Another example is Pavlov teaching dogs to salivate when they hear a gong. These methods have long been applied to human affairs, with one of the most infamous examples being Jeremy Bentham, one of the founders of modern British intelligence and an architect of the worst Jacobin excesses of the French revolution. Bentham designed a prison called the Panoptikon in which behaviorist methods were used to maximize the exploitation of prisoners. Therefore, if you want to get a good image of yourself and your family under a future Obama regime, imagine yourself in the position of that wretched little white rat in a Skinner box, working and scampering and scurrying about hectically and desperately to avoid excruciating electric shocks and to earn a little pellet of food. That is the core idea of behaviorist economics, once the advertising copy has been stripped away. This is your future under the politics of hope and change.

As a political matter, Obama's acolytes are well aware that Clinton evolved well into New Deal territory during her campaign, and these are the ideas that Obama is assigned to crush: as a recent review notes, 'Hillary Clinton, after initially equivocating, has emerged as the would-be heir to FDR and John Maynard Keynes. In addition to imposing a ninety-day moratorium on foreclosures and a five-year freeze on certain adjustable mortgage rates, she would have the federal government buy up an undetermined number of troubled home loans, enabling lenders to convert them to more

affordable deals and putting a floor under the housing market. Clinton would also allow bankruptcy judges to reduce the value of mortgages, a proposal the banking industry vigorously opposes, and she has criticized McCain as the reincarnation of Herbert Hoover….' (John Cassidy, "Economics: Which Way for Obama?" *New York Review of Books*, · June 12, 2008)

Obama is a creature of the catastrophic Great U-Turn under Carter, and of the Reaganite Age of Monetarist decline which followed, and his handlers are determined to go further in this bankrupt direction: 'Should Obama win the nomination, political considerations may well force upon him a more interventionist position, but his first inclination is to seek a path between big government and laissez-faire, a trait that reflects his age—he was born in 1961—and the intellectual milieu he emerged from. Before entering the Illinois state Senate, he spent ten years teaching constitutional law at the University of Chicago, where respect for the free market is a cherished tradition. His senior economic adviser, Austan Goolsbee, is a former colleague of his at Chicago and an expert on the economics of high-tech industries. Goolsbee is not a member of the "Chicago School" of Milton Friedman and Gary Becker, but he is not well-known as a critic of American capitalism either. As recently as March 2007, he published an article in *The New York Times* pointing out the virtues of subprime mortgages. "The three decades from 1970 to 2000 witnessed an incredible flowering of new types of home loans," Goolsbee wrote. "These innovations mainly served to give people power to make their own decisions about housing, and they ended up being quite sensible with their newfound access to capital."' Too bad if you die of exposure after undergoing foreclosure, Goolsbee's doctrines will not doubt offer a world of solace and comfort.

Among the more recent precedents for behaviorist economics, our reviewer notes these: 'Although its intellectual roots go back more than thirty years, to the pioneering work of two Israeli psychologists, Amos Tversky and Daniel Kahneman, behavioral economics took off only about ten years ago, and many of its leading lights, among them David Laibson and Andrei Shleifer, of Harvard; Matt Rabin, of Berkeley; and Colin Camerer, of Caltech, are still in their thirties or forties. One of the reasons this approach has proved so popular is that it appears to provide a center ground between the Friedmanites and the Keynesians, whose intellectual jousting dominated economics for most of the twentieth century.' Now we have a new attempt to put lipstick on the Friedmanite pig. A central concept of this new school of economic kookery and obscurantism is the concept of the nudge, a gentle tap from the regime to push the individual into the direction desired by the finance oligarchs and their political puppets like Obama. Since the goal of the entire exercise is to increase the looting rate and austerity index at the expense of working families, the nudge will have to evolve in a more and more coercive direction. It will go from a nudge to a shove to an elbow in the ribs to a cattle prod to a whip to a truncheon, and then to a bayonet, before turning into a machine gun. Our reviewer continues: 'The central tenet of the Chicago School is that markets, once established and left alone, will resolve most of society's economic problems, including, presumably, the mortgage crisis. Keynesians—old-school Keynesians, anyway—take the view that markets, financial markets especially, often fail to work as advertised, and that this failure can be self-reinforcing rather than self-correcting. In some ways, the behavioralists stand with the Keynesians. Markets sometimes go badly awry, they agree, especially when people have to make complicated choices, such as what type of mortgage to take out. But whereas the Keynesians argue that vigorous regulation and the prohibition of certain activities such as excessive borrowing are often necessary, behavioralists tend to be more hopeful about redeeming free enterprise. With a gentle nudge, they argue, even some very poorly performing markets—and the people who inhabit them—can be made to work pretty well.' (John Cassidy, "Economics: Which Way for Obama?" *New York Review of Books*, June 12, 2008)

As if by magic, the Trilateral hand which guides Obama's fortunes has arranged for a new book which can serve as a fig leaf for his odious and reactionary economic program: 'In a fortuitous accident of timing, Sunstein and his friend Richard Thaler have just published a book that makes the behavioralist case in non-technical language: *Nudge: Improving Decisions About Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. On the face of it, finding two more suitable coauthors would be difficult. Sunstein is a one-man think tank and a prolific writer—by my count, this is his eighth book in as many years. Thaler, who, like Goolsbee, teaches at Chicago's Graduate School of Business, is one of the founders of behavioral economics. During the 1980s, he began publishing a series of columns in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives* about economic phenomena that defied the accepted wisdom of the subject, which depended heavily on the twin assumptions of individual rationality and market efficiency.' (John Cassidy, "Economics: Which Way for Obama?" *New York Review of Books*, · June 12, 2008)

The entire package has to be dressed up in a libertarian mantle, to add an extra layer of camouflage protection and to imbue it with crossover appeal to the numerous drifting stragglers from the Ron Paul campaign who are going to have to go somewhere when their current Pied Piper of the Austrian School is finally defeated at the Republican Convention: 'In defense of Thaler and Sunstein, their emphasis is on public policy. Yet the program they outline seems unduly restrictive. Not content to be behavioralists, they are also libertarians, and they endorse something they call "libertarian paternalism." They write: "Libertarian paternalism is a relatively weak, soft, and non-intrusive type of paternalism because choices are not blocked, fenced off, or significantly burdened. If people want to smoke cigarettes, to eat a lot of candy, to choose an unsuitable health care plan, or to fail to save for retirement, libertarian paternalists will not force them to do otherwise—or even make things hard for them. Still, the approach we recommend does count as paternalistic, because private and public choice architects are not merely trying to track or to implement people's anticipated choices. Rather, they are self-consciously attempting to move people in directions that will make their lives better. They nudge." A nudge, as we will use the term, is any aspect of the choice architecture that alters people's behavior in a predictable way without forbidding any options or significantly changing their economic incentives. To count as a mere nudge, the intervention must be easy and cheap to avoid. Nudges are not mandates. Putting the fruit at eye level counts as a nudge. Banning junk food does not.' Alas! It is a slippery slope, especially when the bankers are calling the shots, as they will be under Obama. The conclusion reached by Thaler and Sunstein is this: "The twentieth century was pervaded by a great deal of artificial talk about the possibility of a "Third Way." We are hopeful that libertarian paternalism offers a real Third Way—one that can break through some of the least tractable debates in contemporary democracies."' (John Cassidy, "Economics: Which Way for Obama?" New York Review of Books, · June 12, 2008) Rather than a third way, this is the same old monetarist blind alley in drag – and, under conditions of the Bush depression, it is a blind alley that leads off a cliff.

YOUTHFUL ENERGY AND LOFTY IDEALS: THE DRAFT AND FORCED LABOR

Obama has issued a "Call to Serve," announcing his intent to impose some kind of peacetime national service; in a major policy address at Cornell College in Mt. Vernon, Iowa. Obama said: 'I am going to ask you to play your part; ask you to stand up; ask you to put your foot firmly into the current of history. I am asking you to change history's course. And if I have the fortune to be your President, decades from now – when the memory of this or that policy has faded, and when the words that we will speak in the next few years are long forgotten – I hope you remember this as a moment when your own story and the American story came together, and history bent once more in

the direction of justice." At the event, Senator Obama was introduced and endorsed by former U.S. Senator Harris Wofford (D-PA), former Associate Director of the Peace Corps and former Special Assistant to the President for Civil Rights during the Kennedy Administration. Wofford was instrumental in the formation of the Peace Corps, played a key role in crafting and passing the legislation that led to the creation of AmeriCorps and Senator, and currently serves as an advisor to ServeNext.' Senator Obama's plan would …would: expand AmeriCorps from its current 75,000 slots to 250,000 slots, enabling the program to establish five new Corps that address some of America's most pressing challenges: Classroom Corps, Health Corps, Clean Energy Corps, Veterans Corps, and Homeland Security Corps; . engage retiring Americans in service on a large scale by expanding and improving Senior Corps, VISTA and other programs that connect individuals over the age of 55 to volunteer opportunities; double the size of the Peace Corps from 7,800 volunteers to 16,000 by its 50th anniversary in 2011 and work to partner volunteers with people from other nations; establish an America's Voice Initiative to recruit and train Americans that are fluent speakers of local languages to bolster our public diplomacy efforts abroad; and create a national online network, modeled on Craigslist, to connect volunteers to service and donation opportunities.'[177] All of these formations could easily acquire paramilitary overtones, with obvious implications for postmodern fascist developments. The Homeland Security Corps was an especially sinister plan that deserved relentless scrutiny and wife exposure.

OBAMA'S FREIWILLIGER ARBEITSDIENST

Not content with this Obama also demanded measures accomplish the following: 'establish a goal of having middle and high-schoolers contribute at least 50 hours a week to community service, and reach that goal through national guidelines for service-learning and additional resources for schools to develop successful programs; Connect disadvantaged youth to service opportunities and a pathway to success through the creation of Green Job Corps and the expansion of Youth Build from 8,000 slots today to 50,000 slots over the next eight years; Create a new American Opportunity Tax Credit to ensure that the first $4,000 of a college education is completely free for Americans willing to complete 100 hours of public service a year; Promote College Serve-Study by immediately increasing the percentage of Federal Work-Study Program funding that goes to community service jobs from 7 percent to 25 percent, and helping colleges and universities reach a goal of 50 percent of serve-study over time; Expand the capacity of the nonprofit sector by establishing a Social Investment Fund Network to provide R&D capital to encourage innovation, find out what works, and expand successful programs to scale across the country; Create a Social Entrepreneurship Agency to enable nonprofits to build capacity through improved collaborations with government. ("Obama to Issue Call to Serve, Vow to Make National Service Important Cause of His Presidency," World socialist web site, December 5th, 2007) In his speech on national service on July 2, 2008 at the University of Colorado, Obama promised that as president he would "set a goal for all American middle and high school students to perform 50 hours of service a year, and for all college students to perform 100 hours of service a year." Underneath the edifying service verbiage was the clear intent to prepare a form of compulsory service for the benefit of the bankrupt Wall Street financiers, which might then kick over into outright forced labor through the use of food control and other expedients as the depression worsened. Obama's youthful dupes do not know it, but there is a future of involuntary servitude waiting for them, be it armed with a rifle or a shovel. Here, their fervent idealism would be ground into powder in the service of Wall Street greed.

THE MOST SCURRILOUS CANDIDATE EVER: OBAMA'S SEXUAL INNUENDO

From a CNN report we learn: Barack Obama appeared to have a bit of an awkward 'moment on the campaign trail in South Bend, Indiana. From the pool report: "[Obama] posed for report pictures with the staff when he apparently felt his phone start to vibrate in his pocket on his right thigh – against which one woman was closely pressed. Later, as two cafe waitresses and owner Brenda Wilson squeezed next to him for a photograph, Obama suddenly turned to one woman. "That's my phone buzzing there," he said. "I don't want you to think I'm getting fresh or anything."' (CNN, April 10, 2008) On May 8, 2008, CNN aired a segment which was later posted with the caption/title "Obama in Jeans." This segment showed Obama lounging in blue jeans in the front of his campaign plane while talking on his cell phone. Readers are invited to judge for themselves whether the comments appended to this photo are correct. Obama clearly has a very scurrilous idea of presidential decorum. Was Obama attempting to prove that he did not share an anatomical deficiency widely attributed to Hitler? An Obama White House would rival the court of Nero or, better yet, Heliogabalus, for its sexual depravity and licentiousness.[178]

"HOLD ON A SECOND, SWEETIE" — OBAMA'S INCURABLE MISOGYNY

Obama's contempt for women is constantly expressed. Another example was his dismissal of a serious policy question about jobs in the auto industry from a woman reporter working for a major Detroit television station while the Perfect Master was mugging his way through an automobile plant. 'The moment came at a campaign stop in Detroit, when Peggy Agar, a reporter at ABC's Detroit affiliate WXYZ-TV, asked Obama this question: "Senator, how are you going to help the American autoworkers?" "Hold on a second, sweetie. We'll hold a press avail," replied Obama, referring to a structured question and answer session with the media. Hours later, Obama left Agar a voicemail, apologizing for not answering her question and for calling her "sweetie." "That's a bad habit of mine," Obama said in the message. "I do it sometimes with all kinds of people. I mean no disrespect and so I am duly chastened on that front." It apparently is a habit. In an earlier campaign stop, Obama said to a woman, "Sweetie, if I start with a picture I will never get out of here." And then: "Sweetie if I start doing autographs I just won't be … I am really late." (Dan Harris, "Obama's 'Sweetie': Spontaneous or Sexist?" ABC News, May 16, 2008)

Obama's patronizing, condescending approach was also in evidence during a visit to Tama Manufacturing near Allentown, Pennsylvania, where he flirted with and flattered women who make less than poverty wages. According to *Huffington Post*: 'Obama lavished compliments on dancewear manufacturer Marisa Cerveris, who gave him a black and pink leotard for [Obama's daughters] Malia and Sasha, explaining she was once in the New York City ballet. "You look like you might be a dancer," Obama told her, later adding: "You're big time." "You're gorgeous," he told Cerveris after glancing at one of her old ballet photos. "I was," she replied. "You still are," he countered, asking the crowd, "Isn't she beautiful?" and answering his own question: "Absolutely." The average unionized worker at Tama makes about $18,000 a year, lower than poverty level wages for a family of four according to government standards. Tama workers make $10.50 an hour, and must contribute $50 a month toward their health care. Obama praised Tama Manufacturing as a success story saying, "I'm glad to see we still have a good company here with a good owner looking after his workers." Recently, these same workers had gone on strike for 15 weeks.

OBAMA FEARS ISSUES OF HOMOSEXUALITY AND BISEXUALITY

Questions of homosexuality and bisexuality, as already noted, are obviously fraught with a great deal of attention and peril in Obama's case. In late October 2007, Obama became embroiled in a controversy because he accepted the support of Donnie McClurkin, the superstar black gospel singer, who is a former homosexual who argues the thesis that homosexuality is a choice, a view which many homosexuals regard as heresy. McClurkin appeared together with Obama at a gospel concert in Columbia, South Carolina. '"Don't call me a bigot or anti-gay when I have suffered the same feelings," said McClurkin. "God delivered me from homosexuality," he added. He then told the audience to believe the Bible over the blogs: "God is the only way." Obama was forced to backpedal furiously, issuing a statement saying that he strongly disagrees with Mr. McClurkin's views and that he has tried to address what he called the homophobia among some black voters. As a result, some of Obama's events were picketed in protest by small groups of gay and lesbian militants.' (Katharine Q. Seelye, Obama's Gospel Concert Tour, *New York Times*, October 29, 2007)

Later, before the Pennsylvania primary, Obama was damaged by a public dispute with the leading gay publication in Philadelphia because he refused to grant an interview, something that many black press organs have also complained about. The *Philadelphia Gay News* attacked Obama for his consistent refusal to speak to gay media outlets. In a pre-election issue, the paper featured a front-page interview with Hillary Clinton and a large blank space under a photo of Barack Obama, with a banner headline reading, "Clinton Talks, Obama Balks." The paper's accompanying editorial commented: "At this point in the Democratic presidential campaign, we're able to view the candidates by their actions. And we have found that Sen. Barack Obama would rather talk at the LGBT community than with them...." (Queerty) All of this left the question of why Obama seemed so blocked and uncomfortable when it came to interacting with media which represent a considerable number of Democratic primary voters. Based on the Larry Sinclair revelations and the Reverend Manning "Trinity of Hell" tape, Obama may be concerned that he will be outed as a closet homosexual or bisexual.

The important Pennsylvania primary was held on April 22. It had been preceded by 6 weeks of intensive campaigning, and had allowed Obama to bring to bear the full range of advantages inherent in his well-heeled Soros-powered pluto-candidacy. Obama outspent Clinton by margins that were variously estimated as two to one, three to one, or four to one (Pat Buchanan on MSNBC), with much of this concentrated in the area of television advertising. Obama's television advertising blitz probably crossed into the area of diminishing returns and of active annoyance and backlash against his condescending and hectoring tone. Obama was defeated by 10 percentage points, 55 to 45. It was a humiliating and ominous defeat. The postmodern fascist had broken his sword against the Clinton lines.

OBAMA GIVES HILLARY THE FINGER

In a campaign appearance the next day, Obama manifestly engaged in an obscene gesture – the *digitus infamis* – directed personally against Mrs. Clinton. He also brushed off his shoulders to show his contempt for Clinton's criticisms. Among the media, the most explicit discussion was provided by O'Reilly on the evening of April 21, 2008, although there had been some previous light-headed badinage on MSNBC. Laluchasigue of noquarterusa.net called attention to the fact that Obama was using coded references to communicate a racist message to his followers in a way that

many other voters would not understand. Laluchasigue pointed out that the key to interpreting Obama's antics over these days were the following lyrics:

> '[Chorus: Jay-Z]
> If you feelin' like a pimp n***a, go and brush your shoulders off
> Ladies is pimps too, go and brush your shoulders off
> N****z is crazy baby, don't forget that boy told you
> Get, that, dirt off your shoulder.

Laluchasigue went on to elaborate his thesis: 'Now, get this Obamabot's reaction to the gesture: "Dude, I nearly swooned — SWOONED, I tell you — when I saw that. That's one of my fave Jay-Z joints of all time. HUGE SWIRLING VORTEX OF LOVE. I could not pink-fuzzy-heart Barack one iota more." Violet Socks posted a diary about that "swooner" over at the terrific new blog…Laluchasigue continued: 'Obama's gesture prompted a mash-up video that made the Jay-Z/Obama connection explicit. Ari Melber, the other Obamabot named Ari at *The Nation*, posted the video on *The Nation*'s website, noting, "Obama really is a Jay-Z fan, too. When asked which hip hop artists he likes in a recent interview, he said, 'lately I've been listening to a lot of Jay-Z — this new American Gangster album.'" Spencer Ackerman, another young white male media Obamaton, called Obama's gesture "perhaps the coolest subliminal cultural reference in the history of American politics." So what is the hype about? What did Jay-Z actually say that captivated Barack Obama? Here is the hook and first verse to the new theme song of Obama '08:

> [Chorus: Jay-Z]
> If you feelin' like a pimp n***a, go and brush your shoulders off
> Ladies is pimps too, go and brush your shoulders off
> N****z is crazy baby, don't forget that boy told you
> Get, that, dirt off your shoulder
>
> [Verse One]
> I probably owe it to y'all, probably to be locked by the force
> Tryin to hustle some things, that go with the Porsche
> Feelin no remorse, feelin like my hand was forced
> Middle finger to the law, n***a grippin ma balls
> Stab the ladies they love me, from the bleachers they screamin
> All the ballers is bouncin, they like the way I be leanin
> All the rappers be hatin, off the track that I'm makin
> But all the hustlers they love it just to see one of us make it
> Came from the bottom the bottom, to the Top of the Pops
> N***a London, Japan and I'm straight off the block
> Like a running back, get it man, I'm straight off the block
> I can run it back n***a cause I'm straight with the Roc.'

Laluchasigue continued: 'Obama hasn't flipped a "middle finga to the law" but to Hillary instead (his godfather Tony Rezko and possible financial angel Nadmi Auchi were the ones flicking off the law). He got his clock cleaned in a debate about his closest associates, his domestic policy proposals and national security credentials, but after a quick, not-so-subliminal reference to Jay-Hova, Obama's back to "feelin' like a pimp." (Laluchasigue, 'Obama Invokes Jay-Z "Stab the Ladies…Middle Finga To The Law", noquarterus.net, April 18, 2008)

The decadent forces of radical chic like Mo Dowd were also fully aware of the scurrilous and obscene references that were built into Obama's contemptible posturing: 'It had to be the first time in history that a presidential candidate had a hip-hop moment. Barack Obama, who says he listens to Jay-Z along with his "old school guy" favorites like Earth, Wind & Fire and the Temptations, alluded to the rapper's 2003 hit "Dirt Off Your Shoulder" on Thursday to sweep away concerns about his pugnacity. After conceding that the Philly debate was tough, he brushed the imaginary lint of Hillary, George and Charlie from his shoulders, in a wordless reference to Jay-Z's lyrics in his anthem about not letting anyone crimp your ride as you cruise from the bottom to the top: "Got some, dirt on my shoulder, could you brush it off for me."' (Maureen Dowd, "Brush It Off," *New York Times*, April 20, 2008) These decadent circles knew what they were getting. And they liked it. With Obama, the institution of the presidency was destined to sink into a sewer of degradation comparable to the era of the British Hellfire Clubs or the more depraved Roman emperors.

OBAMA STONEWALLS THE MEDIA

The clouds gathered ever more densely over Obama's head. Reverend Wright, Bill Ayers, Bittergate – small wonder that he stopped taking questions from his own traveling press corps, who had generally been exemplary in their docility. In Blue Bell, Pennsylvania on April 21, 'reporters and photographers slightly trampled a Sept. 11 memorial garden to get into position to photograph Obama after the event, and to try to ask him a few questions. Obama has not taken questions from reporters traveling with him for 10 days. He gave his supporters some advice about the cameras at the start of his event. "Just ignore them," he said. "Pretend they're not there."' (John McCormick, "Mellow, Outdoor Afternoon with Obama," *Chicago Tribune*, The Swamp, April 21, 2008) A photograph turned up in which the Perfect Master was depicted making the classic coarse gesture not to Sen. Clinton, but to the traveling press corps: The caption read: 'Here's your Barack Obama, all alone on this giant luxury jet plane, reading his newspapers and perhaps flipping the bird to Hillary, the airplane, and especially the political journalists who are again pretending that Hillary Clinton can "win" the nomination, when she doesn't have enough votes or delegates to actually do that. Also, taped to the cabin ceiling ... a blood-stained towel?' [AP Photo] (Wonkette, April 23, 2008)

ELITISM AND OLIGARCHICAL THINKING: OBAMA'S ACHILLES HEEL

The main objection to Obama remained that he was an elitist, an oligarch by training and ideology, and also in terms of the narrow interests he proposed to serve. This was especially evident in states like Ohio, Pennsylvania and Indiana, and later in West Virginia and Kentucky. A Pennsylvania critic observed: "Obama is black by heritage but also a product of liberal elitism, which appears to drive his thinking: Poor kid from single-parent home gets access to the best schools, the best opportunities, and is groomed for greatness…. his thinking hovers on liberal elite. That is why his comment in San Francisco about embittered Middle America was so revealing about whom and what he is. Yet because of race, his political veneer was not scratched. In ideology, is he different from Mike Dukakis, John Kerry, Al Gore or George McGovern? Probably not. He just looks really cool saying the kind of things once said by those four men who lost the presidency for the Democrats. And why did they lose? In large part, because of a lack of connection with bread-and-butter Democrats. Love him or hate him, give Bill Clinton his due: He fought for the presidency against all odds, from a small white Southern town; when he won, he delivered without ever embracing liberal elitism. That is part of the price Hillary Clinton is paying in this primary: The party's liberal-elite side resents Bill's performance… Compare this with two modern presidents

who are widely remembered and admired: William Jefferson Clinton and Ronald Wilson Reagan. Neither came from or had access to the elite system, though at times they brushed against it; when push came to shove, they rejected it for their own survival. Both deeply wanted people to like them because of their upbringings — both came from poor families in small-town America with abusive, alcoholic fathers….If the candidate who emerges from this primary season echoes the liberal elitism of McGovern, Dukakis, Gore and Kerry, then Democrats should start bracing for a losing year, one they should have easily won." (Salena Zito, "Elite Democrats Lose," *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*, April 20, 2008)

OBAMA AS ADULATION ADDICT

As one British journalist noted, 'Obama personally was an adulation addict: he needed the adoration of the mob as his emotional fuel: In the last, say, three weeks, Obama hasn't put forward a single new proposal. He hasn't, at least on any evidence that I've seen, tweaked his stump speech much. He's been static and stale and … he hasn't been looking like he's having fun doing this. That can be deadly, and voters can smell it. A campaign can't be static. It has to sense new dynamics and paradigms as they arise and roll with them. While it shouldn't depart from its basic message, it should undertake little reinventions of the candidate along the way to show that the candidate is on top of what's going on out there.' (Michael Tomasky, *London Guardian*, April 25, 2008) The addiction to mob adulation is historically one of the most ominous possible symptoms for the survival of a democracy. In this regard, Obama was on cold turkey for most of the second half of the primary season, a fact which underscored his weakness as a candidate: 'After the end of February, it was a very long time before Obama WON any victories in primary elections. In the interim, the Bill Ayers case and a second round of the Jeremiah Wright scandal exploded into public view, thoroughly discrediting the Trilateral candidate. Obama had now settled into a familiar pattern: he was able to win the votes of affluent suburbanites, feckless college students, and the black community. He had very little appeal to white voters in general, trade union households, women, retirees, Catholic voters, Jewish voters, Asian voters, Hispanic voters, and to that group of swing voters known as the Reagan Democrats. The only question that remained was whether Obama's losing coalition would look more on the Electoral College map like McGovern in 1972, Carter in 1980, Mondale in 1984, Dukakis in 1988, Gore in 2000, or Kerry in 2004. There was little doubt that Obama was a sure loser in any normal election. Obama's gamble was obviously enough that his friends in the Department of Justice and the FBI would be able to deliver scandals powerful enough to destroy Senator McCain at some opportune time in the fall. In the meantime, the attitude of the hacks and elitists at the Democratic National Committee was a mystery to many: why did they insist on nominating Obama, when he was so obviously a pathetically weak candidate with no hope of winning the presidency in a contested election? Superficial observers said that this was because the party insiders really were multicultural and politically correct, and that they therefore did not want to offend the black community by rejecting its once-in-a-lifetime champion. More seasoned commentators knew very well that the Democratic National Committee did not give a damn about the black community one way or the other, and that the hysterical support for Obama was simply due to the fact that he was the candidate demanded by the Wall Street financial oligarchs for purposes of saving the entire Anglo American imperialist system. This was the real reason, and not any concern about black sensibilities.

CALIFORNIA AND MASSACHUSETTS VULNERABLE TO GOP WITH OBAMA?

As the primaries rolled on, it became painfully obvious that even traditional Democratic states could easily fall to the Republicans if Obama were in fact the candidate. The shocking list of states where this condition obtained included such bulwarks as California, and such swing states as Florida. Even Massachusetts, one of the most reliable Democratic of all the states, turned into a battleground in case of an Obama nomination, presumably due to widespread voter disaffection with the failed governor Deval Patrick, who notoriously spouted the same messianic-utopian rhetoric which was Obama's stock in trade. Massachusetts voters were saying in effect that one Trilateral stooge in a generation was all that they could stomach. The veteran electoral analyst Michael Barone summed up Obama's plight in a commentary issued at the end of April: "…Clinton seems to run stronger than Obama in the industrial (or formerly industrial) belt, running west from New Jersey through Pennsylvania and Ohio to Michigan and Missouri. Obama's weakness among white working-class voters in the primaries here suggests he is poorly positioned to win votes he will need to carry these states in November. This is not a minor problem — we're talking about 84 electoral votes. Obama has also fared poorly among Latino and Jewish voters in every primary held so far. This is of consequence most notably in Florida, which has 27 electoral votes. In 2000, Al Gore won 67 percent of the vote in Broward County and 62 percent in Palm Beach County — both have large Jewish populations. In this year's Florida primary, Obama lost those counties to Clinton by 57 percent to 33 percent and 61 percent to 27 percent. No Democrat can carry Florida without big margins in Broward and Palm Beach. Obama's weakness among Latinos and Jews could conceivably put California's 55 electoral votes in play. Los Angeles County delivered an 831,000 vote plurality for John Kerry in 2004. Most of that plurality came from areas with large numbers of Latinos and Jews…. And his discomfort, evident in the Pennsylvania debate, when he is greeted with anything but adulation does not augur well for his ability to stand firm and show a sense of command in the face of the stringent criticism he is bound to receive as the Democratic nominee. (Michael Barone, "Popular Vote Gives Clinton an Edge," realclearpolitics.com, April 26, 2008)

THE RUBE GOLDBERG-BYZANTINE NIGHTMARE OF THE MCGOVERN-FRASER-DUKAKIS-JACKSON RULES

To understand the rules of the Democratic Party for choosing delegates, you need to imagine the cartoonist Rube Goldberg transported into the flowing robes of a Byzantine Emperor of the tenth century. It would take such a strange hybrid to come up with the present procedures for delegate selection, which have become one of the main reasons why the Democratic candidate almost always loses. Governor Ed Rendell told the discredited Chris Matthews on April 22 that the Democratic Party delegate rules were "screwed up," and that a straight tabulation of the popular vote would be the most democratic criterion for winning. What then were these delegate selection rules upon which Obama was relying as he sought to game the system? According to one attempted explanation, "For its first 150 years, the Democratic Party selected its presidential nominee in a proverbial smoke-filled room, with delegates picked by party bosses. The system began to change in the 1940s and 1950s, when a handful of states including New Hampshire established primaries to give voters a say in the selection of delegates." As a result of the 1968 defeat, a reform commission was set up under the leadership of George McGovern and UAW leader Douglas Fraser. In 1968, Vice President Hubert Humphrey had won the Democratic nomination over the elitist antiwar candidate Eugene McCarthy without winning any primaries. The next year, party leaders named Senator George McGovern of South Dakota to head a panel to overhaul the delegate selection process. The McGovern reforms, by abolishing the tradition of giving party leaders seats at the

convention, sharply reduced the number of senators and congressmen who served as delegates. These officeholders were less inclined to support the party's standard-bearer when they had played no role in the convention. There were also far fewer trade union leaders as delegates, with correspondingly more environmentalists, sexual orientation activists, and minority militants. The Daley machine of Illinois had simply ignored the McGovern recommendations. A floor fight over the seating of the Illinois delegation ensued, with Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago clashing with Jesse Jackson, leader of the reform slate. Daley was ousted and Jackson was seated. McGovern then used the new system he had helped to design in order to seize the 1972 nomination, resulting in his catastrophic defeat. McGovern won Massachusetts and the District of Columbia in one of the biggest defeats in US history. Between 1972 and 1988 there were a series of commissions that were supposed to reform the rules; a 1973 commission chaired by City Councilor Barbara Mikulski of Baltimore scaled back some of the affirmative action provisions in McGovern's rules and explicitly prohibited winner-take-all primaries. Another commission in 1978 turned down the idea of superdelegates. In June 1988, representatives of Dukakis and Jesse Jackson reworked the rules for picking a Democratic Party nominee, creating an elaborate framework for selecting delegates based on proportion of votes in states and congressional districts, with an additional role played by party elders in the form of superdelegates. By 1980, the proportion of Democratic senators who served as delegates had declined to 14 percent, down from 68 percent in 1960. Elected officials were unhappy because they were obliged to run against their own voters and constituents for seats at the convention. Therefore, there was support for the introduction of superdelegates, meaning party veterans and elected officials. The one legitimate purpose served by this innovation was to have some experienced people on the floor of the convention who could say no to a new hysteria of the type that had propelled the obviously doomed George McGovern to the nomination in 1972. But Obama and Axelrod had seen that the entire mechanism by 2008 was ripe for the most cynical gaming. The Electoral College had been designed to give one candidate a convincing and significant majority of the electoral votes, by ruling out proportional representation and instituting a winner take all system.

The modern Democratic Party system, motivated by politically correct and multicultural postmodern criteria did just the opposite: it tended to prevent the emergence of a winner based on the Electoral College mega states fairly early in the game. The Democratic party rules were therefore completely dysfunctional, and they had become a major factor in the breakdown of the entire US political system during the year 2008. These rules were a insane, and the fact was widely recognized. "This is the nightmare" that all the commissions sought to avoid, said consultant Bill Carrick, who was part of the 1982 reform panel, in 2008. It was bad enough that the nomination was in the hands of the party's 795 "superdelegates," who constitute party insiders. Even worse was the fact that these superdelegates seemed to lack the elementary instinct for survival that would have impelled them to give Clinton the nomination based on her superior ability to win the White House. Again, obedience to Wall Street, and not any notion of solidarity with the black community, was the main factor involved. In 1980, Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts ran against President Jimmy Carter in the primaries. Kennedy organized a series of rules challenges against Carter at that year's chaotic convention in New York City, triggering another bout of Democratic soul-searching. "There was a palpable sense that this rules fight was really taking the party down," said the party hack Elaine Kamarck, a Carter backer in 1980. "People felt, if only there had been more elected officials on the floor of the convention, maybe they could have short-circuited this." There was much dithering, leading to the creation of another commission chaired by James Hunt, the governor of North Carolina, which recommended rolling back some of the more extravagant "reforms." But it was the Hunt commission that made Democratic members of Congress into automatic delegates, the

superdelegates of today. In 1984, Jesse Jackson complained that the rules had been stacked against him by organized labor and Democrats aligned with Kennedy and former vice president Walter Mondale. In the 1988 election, Jackson claimed that in Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, and other states that awarded delegates on a winner-take-all basis within each congressional district, he had been robbed of his share of the delegates. "We raised hell about the unfairness of the system that was in play," said Steve Cobble, Jackson's delegate director. The rotten compromise of 1988, extorted by Jackson without regard to the viability of future nominees, mandated proportional representation as the only method for states to apportion their delegates. When the Hunt Commission created the superdelegates in 1982, they constituted about 15 percent of all delegates; since then, they have grown to include some big city mayors, former DNC chairmen, plus former Democratic presidents and vice presidents. Superdelegates now number 795 and constitute 20 percent of the total. The McGovern reforms "have been watered down significantly by this super-delegate stuff," said one Democratic official. "Any time you have that number of delegates that are not elected by the people, it's wrong. It's just wrong." The obvious problem is that, under the proportional representation rule imposed in 1988, it becomes mathematically difficult for a winner to emerge from the primaries. "The unintended consequence has been to make it harder to get a consensus as to who the nominee should be," said another official, who supports a return to some winner-take-all primaries to hasten the process. "The same people who complain about Electoral College strong-arming can't very well have a de facto Electoral College," Jackson said. "That would be suicidal." (Alan Wirzbicki, "Changes have left uncertainty: '80s rules reform skews Democrats' nominee process," *Boston Globe*, February 17, 2008)

The Democratic party rules to delegate selection are currently in blatant contradiction to the rules of the November election. In the Democratic primaries, there is proportional representation; in the Electoral College it is winner take all with a few minor exceptions. In the November election, everything is decided by voting through secret ballot; in the Democratic Party, there are caucuses where loudmouth Malthusian elitists and affluent suburban ideologues can intimidate blue-collar working people, elderly women, and other core constituencies, sometimes browbeating them into supporting candidates they do not want, and are sure not to vote for in November. There are many reports of abuses by the Obamakins in this direction. In Texas this year, Mrs. Clinton won the popular vote convincingly, but still ended up with fewer delegates because the Obama lemming legions were able and willing to stay through the lengthy evening caucuses, thus giving Obama more delegates — surely a scandal for the Democratic Party. . In the Electoral College, the number of votes each state has is in rough proportion to its population, although smaller states fare slightly better because they start off with a minimum of three electoral votes. In the Democratic Party, by contrast, small states and states that are likely to go Republican get a special bonus of delegates compared to vital, indispensable Democratic states like Michigan, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Finally, in the Electoral College it is more or less one-person one-vote; not so in the Democratic Party, where the Jesse Jackson reforms make sure that an inner-city black vote is worth much more in terms of electing delegates than a white, blue-collar, rural vote.

THE DEMOCRATIC RULES: "CRAZY"

The inherent absurdity of this entire system for a political party whose announced goal was not to follow orders from Wall Street, nor to celebrate the ethereal virtues of multiculturalism and political correctness, but was rather supposed to have to do with winning elections, was pointed out by Steve and Cokie Roberts, a team of seasoned observers of the Washington scene. They correctly noted: "Yes, the Clinton camp made strategic blunders that allowed Obama to score heavily in

Republican states where few Democrats vote. But the real culprit is the party's stupid, self-destructive nominating system, which has two major flaws. Since Feb. 19, seven states have voted. Clinton has won four — Pennsylvania, Texas, Ohio and Rhode Island —building up a popular-vote margin of 483,000. Yet her total gain in delegates was exactly five. In Texas, she won by more than 100,000 votes, but because of that state's ridiculous rules, she actually came out five delegates behind. How can that outcome possibly be fair? How can it possibly benefit the party? Wait, it gets worse. Obama built up sizable margins in small states that Clinton was foolish enough to concede. His delegate advantage in Idaho, Kansas and Louisiana — three states that will never vote Democratic — was a total of 38. By contrast, Clinton handily won three large swing states — Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Ohio. And yet, because of party rules, her combined marginal gain amounted to 28 delegates. How can it make sense for Idaho, Kansas and Louisiana to have a bigger impact on choosing the Democratic nominee than Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Ohio? Add in the exclusion of Florida and Michigan, two crucial states that favor Clinton, and there's only one word for the Democrats' system: crazy. And Republicans are gleeful." (Cokie and Steve Roberts: "Democrats will have to overcome their own system," May 6, 2008) Only by junking these rules could the Democrats hope to make a permanent comeback in the party realignment process.

OBAMA AS A BURDEN FOR CANDIDATES DOWN THE TICKET

The North Carolina Republican Party released a television ad attacking Beth Perdue and Richard Moore, two Democratic gubernatorial candidates in that state, because they had both endorsed Obama, who was now labeled as "too extreme for North Carolina" with documentation featuring the Wright "God damn America" rant. It was an ominous sign to Democratic superdelegates that running on the same ticket with the now-tarnished Perfect Master might be highly detrimental to their chances of winning an election. As a result of Obama's reckless reliance on his left CIA, left wing intelligence community network from Chicago, it was now evident that Democratic Party candidates at all levels would go into the November election carrying an immense burden of public opprobrium, suspicion, and resentment. The components of this burden had names: they were Jeremiah Wright, Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn, the rest of Obama's gaggle of Weatherman terrorist cronies, Antoin Rezko, Auchi, Richard Daley, Rod Blagojevich, and many more. The burden included Obama' s Bittergate slurs against the lifestyle of blue-collar working class voters, the hissing venom of Michelle Obama's self-centered and self-righteous fascistoid tirades, plus a whole series of gaffes in which Obama appeared to be babbling in delirium as soon as he was separated from his beloved Teleprompter and had to speak off the cuff. Even more ominous was the fact that the Obama burden was likely soon to include that Michelle Obama "hate Whitey" tape, which was reportedly being used by Karl Rove in private screenings to extract substantial contributions from Republican moneybags and fatcats for Rove's 527 groups. Most critical of all, it was the scandal complex that centered around the names of Donald Young and Larry Sinclair which had the obvious potentiality to bring Obama down even more rapidly than New York Governor Eliot Spitzer had been destroyed.

More eloquent than any polls in mid-summer 2008 was the growing list of Democratic Party elected officials who had taken the unusual step of openly and publicly telling Obama that they were not interested in the vice presidency. The first was Governor Ted Strickland of Ohio, who presided over the classic battleground state which had decided the 2004 election. Then there was Mark Warner of Virginia, a popular former governor who could have given Obama some faint hope of taking Virginia out of the GOP column. Warner wanted to keep running for senator. Another categorical denial came in from Marine General James Jones, the former NATO commander, who

would have given Obama a shred of military credibility. Governor Ed Rendell of Pennsylvania, who had an impressive machine, said that he was no good at being second banana and therefore would have to beg off the veep spot. Then came Senator James Webb of Virginia, a strange militarist ideologue who was wrapped up in his pugnacious Scots-Irish identity trip, and also had a soft spot for the Confederate States of America. Senator Jack Reid of Rhode Island also opted out. Even former Senator Bill Bradley made a public statement rejecting a run for veep. All of these open rejections were very ominous indeed, since each was a powerful vote of no confidence in the viability of the Messiah at the polls.[179]

THE NORTH CAROLINA DEBATE THAT NEVER WAS AND OBAMA'S WIMP FACTOR

A Democratic presidential debate had been scheduled for North Carolina, this time moderated by Katie Couric of CBS. The Perfect Master had gone into contortions to avoid a format in which he was now – after his Philadelphia debacle — manifestly a failure, to say nothing of his fear of new questions about his hate-mongering and terrorist personal associations. Lanny Davis suspected that DNC chair Howard Dean had connived with the Obamakins to get the North Carolina Democratic Party to call off the debate, which had become a serious embarrassment to Obama and Axelrod. Davis demanded that, if Howard Dean had indeed intervened to get Obama off the debate hook, he should resign his chairmanship on the grounds that he had violated the neutrality and impartiality to which the DNC leader is formally pledged. If Obama and Axelrod did not in fact fear a debate, they could easily prove it by offering to show up. How could Obama continue as a viable candidate if he were afraid of his opponents? Would he run from McCain as well? How could such a political coward command voter support? Larry Johnson obtained an internal document of the North Carolina Democratic Party which attempted to motivate the cancellation of the debate by arguing that "While there was great interest in the debate, there were also growing concerns about what another debate would do to party unity…" Larry Johnson then offered an "Uppity Translation: There are growing concerns that any more hard or revealing questions might not be so good for Baby Jesus Obama." (Noquarterusa.net, April 23, 2008) By May, Obama had virtually stopped campaigning. He skipped West Virginia, Kentucky, and Puerto Rico, which had very different demographics, but in which Clinton beat Obama 2:1 each time. Clinton even won South Dakota; Obama could only manage Oregon and Montana.

HO HO AND THE WAR HO

In 2000 and 2004, Democratic activists had demanded that every vote be counted. Now Obama and his friend Ho Ho (as Howard Dean was known in Vermont), both defenders of the politically correct-elitist-neomalthusian status quo that had caused so many defeats, were demanding that Florida and Michigan, two indispensable megastates, not be counted. For any professional pol who wanted to win an election, it was sheer madness. But many careers and reputations had come to depend on the Democratic Party as a multicultural, politically correct crazy quilt of racial identity groups, and sexual preference lobbies, with elitist, radical environmentalist, anti-working class, and neo-Luddite components generally retaining the upper hand. This chaotic congeries, of course, corresponded to the multiple fault lines along which the Ford Foundation, its satellite foundations, and its domestic counterinsurgency apparatus (which had produced Obama) sought to split, divide, slice, and dice the old FDR New Deal Coalition so it could not threaten Wall Street again. It mattered not to Dean, Brazile, Pelosi, Reid, Kennedy and so many others that the politically correct-multicultural rainbow coalition model for the party was an incurable, incorrigible loser. The

rainbow model had led to the rout of the union movement, the collapse of living standards over four decades, and to the impotence and isolation of the party. But the Pelosi faction had lashed themselves to the carcass of multiculturalism, and they would rather lose an infinity of presidential elections rather than lose their personal status and power, no matter what the terrible consequences to the American people.

OBAMA AS THE NEW MCGOVERN: EGGHEADS AND BLACKS ARE NOT ENOUGH

After Obama's staggering defeats in Ohio and Pennsylvania, even some of the more clear-eyed acolytes of his campaign began to fear for the result in November. What caught their eye was the eerie resemblance between the outlines of Obama's coalition as he became weaker and weaker in April and May, and the 1972 McGovern voter base. That distant debacle was clearly in danger of being repeated if Obama got the nomination. John Judis had co-authored a book about what he saw on as the emerging Democratic majority, but Judis was now alarmed. He wrote an article which caused a furor among the more faithful Kool-Aid addicts at *The Nation*, who began directing their vituperation and infective against their hapless left liberal colleague. Judis found that '…Obama's weaknesses as a general election candidate grow more apparent with each successive primary. I visited Pennsylvania during this time, and could feel the growing disillusionment with Obama. … Obama cut into Clinton's advantage, but couldn't erase it. Even though he campaigned extensively among white working class Pennsylvanians, he still couldn't crack this constituency. He lost every white working class county in the state. He lost greater Pittsburgh area by 61 to 39 percent. He did poorly among Catholics – losing them 71 to 29 percent. A Democrat can't win Pennsylvania in the fall without these voters. And those who didn't vote in the primary but will vote in the general election are likely to be even less amenable to Obama. But Obama also lost ground among the upscale white professionals that had helped him win states like Wisconsin, Maryland, and Virginia. For instance, Obama won my own Montgomery County, Maryland by 55 to 43 percent but he lost suburban Philadelphia's very similar Montgomery County by 51 to 49 percent to Clinton. He lost upscale arty Bucks County by 62 to 38 percent. …the electoral premise of Obama's campaign – that he can attract middle class Republicans and Independents--is being undermined. Indeed, if you look at Obama's vote in Pennsylvania, you begin to see the outlines of the old George McGovern coalition that haunted the Democrats during the '70s and '80s, led by college students and minorities. In Pennsylvania, Obama did best in college towns (60 to 40 percent in Penn State's Centre County) and in heavily black areas like Philadelphia. Its ideology is very liberal. Whereas in the first primaries and caucuses, Obama benefited from being seen as middle-of-the-road or even conservative, he is now receiving his strongest support from voters who see themselves as "very liberal." In Pennsylvania, he defeated Clinton among "very liberal" voters by 55 to 45 percent, but lost "somewhat conservative" voters by 53 to 47 percent and moderates by 60 to 40 percent. In Wisconsin and Virginia, by contrast, he had done best against Clinton among voters who saw themselves as moderate or somewhat conservative. Obama even seems to be acquiring the religious profile of the old McGovern coalition. In the early primaries and caucuses, Obama did very well among the observant. In Maryland, he defeated Clinton among those who attended religious services weekly by 61 to 31 percent. By contrast, in Pennsylvania, he lost to Clinton among these voters by 58 to 42 percent and did best among voters who never attend religious services, winning them by 56 to 44 percent. There is nothing wrong with winning over voters who are very liberal and who never attend religious services; but if they begin to become Obama's most fervent base of support, he will have trouble (to say the least) in November. The primaries, unfortunately, are not

going to get any easier for Obama. While he should win easily in North Carolina, where he benefits from a large African-American vote and support in the state's college communities, he is going to have trouble in Indiana, Kentucky, and West Virginia, where he will once again be faced by a large white working class vote. He can still win the nomination and lose these primaries. Pennsylvania was the last big delegate prize. But if Obama doesn't find a way now to speak to these voters, he is going to have trouble winning that large swath of states from Pennsylvania through Missouri in which a Democrat must do well to gain the presidency. That remains Obama challenge in the month to come.' (John B. Judis, "The Next McGovern? — Obama may still get the nomination, but his loss tonight deals a harsh blow to his electability arguments," *The New Republic*, April 23, 2008) Judis was flayed and vilified by the true believers among the lemming legions who saw this essay as an act of unspeakable *lèse majesté*.

A right-wing commentator stressed that Obama was showing signs of mental disintegration even as his vote totals deteriorated, and that there was always the possibility that he might be quickly taken down by a scandal of the Spitzer type. 'Hillary won just enough to show that it is ludicrous to oust a 10-point winner at this late junction, but not quite the blow-out that might cause a stampede to her in the next few states. The Democrats are tottering at the edge of the abyss. They are about to nominate someone who cannot win, despite vastly out-spending his opponent, any of the key large states — CA, NJ, NY, OH, PENN, TX, etc. — that will determine the fall election. And yet not to nominate him will cause the sort of implosion they saw in 1968 or the sort of mess we saw in November 2000. Hillary won't quit, since she knows that Obama, when pressure mounts, is starting to show a weird sort of petulance, and drops the "new politics" for snideness. And at any given second, a Rev. Wright outburst, an Ayers reappearance, another Michelle 'never been proud' moment, or another condescending Obamism can cause him to nose dive and become even more snappy.' (Victor Davis Hanson, "The Second Coming of McGovern," National Review.com, April 22, 2008)

OBAMA: ALWAYS THE RACE CARD

Professor Sean Wilentz elaborated on his penetrating diagnosis that the most basic technique of the Obama campaign was to accuse any critic or opponent of being a racist, all the while denying that any race card was being played at all by Obama. As the skein of Obama's defeats lengthened, the media whores at the *Washington Post* and other financier controlled press organs began putting out the line that the problem was not with Obama, but rather with the American people, who were now being exposed as unreconstructed racists. Here again, we see the logic of the Carter *malaise* speech, which is the eternal template for every Trilateral puppet politician: when you get into trouble because of your own incompetence, treachery, and stupidity, turn the tables as fast as you can and blame the American people. Wilentz wrote: 'In fact, all of the evidence demonstrates that white racism has not been a principal or even secondary motivation in any of this year's Democratic primaries. Every poll shows that economics, health care, and national security are the leading issues for white working class voters - and for Latino working class voters as well. These constituencies have cast positive ballots for Hillary Clinton not because she is white, but because they regard her as better on these issues. Obama's campaign and its passionate supporters refuse to acknowledge that these voters consider him weaker — and that Clinton's positions, different from his, as well as her experience actually attract support. Instead they impute racism to working class Democrats who, the polls also show, happen to be liberal on every leading issue. The effort to taint anyone who does not support Obama as motivated by racism has now become a major factor in alienating core Democrats from Obama's campaign. Out with the Democratic Party of Jefferson, Jackson, F.D.R.,

Truman, Kennedy and Johnson, and in with the bright, shiny party of Obama - or what the formally "undeclared" Donna Brazile, a member of the Democratic National Committee and of the party's rules committee, has hailed as a "new Democratic coalition" swelled by affluent white leftists and liberals, college students, and African-Americans.' (Sean Wilentz, "Barack Obama and the Unmaking of the Democratic Party," *Huffington Post*, May 23, 2008)

It was a slow motion tragedy unfolding before the eyes of the public: the bosses of the Democratic Party, because they were controlled by the Wall Street financial elite who demanded Obama and nothing but Obama, were throwing elementary political prudence out the window to nominate a candidate who was doomed to defeat under all normal circumstances. At the same time, the Obama fanatics attempted to motivate their hysterical persistence with the idea that the old voting blocs were irrelevant, because the Perfect Master was going to bring in hordes of new voters. 'This year's primary results show no sign that Obama will reverse this trend should he win the nomination. In West Virginia and Kentucky, as well as Ohio and Pennsylvania, blue collar white voters sent him down to defeat by overwhelming margins. A recent Gallup poll report has argued that claims about Obama's weaknesses among white voters and blue collar voters have been exaggerated - yet its indisputable figures showed Obama running four percentage points below Kerry's anemic support among whites four years ago. Given that Obama's vote in the primaries, apart from African-Americans, has generally come from affluent white suburbs and university towns, the Gallup figures presage a Democratic disaster among working-class white voters in November should Obama be the nominee. Yet Obama's handlers profess indifference - and, at times, even pride — about these trends. Asked about the white working-class vote following Obama's ten-point loss in Pennsylvania, chief campaign strategist David Axelrod confidently told an National Public Radio interviewer that, after all, "the white working class has gone to the Republican nominee for many elections going back even to the Clinton years" and that Obama's winning strength lay in his ability to offset that trend and "attract independent voters... younger voters" and "expand the Democratic base."' (Sean Wilentz, "Barack Obama and the Unmaking of the Democratic Party," *Huffington Post*, May 23, 2008) It is clear that the attempted radical de-emphasis of blue-collar workers and the white working class in general reflects the characteristic class hatreds of Obama's base of support among affluent suburbanites and Malthusian fanatics. What Axelrod says here also reflects the doctrine which Bill Ayers, Bernardine Dorn, and the rest of the Weathermen had been professing for four decades, and that is that the white working class is the enemy and has to be destroyed.

OBAMA: CANDIDATE OF ELITIST CLASS HATRED AGAINST WHITE WORKERS

As Wilentz points out, the notion that Obama is going to bring in masses of new voters is a utopian fiction concocted by spin doctors like Axelrod and his ilk: 'Apart from its basic inaccuracy about Clinton's blue-collar support in 1992 and 1996, Axelrod's statement was a virtual reprise of the Democratic doomed strategy from the 1972 McGovern campaign that the party revamped in 1988. The main difference between now and then is the openness of the condescension with which many of Obama's supporters - and, apparently, the candidate himself - hold the crude "low information" types whom they believe dominate the white working class. The sympathetic media coverage of Obama's efforts to explain away his remarks in San Francisco about "bitter," economically-strapped voters who, clinging to their guns, religion, and racism, misdirect their rage and do not see the light, only reinforced his campaign's dismissive attitude. Obama's efforts at rectification were reluctant and half-hearted at best - and he undercut them completely a few days

later when he referred derisively, on the stump in Indiana, to a sudden "political flare-up because I said something that everybody knows is true." Culturally as well as politically, Obama's dismissal of white working people represents a sea-change in the Democrats' basic identity as the workingman's party - one that has been coming since the late 1960s, when large portions of the Left began regarding white workers as hopeless and hateful reactionaries. Faced with the revolt of the "Reagan Democrats" - whose politics they interpreted in the narrowest of racial terms - "new politics" Democrats dreamed of a coalition built around an alliance of right-thinking affluent liberals and downtrodden minorities, especially African-Americans. It all came to nothing. But after Bill Clinton failed to consolidate a new version of the old Democratic coalition in the 1990s, the dreaming began again - first, with disastrous results, in the schismatic Ralph Nader campaign of 2000 and now (with the support of vehement ex-Naderites including Barbara Ehrenreich and Cornel West) in the Obama campaign. (Sean Wilentz, "Barack Obama and the Unmaking of the Democratic Party," *Huffington Post*, May 23, 2008)

OBAMA BETRAYS THE FORGOTTEN AMERICANS

Wilentz correctly concludes that the Democratic Party is about to cast its fate to the winds in a way which has obviously tragic implications for the party's working-class base, many of whom need the urgent help of a president who is actually sympathetic to their plight and inclined to do is something about the Bush economy and the related accumulative wreckage of the Bush era. Wilentz sums up: 'Obama must assume that the demographics of American politics have changed dramatically in recent years so that the electorate as a whole is little more than a larger version of the combined Democratic primary constituencies of Oregon and South Carolina. In any event, Obama had shown no ability thus far to attract the one constituency that has always spelled the difference between victory and defeat for the Democratic Party. The party must now decide whether to go along with Obama and renounce its own heritage — and tempt the political fates.' (Sean Wilentz, "Barack Obama and the Unmaking of the Democratic Party," *Huffington Post*, May 23, 2008)

The crackpot notion that Obama can somehow win the Electoral College without blue-collar workers, the white working class, and the Reagan Democrats even spawned a totally new school of pseudo-sociology. The premise here was that the United States was now a totally parasitical country with no working-class worth mentioning that was left over. It is of course true that productive jobs in the United States have been wiped out since the Carter Volcker era at an unprecedented rate, but it is at the same time a total illusion to think that the Democratic Party can mean without the support of its traditional working-class base; the defeats of the effete patricians Gore and Kerry proved just the opposite, in contrast to the victories of Clinton, who did have some considerable populist appeal. A certain Chris Bowers indulged in a lengthy hallucination about a utopian world having very little relation to present day reality. Gary Hart in 1984 had claimed that he would win thanks to the new social ascendancy of the yuppies or young urban professionals. During the 1990s, a class of affluent young housewives known as soccer moms were supposed to provide the key demographic for getting elected. After 9/11, these soccer moms became security moms. Generally speaking, the more elaborate the demographic theory, the smaller the real chance of the candidate to get elected. This rule of thumb points to big trouble for Obama, since his signature demographic theory is one of the most arcane to come along in many moons. Obama, you must realize, is being touted as the candidate of a new, glamorous, and dynamic population group known as the "creative class."

OBAMA'S CHIMERA OF THE "CREATIVE CLASS"

Bowers writes that

> …unless Obama somewhat surprisingly does not become the next President of the United States, the Democratic Party will experience its first changing of the guard since the late 1980's. What differences will be in store? Here are the three major changes I expect:
>
> *1. Cultural Shift: Out with Bubbas, up with Creatives*: There should be a major cultural shift in the party, where the southern Dems and Liebercrat elite will be largely replaced by rising creative class types. Obama has all the markers of a creative class background, from his community organizing, to his Unitarianism, to being an academic, to living in Hyde Park to shopping at Whole Foods and drinking PBR. These will be the type of people running the Democratic Party now, and it will be a big cultural shift from the white working class focus of earlier decades. Given the demographics of the blogosphere, in all likelihood, this is a socioeconomic and cultural demographic into which you fit. Culturally, the Democratic Party will feel pretty normal to netroots types. It will consistently send out cultural signals designed to appeal primarily to the creative class instead of rich donors and the white working class.
>
> *2. Policy Shift: Out with the DLC, up with technocratic wonks*. My sense of Obama and his policy team is overwhelmingly one of technocratic, generally less overtly ideological professional policy types. We should see a shift from the more corporate and triangulating policy focus of the Democratic Party in the 1990's, and see it replaced by whatever centrist, technocratic policies are the wonkish flavor of the month. It will all be very oriented toward think-tank and academic types, and be reminiscent of policy making in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. A sort of "technocratic liberalism" that will be less infuriating than DLC style governance, but still not overtly leftist.
>
> *3. Coalition reorganization: Out with party silos, in with squishy goo-goos*. In addition to a shift in culture and policy focus, I also expect a different approach to coalition building. A long-standing Democrats approach of transactional politics with different issue and demographic silos in the party shift toward an emphasis on good government (goo goo) approaches. We will see lots of emphasis on non-partisanship, ethics reform, election reform instead of on, say, placating labor unions, environment groups, and the LGBT community by throwing each of these groups a policy bone or two. Now, the focus will be on broad, squishy fixes that are designed to appeal to several groups at once.' (Chris Bowers, Changing of the Guard, open left, May 8, 2008)

This is the eternal delirium of the crisis-crazed petit bourgeois, who imagines himself or herself to represent pure and undifferentiated humanity free from all parochial interests, and cannot imagine that there are billions of people in the world who do not see things in the same way. The source for this idiocy is a successful and trendy academic huckster by the name of Richard Florida, the author of *Cities and the Creative Class* and *The Rise of the Creative Class*. Here is how Florida advertises himself on his own website: 'Just as William Whyte's 1956 classic *The Organization Man* showed how the organizational ethos of that age permeated every aspect of life, Florida describes a society in which the creative ethos is increasingly dominant. Millions of us are beginning to work and live much as creative types like artists and scientists always have. Our values and tastes, our personal relationships, our choices of where to live, and even our sense and use of time are changing. Leading this transformation are the 40 million Americans – over a third of our national workforce – who create for a living. This "creative class" is found in a variety of fields,

from engineering to theater, biotech to education, architecture to small business. Their choices have already had a huge economic impact. In the future, they will determine how the workplace is organized, what companies will prosper or go bankrupt, and even which cities will thrive or wither.'

Another creative class pseudo-sociologist is the pretentious and oligarchical journalist of the *New York Times* David Brooks, the author of *Bobos in Paradise*, where the "bobos" or bourgeois bohemians — that is to say, bourgeois in income and Bohemian in lifestyle, correspond to Florida's creative class. These studies actually reflect nothing more than the decline of productive employment in the United States which has now been going on for 30 years, since the massive deindustrialization under Trilateral Paul Adolph Volcker, Jimmy Carter's appointee to head the Federal Reserve. The United States is widely acknowledged to be falling farther and farther behind the world standard when it comes to hard scientists and engineers, and this is the creative class which will be decisive in the 21st century. The United States has fewer and fewer industrial workers, and fewer and fewer indigenous Ph.D.'s in science. Florida's analysis has lost some of its glow since the collapse of the dot com bubble in 2001. The group that he was originally talking about was made up of fast-talking dot.com stockjobbers, a class that might be better termed as parasitical subjectivists rather than creative.

As one right-wing commentator points out, the apex of Florida's creative class sociological analysis took place in a rare interval of world history when the laws of economics seemed to have been momentarily suspended — during the lunatic excesses of the 1999-2000 dot com bubble. Its time has already passed. He argues that 'Neither the professor nor his most ardent adherents seem worried that the Internet generation formed its eccentric capitalist culture during a speculative bubble, when billions of dollars of free-flowing investment capital gave workers and their bosses the freedom to ignore basic economic concerns, and that now, with that money vanished and many companies defunct, a focus on such old-economy ideas as profits and tax rates has re-emerged. Moreover, as Florida's ideas reach beyond urban-planning types and New Age liberal politicians, they are at some point likely to find resistance from the hard-core urban Left, composed increasingly of social-services activists and representatives of public-employee and service-industry unions, who demand ever more government spending for social programs, not art and culture. Indeed, the professor's relentless argument that governments should help furnish bobo-friendly amenities ultimately comes to sound like a new form of class warfare: old-economy workers have no place in his utopian dreams. But a far more serious—indeed, fatal—objection to Florida's theories is that the economics behind them don't work. Although Florida's book bristles with charts and statistics showing how he constructed his various indexes and where cities rank on them, the professor, incredibly, doesn't provide any data demonstrating that his creative cities actually have vibrant economies that perform well over time. A look at even the simplest economic indicators, in fact, shows that, far from being economic powerhouses, many of Florida's favored cities are chronic underperformers. Exhibit A is the most fundamental economic measure, job growth. The professor's creative index—a composite of his other indexes—lists San Francisco, Austin, Houston, and San Diego among the top ten. His bottom ten include New Orleans, Las Vegas, Memphis, and Oklahoma City, which he says are "stuck in paradigms of old economic development" and are losing their "economic dynamism" to his winners. So you'd expect his winners to be big job producers. Yet since 1993, cities that score the best on Florida's analysis have actually grown no faster than the overall U.S. jobs economy, increasing their employment base by only slightly more than 17 percent. Florida's indexes, in fact, are such poor predictors of economic performance that his top cities haven't even outperformed his bottom ones. Led by big percentage gains in Las Vegas (the fastest-growing local economy in the nation) as well as in Oklahoma City and Memphis,

Florida's ten least creative cities turn out to be jobs powerhouses, adding more than 19 percent to their job totals since 1993—faster growth even than the national economy. […] Florida's ten most creative mid-sized cities are even less impressive economic engines. Since 1993, these cities, which include such underperformers as Albany, New York, and Dayton, Ohio, have increased their job totals by about 16 percent—less than the national average.' (Steven Malangan, "The Curse of the Creative Class," *City Journal*, Winter 2004)

ITALIAN FASCISM AND THE CREATIVE CLASS, 1919-1922

In reality, the situation is far worse. The drooling acolytes of Obama automatically assume that the presence of artists, writers, movie makers, and other people who claim to be creative is a guarantee that a social movement is progressive and destined to win. Here once again, a look backwards at the early years of Italian fascism shows how foolish this attitude really is. The early years of Italian fascism between 1919 in 1922 saw the participation in the new fascist movement of a whole series of writers and artists, most of whom were far more gifted than the gaggle of pretentious no talents who are huddling around Obama. Some of these belonged to the movement or artistic school known as the futurists. To the surprise of many modern left liberals, it turns out that these artistically talented futurists were also rabid warmongers, determined to get Italy into World War I, and then determined to support an aggressive imperialistic foreign policy. The founder of the futurist movement was Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, who wrote in his 1909 *Futurist Manifesto*, "We want to glorify war - the only cure for the world - militarism, patriotism, the destructive gesture of the anarchists, the beautiful ideas which kill, and contempt for woman. We want to demolish museums and libraries, fight morality, feminism and all opportunist and utilitarian cowardice." The fascist futurists Marinetti, Carlo Carrà, Gino Severini, Corrado Cagli, Dante Baldelli, Luigi Russolo, Ardengo Soffici, and Giacomo Balla were the leading painters of Italy at that time. Umberto Boccioni the chief sculptor of the group, was also an international celebrity. The architect Antonio Sant'Elia was another fascist futurist. The futurists glorified danger, war, and the machine age, attacked academies, museums, and other establishment bastions, and spoke out in favor of fascism.

Even more important for the development of Italian fascism was Gabriele D'Annunzio, who was by all odds the most famous and influential Italian novelist and poet of the age. D'Annunzio was a disciple of Nietzsche who belonged to the decadent school of late 19th century literature. D'Annunzio character of Andrea Sperelli in his novel *Il piacere* (*The Child of Pleasure*) evokes a typical human type of decadent late 19th century European society. Sperelli could certainly teach Obama's most decadent followers a thing or two. D'Annunzio agitated for Italy to enter World War I, and dropped leaflets on the enemy during a daring Italian air raid on Vienna. Later, he became the leader or *Duce* of the fascist forces who seized the city of Fiume, in Istria, along the border with the newly emerging nation of Yugoslavia. Here D'Annunzio developed most of the ceremonies and rituals which came to characterize the fascist political liturgy, including the Roman salute, the balcony speech, the chanting of slogans, and other fascist paraphernalia. Even after Mussolini had emerged as the principal fascist leader, he was always aware that D'Annunzio represented a very formidable rival who might have been able to oust him under certain circumstances. Given these fascist precedents, we need to keep our enthusiasm for the new creative class very much under control. Self-styled creativity is no guarantee of morality, or even of real creativity.

One might be willing to accept the suicide of the post-1968 multicultural, politically correct, Malthusian, and neo-Luddite Democratic Party, which had proven to be such so useless for social change or even for defending what had been won under the New Deal. But then what? 'Obama's

campaign has been very clever in carving out a strategy to amass Democratic delegate votes, but its momentum is in some ways a Potemkin construction—built largely on victories in states that no Democrat will win in November—that will fall apart under Republican pressure. And then where will we be?' (Adolph Reed Jr., "Obama No," *The Progressive,* May 17, 2008)[180] That was the view of many honest Democrats.

HYSTERIA OF THE FINANCE OLIGARCHS FOR OBAMA

But the house organ of the New York financier elite saw things differently. The *New York Times* now editorialized against Clinton in an outburst of wild hysteria which reflected all the desperation of a bankrupt and discredited ruling elite who were now peering into the abyss of defeat and default everywhere they turned: 'It is getting to be time for the superdelegates to do what the Democrats had in mind when they created superdelegates: settle a bloody race that cannot be won at the ballot box. Mrs. Clinton once had a big lead among the party elders, but has been steadily losing it, in large part because of her negative campaign. If she is ever to have a hope of persuading these most loyal of Democrats to come back to her side, let alone win over the larger body of voters, she has to call off the dogs.' ("The Low Road to Victory," *New York Times*, April 23, 2008) Over at the *Washington Post*, supposedly serious columnists were raving in favor of Obama like adolescent girls once did for Elvis or for the Beatles. One sample of this psychotic prose: 'The presumptive Democratic presidential nominee is far from perfect. But he has demonstrated the most mysterious and precious gift in politics, which is grace under pressure. […] What's compelling about Obama is that fusion of grace and ambition. He's playing for the highest stakes, but he makes it look easy. That cool, graceful quality evokes John F. Kennedy and the Rat Pack — all these sleek, handsome men in silk suits and skinny ties who never break character, never miss a beat.' (David Ignatius, "Mr. Cool's Intensity," *Washington Post*, May 11, 2008)

OLBERMANN DEMANDS VIOLENCE AGAINST SEN. CLINTON

Over at MSNBC, the Brzezinski Network, Obamakin media whores Keith Olbermann and Howard Fineman of *Newsweek* showed their contempt for democracy and representative government by demanding that the superdelegates immediately abort and override any remaining primaries and proceed to the coronation of the divine Barry. Fineman demanded that "grownups" come forward "like a referee in a fight" to separate the contenders. These, Fineman opined, would be "the super-super-super delegates" – exalted oligarchs indeed. Olbermann emphatically nodded assent, saying that the need was for heavies powerful enough to take Mrs. Clinton into a room "and only he comes out." Here was another blatant document of elitism parading itself in a psychotic public tantrum. A threat of violence to a presidential candidate was also implied. Maybe it was time for the Secret Service to visit Olbermann. In any case, it was time for the old sports junkie to get the sack. James Poniewozik, the media critic of *Time Magazine*, registered the degeneracy of this Keith Olbermann, who had now advanced to the position of chief resident yelping media hound of MSNBC, otherwise known as Obamavision. Olbermann had re-invented himself based on the usual two points, opposition to Bush and opposition to the Iraq war. Olbermann launched a tirade at Clinton after she made a garbled remark about the Robert Kennedy assassination in relation to the unusual length of the 2008 primary and the media hysteria calling on her to drop out. Poniewozik commented acutely: "Even if we concede his argument--that Clinton was at best callously and at worst intentionally suggesting she should stay in the race because Obama might be killed--every time he turns up the volume to 11 like this lately, he sounds like just another of the cable gasbags he

used to be a corrective to." (James Poniewozik, "Keith Olbermann Blows Last Remaining Gasket," *Time*, May 27, 2008)

Former SDS leader and foundation fellow traveler Tom Hayden worried that Obama was too weak on the issues, and was losing out to Hillary for that basic reason: "...Obama's basic problem is that he relies on stylistic differences rather than substantive ones, because he believes he cannot attack Clinton on policy grounds and still maintain his centrist orientation. She senses that, is therefore neutralizing the policy differences, and taking the offensive to demolish his character claims. Between two candidates with personal baggage, she figures the voters will ultimately vote for experience." (Huffington Post, April 23, 2008) But there were very important policy differences between Clinton and Obama, and these explained the way the Democratic Party was dividing. Clinton was for a freeze on foreclosures and on interest rate resets on adjustable rate mortgages; Obama wanted to let the "market" work. Clinton had crossed into explicit New Deal territory by proposing the re-creation of the Home Loan Ownership Corporation, an FDR creation. Clinton commented: "During the Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Congress dealt with huge impending foreclosures by creating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (HOLC. Now, a small but growing group of academics and public figures, including Senator Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, is calling for the federal government to bring back something like the HOLC. Count me in."[181] Obama's man Goolsbee sniffed that one had to respect the "market," instead. Clinton was for universal health care; Wall Street crowed that Obama was the only Democrat who opposed it. Clinton wanted to apply the New Deal method by lifting the 18¢ per gallon federal gasoline tax, and shifting the resulting tax burden to a windfall profits tax on the oil cartel to keep the Highway Construction Fund replenished and maintain jobs on the front. Obama cited a myriad of reactionary pro-Wall Street economic charlatans to assert that this was pandering; he lost the Indiana primary as a direct result. Clinton, having learned something during the campaign, wanted to re-open NAFTA and other free trade sellouts. Obama gave lip service to this idea, but sent Goolsbee to reassure the Canadians that this was pure electioneering demagogy. Clinton was for a robust manned space program, one of the indispensable science drivers for any future recovery; Obama wanted to wipe out the manned space program by shifting the funds into education – a cheap and transparent anti-science ploy. Obama's advisors, especially the pudgy-faced Jason Furman and his sidekick Jeffrey Liebman, wanted to begin privatizing Social Security to please Robert Rubin of bankrupt Citibank; Clinton was having none of this. Even more important, as time went on, Obama moved towards the Wall Street financier line on all major issues, while Clinton moved in the New Deal direction. It was a clear choice.

CLINTON IN NEW DEAL TERRITORY

In economic policy, Michelle Obama's veiled references to broken souls and a future of sacrifice and the presence of ultra-right Friedmanite Chicago school ideologues like Austan Goolsbee make clear that an Obama presidency will be one of savage austerity, economic sacrifice, and a lowering of the standard of living for the already exhausted and depleted US population. There will be onerous global warming taxes to please Al Gore, global solidarity taxes for third world subversion, and much more. The proceeds will flow to Wall Street. Corporate state entities of the type demanded by Rubin, Soros, Rohatyn and Rudman will be set up to exploit the infrastructure crisis to create new financial bubbles. Obama is likely to cause more immiseration that Carter, who still holds the post-Hoover record in this sad department. Civil war in the US is a distinct possibility. Sen. Clinton, by contrast, benefited by being betrayed and scorned by the worst Wall Street predators (Rockefeller, Soros), the worst media whores, and the worst Democratic Party elitists. She

would be beholden in the White House to none of them, but rather to blue collar workers. She had evolved in the direction of the Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal on a number of issues. Most important, Hillary and Bill Clinton offered the greatest potential in sight for escaping the status of puppet of the banking establishment which has been the tendency for post-1944 presidents. Together, they might even hope to approximate a new FDR presidency. Sen. Clinton's considerable fighting qualities were our best bet in this regard; she had already stopped the Obama coup several times, when weaker figures like Edwards ran away.

REVEREND WRIGHT: OBAMA JUST ANOTHER POLITICIAN

Obama's marplot spiritual guru was not about to hop in his Porsche, drive home to his $1.6 mansion, start enjoying his $10 million line of credit, and taste the many joys of leisured and affluent victimhood. On the last weekend of April 2008, Reverend Wright went on the offensive to assert the validity of his personal school of racist provocations. He was interviewed by Bill Moyers, LBJ's former flack and salesman for the Vietnam war, and now the dean of the foundation-funded media whores in public television. Here Wright suggested that Obama was simply a prevaricating "politician" who responded like a politician, trimming and fibbing according to the needs of the moment. It was not a good ad for Obama's pretentious claim to float above the vulgar political fray. Then there was a stop in Dallas, where Wright revealed that he had been crucified by being denied the honorary degrees and triumphant lecture appearances which he clearly felt were his due. Then it was on to the NAACP dinner in Detroit, where the Jeremiad proffered his view that the media were unfairly stressing that the candidate was "Barack HUSSEIN Obama, Barack HUSSEIN Obama, Barack HUSSEIN Obama." At the National Press Club in Washington on the morning of April 28, Wright was in the full exultance of the manic phase. He basked in attention of hundreds of reporters of thirty television cameras. He repeatedly identified the black church with his own inflated ego, an act of gross historical injustice to the majority of black traditionalist churches who wanted nothing to do with the cursing and hating of his own style, nor with the synthetic religion that was black liberation theology.

What finally did Wright want? Above all, he wanted attention, since he was a megalomaniac in no way inferior to Obama. What else did he want? As it turned out, he wanted an apology for slavery and racism. All this sound and fury for mere words, a mere piece of paper expressing sorrow for the wrongs of the past. It showed that Wright was not capable of formulating demands that might be meaningful for the lives of the real victims of today, the majority of the black population who remained trapped in the poverty of the inner city ghetto. The black majority, the black underclass, needed something far more meaningful than a mere apology that would leave them exactly where they were. They needed housing, jobs, health care, education, urban mass transit, a ban on foreclosures, measures to control the gas price, and a whole series of other improvements in the material conditions of their lives. The resources needed for those improvements would be measured in the trillions of dollars. But what of that? In March 2008 alone, Bernanke had pumped almost half a trillion into the banking system to deal with the Bear Stearns debacle. The same money pumped into American cities would create a new world. A few of those injections, properly invested, would go far towards lifting the Other America out of poverty and despair. The beneficiaries would be inner city blacks, to be sure. But they would also be poor whites in Appalachia, the high plains, and the rest of rural America. They would be Latino migrant farm workers. They would be super-exploited Vietnamese, Koreans, and other Asians. And that would be a united front of the American people against Wall Street. This, of course, was the eventuality that the Ford Foundation and other sponsors of black liberation theology were paying good money to

sabotage and abort. So Wright used his hour of fame to demand essentially nothing for the most disadvantaged part of the black community – just like his friend Farrakhan, who had ruined the success of the Million Man March by giving a raving speech about numerology and occult freemasonic symbolism instead of laying out a fighting program to rebuild America for all the people.

Down the road was even more trouble, since Wright was now promising a book to be published in October 2008, on the eve of the general election. And if there was to be a book, there would also be a book tour, with innumerable press conferences and press availabilities, and unending opportunities for Wright to embarrass and sabotage Obama, if he were still in the race at that point. As soon as the primaries were over, Obama quit Trinity United once and for all. But after 20 years, it was much too late to neutralize the issue. Obama was clearly a candidate with so many demolition charges built in that Democrats now had to jettison this fatal baggage before he dragged them down.

TONGUE-TIED: OBAMA'S CATASTROPHIC PRESS CONFERENCE OF APRIL 29, 2008

April was indeed the cruelest month for Obama. What followed was one of the most bizarre press conferences in recent American history. This time there was no teleprompter, and for this the Perfect Master paid a terrible price. No longer was his head thrown back in haughty superiority. Now his eyes were downcast, his speech halting, his demeanor grim and saturnine, with streaks of anger. Never had the Perfect Master stuttered, stammered, paused, halted, hiccupped, and gurgled so much as on this fateful occasion. He said "uuh" a great deal. He drew out the word "and" until it seemed to have two syllables. Never had the great balcony orator been so tongue-tied. A good index of the disintegration of Obama's troubled personality might have been the "y'know index." As long as he had read off teleprompters, he had been fluent. As long as he stuck to the pre-masticated utopian platitudes and messianic clichés of his stock stump speech as written by the Grub Street scrivener Favreau, he had been reasonably proficient. But now, when he had to extemporize under fire, and above all to exercise some sort of self-reflexive and self-critical judgment, the words would not come. Obama was now the waffle candidate, and he proved it by waffling on the Wright issue. Even with hell gaping below his candidacy, he could not bring himself to break definitively with the racist provocateur. He was still a member of Wright's church, and he would not quit that church unless and until he had conferred with Reverend Otis Moss III, the Ford Foundation scholar who was now the pastor. Even when Obama's political survival was at stake, he was a wimp who could not be decisive.

OBAMA – APOSTATE MOSLEM OR MAHDI ?

Many Obama backers tried to create the impression that Obama's Moslem name would automatically win him the good will of a billion Moslems around the world. But this may represent a misconception on the part of handlers like Brzezinski, who is notorious for knowing virtually nothing of the Islamic world and of many of the parts of the world that he tries so hard to manipulate and destroy. Would Obama be able to give US imperialism a face lift and a new lease on life among the Moslems? A veteran neocon warned against the 'argument that Mr. Obama's election would raise America's esteem in Africa — indeed, he already arouses much enthusiasm in his father's native Kenya and to a degree elsewhere on the continent. But it is a mistake to conflate his African identity with his Muslim heritage. Senator Obama is half African by birth and Africans can understandably identify with him. In Islam, however, there is no such thing as a half-Muslim.

Like all monotheistic religions, Islam is an exclusive faith. As the son of the Muslim father, Senator Obama was born a Muslim under Muslim law as it is universally understood. It makes no difference that, as Senator Obama has written, his father said he renounced his religion. Likewise, under Muslim law based on the Koran his mother's Christian background is irrelevant. […] His conversion, however, was a crime in Muslim eyes; it is "irtidad" or "ridda," usually translated from the Arabic as "apostasy," but with connotations of rebellion and treason. Indeed, it is the worst of all crimes that a Muslim can commit, worse than murder (which the victim's family may choose to forgive). With few exceptions, the jurists of all Sunni and Shiite schools prescribe execution for all adults who leave the faith not under duress; the recommended punishment is beheading at the hands of a cleric, although in recent years there have been both stonings and hangings. (Some may point to cases in which lesser punishments were ordered — as with some Egyptian intellectuals who have been punished for writings that were construed as apostasy — but those were really instances of supposed heresy, not explicitly declared apostasy as in Senator Obama's case.) It is true that the criminal codes in most Muslim countries do not mandate execution for apostasy (although a law doing exactly that is pending before Iran's Parliament and in two Malaysian states). But as a practical matter, in very few Islamic countries do the governments have sufficient authority to resist demands for the punishment of apostates at the hands of religious authorities. For example, in Iran in 1994 the intervention of Pope John Paul II and others won a Christian convert a last-minute reprieve, but the man was abducted and killed shortly after his release. Likewise, in 2006 in Afghanistan, a Christian convert had to be declared insane to prevent his execution, and he was still forced to flee to Italy. Because no government is likely to allow the prosecution of a President Obama — not even those of Iran and Saudi Arabia, the only two countries where Islamic religious courts dominate over secular law — another provision of Muslim law is perhaps more relevant: it prohibits punishment for any Muslim who kills any apostate, and effectively prohibits interference with such a killing.' (Edward N. Luttwak, "President Apostate?" *New York Times*, May 12, 2008)

DONALD YOUNG: MURDER IN WRIGHT'S CATHEDRAL

A dangerous scandal looming over Obama was the murder of Donald Young, the gay choirmaster in Wright's and Obama's church, whose bullet-riddled body was found last Christmas morning. *The Globe* of May 19, 2008 quoted the opinion of a Chicago private detective that Young was murdered to keep him quiet about Obama, meaning the candidate's notorious homosexual activities. These latter are attested to by Larry Sinclair of Minnesota, who has a federal civil suit pending in which he alleges that he had two gay sex encounters with Obama in 1999, with Obama indulging in crack cocaine. Sinclair also alleges that Donald Young tried to sound him out about matters related to Obama before Young was murdered. This first echelon also includes Reverend James David Manning's "Trinity of Hell" tape, which names Obama and Wright as closet homosexuals, a charge repeated by Manning on the Hannity radio program. Was Obama Wright's catamite? Murder in the cathedral, gay sex, and crack cocaine now loomed over Obama's arrogant claim of victory.

THE OBAMA BODY COUNT

There were other mysterious deaths related to Trinity United and the surrounding area. Two other young black men that attended the same church—Larry Bland and Nate Spencer—also died within 40 days of each other, beginning in November 2007. Nate Spencer was a member of the TUCC Sanctuary Choir; his funeral was held on Monday January 7, 2008. All three were openly homosexual. Larry Sinclair stated in sworn affidavits that Obama is a closet bisexual with whom he

had sexual and drug-related encounters in November 1999. Sinclair also claimed that Obama was personally acquainted Donald Young and that choir director Donald had contacted him shortly before being murdered from multiple gunshot wounds on December 23, 2007. These killings are receiving a number of different reactions. Mike Parker, reporting for CBS in Chicago, wrote, "Activists fear gay African-Americans are being targeted for murder," while Marc Loveless of the Coalition for Justice and Respect queries, "Are we under attack? Is this a serial killer?" An even more sinister aspect of this case is being investigated. Sinclair has stated in an affidavit to the Chicago Police Department, Donald Young had informed him that he and Barack Obama were "intimate" with each other. Sinclair revealed in a January 18, 2008, YouTube video that on two separate occasions in November 1999, he engaged in sexual acts with Obama, and that Obama smoked crack cocaine—once in a limousine and the other time at a hotel in Gurnee, Ill. Sinclair has also raised the important question of why Donald Young, whom he had never met, would initiate these calls using cell phone numbers which Sinclair had given to the Obama campaign, at a time when Sinclair had not yet gone public with any part of his story and was therefore not a public figure. A private investigator connected to the Chicago Police Department told the *Globe*, "Donald Young was silenced because of something he knew about Obama. Donald was in a position where he heard a lot of things and saw a lot of things concerning Barack." … The unavoidable fact was that three gay black men had died, two by violence, within a span of 40 days among the members of Jeremiah Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ, which at the time was the object of consuming media attention. [182]

MICHELLE OBAMA, RACIST; ILYAS ACHMADOV, ENVOY OF TERRORISTS

Another echelon of scandal was the Michelle Obama racist tirade against white America, reportedly employing extreme language. Still another echelon involved contacts of the Obama campaign to certain foreign organizations, including terrorist groups like the Chechen rebels. A mere hint was the case of Robert Malley, who was forced out because he was meeting with Hamas. Malley was working for the International Crisis Group, which is funded by Soros and features Brzezinski on its board. Far more explosive are Brzezinski's lobbying activities for Ilyas Achmadov, the resident US envoy of the top Chechen terrorist gang, which specializes in massacres of women and children in hospitals and schools, with a body count in the thousands. Achmadov is now living in Washington DC with an upscale apartment, a posh office, a secretary, a travel budget, and a public relations budget, all generously paid for by US taxpayers – an arrangement obtained for him by Brzezinski. Moscow wants Achmadov extradited to stand trial as a mass murderer and terrorist, but Brzezinski is protecting him.

SECURING A SUCCESSFUL PARTY REALIGNMENT

This year of 2008 was a rare historical turning point, a watershed party re-alignment election in the series 1828 (Jackson), 1860 (Lincoln), 1896 (McKinley over Bryan), 1932 (FDR and the New Deal), and 1968 (the Nixon southern strategy). A new stable progressive coalition for the next four decades needed to be forged, and only Clinton had shown the ability to permanently incorporate Latinos, Asians, Reagan Democrats, women, retirees, union households, Jewish voters, and other key groups which will be critical for dominating the Electoral College until about 2050. Obama was betting on a congeries of groups and a crazy quilt of oddly assorted states to make it. Clinton's underlying appeal to black voters would return once the smoke had cleared. Clinton's duty was therefore to act to save the country from national catastrophe under Obama and his controllers, whatever it took.

OBAMA BETS EVERYTHING ON GEORGIA AND VIRGINIA

By July, Obama's hopes for winning at the ballot box (as distinct from by means of scandals orchestrated by the FBI) came down to this: 'Obama's entire claim to redrawing the political map is based on his perceived ability to win in Southern states precisely because of African-American voters. … Hillary's claim that she alone was capable of winning large swing states that Democrats must win, such as Ohio and Pennsylvania, went unnoticed and unheeded by Dean, Pelosi and others. However, this is a severe and dangerous gamble. As we pointed out a few weeks back, the Obama campaign seems to know that Ohio and Florida are going to be a stretch, so they are looking for alternate paths to 270, which means they are relying heavily on the Southern states, especially Virginia and Georgia. They also discuss the Rocky Mountain states of Nevada, New Mexico and Colorado, but frankly, even if he wins those three, and Michigan, Pennsylvania and New Hampshire (all three of which will be highly competitive), if he loses Ohio and Florida, he will lose the election 267-271 (this count includes all the states Kerry won). In short, if Obama loses Ohio and Florida, the three Rocky Mountain states and Georgia and Virginia become must win states. As Senator Obama will still lose the general election with the three Rocky Mountain states if he fails to swing Georgia and Virginia, these two states are of particular interest. […] Mr. Obama can write off Georgia and North Carolina for the same reasons that Mississippi is beyond his reach — although the math in those two states is slightly less daunting…. But while Obama is throwing millions of dollars at states that have not gone to Democrats since 1964 (Virginia), and 1992 (Georgia and Bill), he'll be opening the door even wider for Republicans in actual swing states. Mike DuHaime, political director of the Republican National Committee, doesn't argue with Obama's fund-raising advantage. But he disputes the notion that Obama can afford to keep throwing money at long shots once the campaign really heats up in the fall, and he contends that Obama's defense of vulnerable states like New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Ohio will be much more expensive. "It would take a major swing to swing these [Southern] states," says DuHaime. "I don't fault them for trying to expand the map, but we have better opportunities in other states that are just as big, if not bigger — Pennsylvania, Ohio, for example."'[183] Democrats should also note that what is being aimed at here is not a permanent and durable Democratic majority capable of rebuilding the country, but rather an odd bloc of states built around the personality cult of Obama. Even if Obama got to the White House, if the next Democratic nominee after Obama were not also Obama, there would be no strategy left. As usual, Obama was building a personality cult, not a permanent and reliable voting bloc with a coherent pattern based on identifiable voter groups. There would be no FDR coalition, but just a flash in the pan.

OBAMA HAS NEVER WON A CONTESTED ELECTION

The 2008 presidential election represents the second time that Obama has ever run in a truly contested election. In his 1996 state senate race, he threw all his opponents off the Democratic primary ballot, which was tantamount to election. In 2000, Obama made a bid for election to the US House of Representatives, but in this case he had an actual opponent, the incumbent Democrat Representative Bobby Rush. In this contest, Obama was resoundingly thrashed. In his 2004 US Senate race in Illinois, his Democratic primary opponent and his Republican general election opponent were conveniently destroyed by scandals piloted by his friends at the reactionary *Chicago Tribune*. In the end, his Republican general election opponent was a carpetbagger and buffoon, Allan Keyes from Maryland. One wonders why the Democratic Party would ever consider betting its fortunes in a once in four decades party realignment election on a candidate who has never won a contested election.

OBAMA IS WATERGATE-BAIT

In early May, Harold Ickes of the Clinton campaign had talked about an October surprise. This could have meant a number of things, since Obama was indeed a scandal-rich contender, and one of the prominent possibilities was the notorious Michelle Obama "Hate Whitey" tape, an apoplectic outburst of racist rage by the Messiah's consort, full of violent and obscene invective against the white race, white American, and other objects of Michelle's fascistoid rage cathexis. There was an uneasy awareness, even among the most fanatical Obama acolytes, that there were more scandals lurking in the Perfect Master's closet: 'The Clinton campaign has made it clear that Senator Clinton remains in the race because anything can happen. That generally has been taken to mean that a scandal could erupt that would cause the Obama campaign to implode. Some Reverend Wright on steroids might burst into public view. Keep in mind what happened to Eliot Spitzer.' (Bob Herbert, *New York Times,* May 27, 2008)

RESULT: A LONG HOT SUMMER OF SCANDAL DOSSIERS

Karl Rove increasingly resembled the Japanese Admiral Nagumo at Midway, who dithered and hesitated when he should have been launching his attack waves at the earliest possible moment. As a result, he was caught flat-footed with his planes warming up on deck when the main US dive bomber attack materialized; four Japanese carriers were sunk and the war was as good as lost. Karl Rove seemed to think that he could hold the Michelle Obama "Hate Whitey" tape in reserve until mid-October, using it in the next few months to harvest huge quantities of GOP cash to stoke the fires of his 527 empire. Karl might be more interested in getting his hands on that cash than in anything else. But he was risking watching McCain get the Spitzer treatment and be swept away in 72 hours. The summer 2008 battle of the scandal dossiers was like thermonuclear war: the greatest advantage was to be gained by a successful first strike, after which the retaliatory riposte would be weak and disorganized. The new motto for the holders of the scandal dossiers should be" "Use 'em or lose 'em." Whatever scandal dossiers you attempt to hold in reserve are likely to be useless, since your own candidate can be taken down in a day or two, and once such an attack has started it will be almost impossible to stop it or even disrupt it. Once McCain had the GOP nomination, he was wide open to scandal attack. The wiser course for the GOP oppo research brigade was to recognize that Obama was the FBI-CIA intelligence community candidate, and that he was the one slated to enjoy a scandal-assisted quest for the White House as his opponents were destroyed – or, for that matter, liquidated. It was far better to destroy Obama before he attained the Democratic nomination, thus making Hillary the candidate. Hillary was herself more or less impervious to scandals, having thrived in the crucible of Whitewatergate and Monicagate, but she was not going to get the same kind of help from the FBI that Obama was sure to have. McCain's best chance was, ironically and in contrast to the usual rules, to unload everything preemptively on Obama in June and July, and then mobilize for a more or less fair fight with Hillary in September and October. If Karl Rove and company did not do this, it could only mean that they were blinded by greed and not that much concerned about McCain's fate, after all.

THE LIKELY CATASTROPHE OF AN OBAMA PRESIDENCY

May of 2008 saw the death of Hamilton Jordan, who had been Jimmy Carter's top crony from the Georgia mafia and White House Chief of Staff. David Broder, one of the top ideological watchdogs of the financier establishment, took this occasion to refer back to interviews that Jordan had given to historians soon after the end of the disastrous Carter administration. Jordan's main

point had been that the Carter coup inside the Democratic Party had only been possible in the first place because of an extraordinarily high degree of chaos and disorganization among the Democrats after eight years of Nixon and Ford. Broder noted: 'The main theme of Jordan's interview was this intriguing observation: "Only because of the fragmentation that had taken place" in the Democratic Party and its allied groups was Carter able to be nominated and elected in 1976. But that same fragmentation made the challenge of governing so difficult that he was almost doomed to fail. What Jordan meant was this: In the two previous elections, the Democratic Party was riven by strife over the Vietnam War, social policy and civil rights. It was bitterly divided by the nomination of Hubert Humphrey over Eugene McCarthy in 1968, and of George McGovern over Humphrey and others in 1972. In 1974, after Watergate ended the Republican revival, the old-guard Democrats suddenly confronted an influx of reform-minded new faces in Congress. But once Carter was in the White House, the liberals who controlled Congress quickly took his measure. They put their obligations to their constituencies and interest groups ahead of any loyalty to him. He never had a "honeymoon," and by his third year his presidency had unraveled, not because of Republican obduracy but because of his inability to lead his fellow Democrats. gained his first and most important win in Iowa with 37.6 percent of the votes, while Hillary Clinton and John Edwards split almost 60 percent evenly. Both Carter and Obama lost several late primaries but held on to the delegate lead they had staked out earlier. This is the cautionary tale Obama and his brain trust could find in Jordan's interview. Obama, too, has profited from fragmentation in the Democratic Party that has allowed a long shot, once again, to capture its greatest prize. But if he is elected, he will have to solve the problems of fragmentation that doomed Jimmy Carter.' (David Broder, *Washington Post*, May 29, 2008)

Naturally, Broder did not mention the real basis of in-depth comparison between Carter and Obama, which is that both are puppets of the Trilateral Commission and of Zbigniew Brzezinski personally. Nevertheless, this point is well taken, and has already been discussed by me in the companion volume to this study, *Obama — The Postmodern Coup: the Making of a Manchurian Candidate*, where I developed a detailed comparison between the Carter regime and the likely outlines of a future Obama rule. By running as a blank slate, and by promising to be all things to all people, Obama at will necessarily face a moment of shocked recognition when the majority of his followers be allies that they have been hoodwinked by his sanctimonious utopian platitudes and vapid messianic rhetoric. That moment is likely to come less than 12 months into Obama's term in office. But since the political, economic, and military crisis of the United States today is so much more severe than it was three decades ago we cannot assume that the penalty for letting Obama into the White House will be comparable to what it was under Reagan and Bush, bad as those presidents were. Rather, the perspective under Obama would have to be a catastrophic combination of hyperinflationary economic depression and breakdown crisis, accompanied by extreme forms of foreign military adventure likely to end in crushing defeat, with the United States internal political situation rapidly degenerating in the direction of possible civil war, somewhat along the lines of the breakdown of public order in the Roman Empire during the 50 year crisis of the third century A.D.

RALPH NADER: OBAMA EXPLOITS WHITE GUILT

There was an immediate necessity for critical voices to start attacking Obama from his left, since that was his greatest vulnerability. Here was an area where Ralph Nader could perhaps provide an important public service. Nader shared his views about Obama with the *Rocky Mountain News:*

> Q: Do you see Barack Obama as qualitatively different than Al Gore or any other Democrats. He talks about taking on lobbyists, not taking money directly from lobbyists ... People portray

him as being different. Do you see him as being any better than Al Gore or any of the other Democrats that you've opposed over the years?

Nader: No. I mean, he's deceiving people. He takes, he takes ... In this very building he would take money from corporate lawyers who are not registered lobbyists but whose desks are across the aisle from corporate lawyers who are registered lobbyists in the same law firm. That has been reported more than once in the mainstream press ... Six out of seven industries, as of a month ago, have given more money to Obama than they have to McCain, only the transportation industry is more equal opportunity corruption. Look at the health care industry. It has poured money into his campaign. The securities industry, the defense industry. No. There's only one thing different about Barack Obama when it comes to being a Democratic presidential candidate. He's half African-American. Whether that will make any difference, I don't know. I haven't heard him have a strong crackdown on economic exploitation in the ghettos. Payday loans, predatory lending, asbestos, lead. What's keeping him from doing that? Is it because he wants to talk white? He doesn't want to appear like Jesse Jackson? We'll see all that play out in the next few months and if he gets elected afterwards. I think his main problem is that he censors himself. He knows exactly who has power, who has too much, who has too little, what needs to be done right down to the community level. But he has bought the advice that if you want to win the election, you better take it easy on the corporate abuses and do X, Y, Z. When I hear that I say, Oh, I see. So he's doing all this to win the election, and then he'll be different. Well let's see if it worked. Did it work for Mondale? Did it work for Dukakis? Did it work for Clinton? Yes, but only because of Perot? Did it work for Gore? Did it work for Kerry ... ?

Q: Do you think he's trying to, what was your term, 'talk white?'

NADER: Of course. I mean, first of all, the number one thing that a black American politician aspiring to the presidency should be is to candidly describe the plight of the poor, especially in the inner cities and the rural areas, and have a very detailed platform about how the poor are going to be defended by the law, is going to be protected by the law, and is going to be liberated by the law. Haven't heard a thing. I mean, the amount of economic exploitation in the ghettos is shocking. You'd think he'd propose a task force to at least study it. I mean, these people are eroded every day. The kids, bodies are asbestos and lead, municipal services discriminate against them because it's the poor area, including fire and police protection and building code enforcement. And then the lenders, the loan sharks get at them, and the dirty food ends up in the ghettos, like the contaminated meat. It's a dumping ground for shoddy merchandise. You don't see many credit unions there. You don't see many libraries there. You don't see many health clinics there. This is, we're talking 40-50 million Americans who are predominantly African-Americans and Latinos. Anybody see that kind of campaigning? Have you seen him campaign in real poor areas of the city very frequently? No, he doesn't campaign there.

Q: What do you think the purpose of that is?

NADER: He wants to show that he is not a threatening, a political threatening, another politically-threatening African-American politician. He wants to appeal to white guilt. You appeal to white guilt not by coming on as a black is beautiful, black is powerful. Basically he's coming on as someone who is not going to threaten the white power structure, whether it's corporate or whether it's simply oligarchic. And they love it. Whites just eat it up.[184]

The Obama cultists howled, but Nader's points were well taken as far as they went. Libertarian presidential candidate Bob Barr attacked Obama for his cowardly capitulation on the renewal of the totalitarian FISA law. Barr promised that he would not betray his supporters in the same way that Obama had. It was a miserable time to be a Democrat.

FREE LARRY SINCLAIR, OBAMA'S POLITICAL PRISONER

On June 18, 2008, Larry Sinclair appeared at the National Press Club in Washington DC to officially deliver his bill of indictment against Obama. Incredibly, he was arrested just after he concluded the press conference. Sinclair was taken into custody by DC police and US Marshals in the Square Bar off the Holeman Lounge, where he had spoken to the media. From Wednesday to Monday, Larry Sinclair was held in the DC Jail, the victim of a Gestapo-style enemies' list operation that went beyond Nixon, carried out just three blocks from the White House. Sinclair had come to the National Press Club to detail his charges that the self-proclaimed Democratic presidential nominee Barack Hussein Obama had indulged in two homosexual encounters complete with crack cocaine in early November 1999, that Obama was complicit in the December 2007 assassination of Donald Young, the gay choirmaster of Jeremiah Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ, and that Obama's resident perception monger, David Axelrod, had paid the pornographic website Whitehouse.com $750,000 to organize a campaign of character assassination against Sinclair, culminating in a faked polygraph test. At the close of the press conference, Sinclair was arrested inside the press club by US Marshals and DC police, apparently based on an old Delaware warrant. The Whitehouse.com owner, Dan Parisi, abortively called off his own scheduled press conference in another room of the Press Club once it was known that Sinclair had been arrested.

GESTAPO TACTICS IN THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, THE TEMPLE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Where were the civil libertarians? Where were the paladins of the ACLU? Where were the outcry and the indignation? Was no one concerned about threats to lynch a gay man for political reasons in the heart of the nation's capital? Where were the left liberals who had been ostensibly so concerned about civil rights and civil liberties from Nixon to Bush-Cheney? Perhaps they were sleeping, or perhaps they had drunk the Obama Kool-Aid and had become morally insane. Or perhaps they were so obsessed with the reform of the FISA law and the danger that Bush might be listening in to their telephone calls that they did not notice when a prominent critic of a presidential candidate who is infamously a darling of the establishment media was actually arrested, taken into custody and led away, the target of Gestapo tactics in the National Press Club, the sanctum sanctorum of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the First Amendment generally. Surely the weak sisters who had joined Obama's fifth column were morally insane when they joke about how Barky's Myrmidons were able to arrest Sinclair. If the First Amendment does not apply to speech which is not popular with the establishment and the mob, then the First Amendment does not exist at all, for anybody. Any journalist or writer should be able to see that they themselves may be next, now that the US Marshals are serving as the "Fight the Smears" enforcement arm of the Obama campaign. Selective and vindictive prosecution, anyone?

The mere fact that Larry Sinclair had been able to hold such a successful press conference was already a serious defeat for the corrupt and brutal Obama machine. Sinclair had appeared in the Holeman Lounge before more than a hundred journalists, with 10 cameras set up on tripods in the back of the room. The number of handheld cameras, camcorders, and tape recorders was beyond counting. The press conference was dignified, businesslike, factual. There was no screaming, no disruption, no threats or insults. Every journalist who wanted to ask a question was given ample opportunity to do so, and about three dozen questions were asked. Reasonable follow-ups were allowed. There were journalists from Britain, from Germany, from India, from China. Most of the questions represented honest attempts to pin down the facts of what was being alleged.

Sinclair's honesty compared favorably to that of most politicians today. He started his presentation with a detailed admission of his criminal record, jail time served, his pending court motion to dismiss an old Colorado warrant, and a statement that his troubles with the law date back more than 20 years to 1980-1986. In the question-and-answer segment, Sinclair gave a straight answer to every question he was asked. He did not dodge questions, he did not prevaricate, he did not refuse to answer questions, and he did not bungle his answers. Sinclair has made serious mistakes in life, as he readily conceded. But Sinclair is not a candidate, not a person who has to be evaluated by the public and then accepted or rejected. Sinclair came forward as a witness with a series of allegations to make and a story to tell. It was up to public opinion and most emphatically the news media to evaluate those allegations and those facts, including through the efforts of enterprising investigative journalists anxious to make a name for themselves by finding out the truth about what is potentially the biggest political scandal of the century. Obama, after all, is the candidate of whom we know little and who needs urgently to be evaluated. The issue posed is not what you think about Larry Sinclair. The overriding issue is the presidency in a time of military defeat, institutional crisis, and economic breakdown.

HOMOPHOBIC DEATH THREATS AGAINST SINCLAIR

Obama's lemming legions, and especially his notorious mercenary *squadristi* of the Internet, had done everything possible to sabotage and disrupt Sinclair's press conference. One Obama backer had issued a categorical death threat against Sinclair in terms that made it abundantly clear that a homophobic hate murder might be in the offing. The FBI and the District of Columbia police had shown zero interest in offering Sinclair protection against a possible hit by one of Obama's fanatics. Once it is accepted that police agencies can intervene in political campaigns, it is possible to a rest or detain almost anyone if the interest is great enough. If nothing can be found at this level, there are always old parking tickets and library fines that can be ginned up. Any political candidate who has had dealings with the Federal Elections Commission can be hauled in on some minor technical violation. The precedent established by the arrest of Sinclair at the National Press Club was exceedingly ominous for the public life of this country. The irony was that repression was being carried out not to help the Republicans, but rather under ultra-left cover, to help the radical subversive Obama.

Since the warrant used as the pretext to arrest Sinclair came from Delaware, attention naturally turned to Senator Joe Biden, the incorrigible blowhard and defeated presidential candidate who is now known to be angling for the post of vice president or Secretary of State in a future Obama regime. We also note that Biden's son, the nepotist Beau Biden, the current Attorney General of Delaware, issued the warrant. As the cops would say, the Biden machine, anxious to ingratiate themselves with Obama, had the means, motive, and opportunity to arrange this outrageous arrest. For those gullible enough to believe that civil liberties might improve under an Obama regime, this ought to provide a reality shock. Do not assume that civil liberties will get better under Obama; the evidence is now that they will get worse. Obama's National Press Club caper is as blatant as anything seen under Bush – and Barky is not even in the White House.

At the end of his detailed indictment of Obama, Sinclair demanded information on four points. The first involves Obama as phone records for November 3, 1999 through November 8, 1999 — the time frame of the two alleged encounters between Obama and Sinclair, mediated, Sinclair said, by Paramjit Multani of Five Star Limo at O'Hare Airport. The second involves Obama's phone records for September 2007 — December 23, 2007, when Sinclair was receiving probing phone calls from Donald Young about how much Sinclair had revealed concerning Obama — calls that

ended when Young was found dead from multiple gunshot wounds just before Christmas 2007. Sinclair's third demand for clarification touches communications from Obama, Axelrod, and campaign manager David Plouffe to Whitehouse.com in January and February 2008. Sinclair's fourth point regards possible payments by Obama, Obama's campaign, Axelrod, Plouffe, and Axelrod's AKP Message and Media to Whitehouse.com in that same time frame of January-February 2008.

OBAMA MUST ANSWER, NOT EVADE

It was up to Obama to answer these charges. It was imperative that this be done promptly, without further delay, before the Democratic Convention. No responsible citizen wants a president who can be blackmailed and thus turned into a puppet because he is hiding secrets about bisexual activities, crack cocaine, political murder, and character assassination campaigns. It was also up to the great news organizations, including ABC, CBS, NBC, *The New York Times*, and the *Washington Post*, to carry out their responsibility to the public. These news organizations could not play the role of kept courtesans of those in political power. As Sinclair pointed out, he had told his story and had thus done everything he could. It was up to the great media concerns to locate and interview the limo driver Paramjit Multani, to investigate the relevant telephone records, and above all to question Obama himself about this very serious matter. It was not the role of the corporate media to sit back and sniff about whether Sinclair had conclusively proven his own case to their satisfaction or not; the proving or disproving is the responsibility of the media, and let them make damn sure that they get it right.

By today's journalistic standards, Sinclair's allegations were extraordinarily substantive already, especially when compared with some other major scandal allegations heard during the primaries. Sinclair had filed a federal civil suit against Obama and Axelrod, complete with sworn affidavits and court papers. This meant that he was willingly risking rule 11 penalties for filing a frivolous lawsuit. He had also made statements to the Chicago police about his contacts with murder victim Donald Young. These steps represented a very high degree of public commitment by Sinclair to the truth of what he is saying. Compare this to the shoddy standards of the *New York Times* which, on February 21, 2008 published and prominently displayed on its front page an innuendo about a supposed sex affair between Senator McCain and a certain Vicki Iseman, a Washington lobbyist. Not one single solitary named source was cited to support this innuendo. Or, take the case of *Vanity Fair* magazine, the house organ of decadent left liberalism, which included a slander piece against President Clinton entitled "The Comeback Id" by Todd Purdum in its July 2008 issue. Here again, there was not one single named source who was willing to have his or her name publicly associated with Purdum's sleazy allegations. It was painfully obvious that there is one set of journalistic standards for the Perfect Master Obama, and another and much laxer set for the competition. This was intolerable.

NO SECRETS FOR THOSE WHO WANT TO ACCESS THE NUCLEAR BUTTON

It is fair to say that the idea of a private sphere for US presidential candidates about which the general public is not entitled to know anything became obsolete at the same time that intercontinental ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads became available around 1960 to 1965. Since then, every presidential candidate has in effect appeared before the public asking to get his or her hands on the thermonuclear button that can start World War III. At this point, the notion of a private sphere for presidential candidates becomes wholly untenable. In this day and age, we have

the right to know everything but everything about presidential nominees who are asking for our votes. We have a right to know their full personal histories, with no exceptions, no omissions, and no withheld documents. We have a right to know if they are HIV-positive and whether they ever registered for the draft. We want to know if they have received electroshock, psychopharmaca, and whether they have been treated by a psychiatrist. We have a right to see their birth certificate, their college transcript, their senior thesis if they wrote one, their law school transcript, their passport, papers from earlier times in public office, and all other relevant documents. We have a right to know about their mother, their father, their sister, their brother, their Aunt Tilly, their best friends at all stages of life, their boyfriends, their girlfriends, their pets, their backers, their sponsors, their gurus, their controllers, and their associates of every kind. We want to know what religions they have professed or not professed. More than a right to know these things, we have an imperative duty to find them out. For they are asking to get their hands on the thermonuclear button, the misuse of which can unleash a thermonuclear fireball that will not respect any aspect of the privacy of ourselves and our family. Naturally, candidates are free to make their own choices in life just like everybody else: they can choose their religion, their personal associations, their forms of recreation, and all the rest in any way that they like. But none of this — absolutely nothing — can be claimed as a secret off limits to the attention of the public. All of it must be thoroughly investigated, aired, and published when the presidency is at stake. An Air Force crewman at a missile silo in the Dakotas goes through a background check which leaves scant room for privacy. We must demand nothing less from presidential candidates.

OBAMA'S COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT AND ALLEGED COCAINE USE

Larry Sinclair alleges that Obama has indulged in crack cocaine. Those familiar with the public literature about the current tenant of the White House know very well that there are many indications that his extraordinarily low level of performance may derive from cognitive impairment brought on by habitual cocaine use. How many more coke fiends in the White House are compatible with the further national survival of the United States? Ronald Reagan notoriously suffered from cognitive impairment and constantly made his remarks off index cards which he kept hidden in his hands. Those index cards were a low-tech version of the glass plates of the Teleprompter upon which Obama relies. As soon as he cannot read his words off those glass plates, Obama begins to stutter, to stammer and babble, to hem and to haw, repeatedly losing his syntax and constantly interjecting "um" and "you know." What if Obama's cocaine use really did not stop in 1981, as he suggests in his memoir, and continued all the way to late 1999 at the very least, as Larry Sinclair has alleged? That might suggest that Obama suffers from greater cognitive impairment than Bush, as Obama's incredible series of gaffes at the end of the primaries also indicates. Larry Sinclair stressed during his press conference that he has been a gay man all his life, and that he regarded the crack cocaine issue as the central one, at least until the time of the Donald Young murder. During the press conference, Sinclair announced that he was willing to make his own personal medical records, including mental health records, available to responsible representatives of accredited news organizations, at their own expense. That means that Sinclair is much more forthcoming about his medical history than Obama, who has withheld his medical records and offered a single meaningless page of advertising copy signed by his personal physician. And remember that Sinclair was not running for any office, while Obama wants to be president. In the meantime, Larry Sinclair was still the target of frame-up operations, threats, and harassment. What kind of a presidential campaign would we have when critics of the most radical subversive to ever get this close to the presidency have to worry about a knock on the door in the middle of the

night? There was a rising demand that the Obama campaign drop their enemies' list operation against Larry Sinclair, release him from jail at once, and halt their vendetta against him.

SIGNS OF OBAMA'S MENTAL DISINTEGRATION: THE GAFFES

The right-wing commentator Michelle Malkin called attention to Obama's unprecedented string of public gaffes: for Malkin, Obama was 'a perpetual gaffe machine. Let us count the ways, large and small, that his tongue has betrayed him throughout the campaign: Last May, he claimed that Kansas tornadoes killed a whopping 10,000 people: "In case you missed it, this week, there was a tragedy in Kansas. Ten thousand people died — an entire town destroyed." The actual death toll: 12. Earlier this month in Oregon, he redrew the map of the United States: "Over the last 15 months, we've traveled to every corner of the United States. I've now been in 57 states? I think one left to go." Last week, in front of a roaring Sioux Falls, South Dakota audience, Obama exulted: "Thank you Sioux City…I said it wrong. I've been in Iowa for too long. I'm sorry." Explaining last week why he was trailing Hillary Clinton in Kentucky, Obama again botched basic geography: "Sen. Clinton, I think, is much better known, coming from a nearby state of Arkansas. So it's not surprising that she would have an advantage in some of those states in the middle." On what map is Arkansas closer to Kentucky than Illinois? Obama has as much trouble with numbers as he has with maps. Last March, on the anniversary of the Bloody Sunday march in Selma, Alabama, he claimed his parents united as a direct result of the civil rights movement: "There was something stirring across the country because of what happened in Selma, Alabama, because some folks are willing to march across a bridge. So they got together and Barack Obama Jr. was born." Obama was born in 1961. The Selma march took place in 1965. His spokesman, Bill Burton, later explained that Obama was "speaking metaphorically about the civil rights movement as a whole."

Earlier this month in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, Obama showed off his knowledge of the war in Afghanistan by honing in on a lack of translators: "We only have a certain number of them and if they are all in Iraq, then it's harder for us to use them in Afghanistan." The real reason it's "harder for us to use them" in Afghanistan: Iraqis speak Arabic or Kurdish. The Afghanis speak Pashto, Farsi, or other non-Arabic languages. Over the weekend in Oregon, Obama pleaded ignorance of the decades-old, multi-billion-dollar massive Hanford nuclear waste clean-up: "Here's something that you will rarely hear from a politician, and that is that I'm not familiar with the Hanford, uuuuhh, site, so I don't know exactly what's going on there. (Applause.) Now, having said that, I promise you I'll learn about it by the time I leave here on the ride back to the airport." I assume on that ride, a staffer reminded him that he's voted on at least one defense authorization bill that addressed the "costs, schedules, and technical issues" dealing with the nation's most contaminated nuclear waste site.'[185] Obama first said Iran was a tiny country that did not pose a threat, then that it was not a threat a few days later – a very ominous and light-headed performance.

When Obama was in Sunrise, Florida, he thought he was in Sunshine, Florida: "How's it going, Sunshine? Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you everybody. It's good to be in Sunshine!" Obama declared on taking the stage this afternoon for a rally at the BankAtlantic Arena in Broward County, Fla., just west of Ft. Lauderdale.[186] On Memorial Day 2008, Obama intoned: "As our nation honors its unbroken line of fallen heroes — and I see many of them in the audience here today — our sense of patriotism is particularly strong. (New Mexico, Memorial Day 2008) Obama also boasted that his grandmother's brother, Charlie Payne, helped liberate a Buchenwald sub-camp in April 1945 as part of the 89th Infantry Division. But it was the Soviet Red Army that freed the inmates of Auschwitz.[187] None of this made any impact on the swooners of the controlled corporate media. Arch-oligarch David Broder, for example, continued to write hogwash like this about

Barky's "innocents abroad" world blitz: "…as millions of Americans who watched the primary campaign learned, Obama is invariably articulate. There would be no verbal gaffes."[188] Invariably articulate? No gaffes? Obama's Teleprompter dependency and gaffes, like Carter's infamous "fuzziness," had already emerged as a major campaign issue. Without the glass plates of the Teleprompter, Obama hemmed and hawed, or virtually babbled in delirium. What planet was Broder living on? This column posed the question of mental impairment not just for Obama, but for Broder as well.

OBAMA'S MENTAL DEBILITY: IMPLICATIONS OF NEW MARIJUANA RESEARCH

By a happy coincidence, new evidence of the relation between marijuana use and mental impairment came to light late in the primary season. Given Obama's confession of heavy marijuana use, these considerations are highly relevant to his qualifications for the presidency: 'Long-term heavy use of marijuana may cause two important brain structures to shrink, Australian researchers [have found]. Brain scans showed the hippocampus and amygdala were smaller in men who were heavy marijuana users compared to nonusers, the researchers said. The men had smoked at least five marijuana cigarettes daily for on average 20 years. The hippocampus regulates memory and emotion, while the amygdala plays a critical role in fear and aggression. The study, published in the American Medical Association's journal *Archives of General Psychiatry*, also found the heavy cannabis users earned lower scores than the nonusers in a verbal learning task — trying to recall a list of 15 words. The marijuana users were more likely to exhibit mild signs of psychotic disorders, but not enough to be formally diagnosed with any such disorder, the researchers said. "These findings challenge the widespread perception of cannabis as having limited or no harmful effects on (the) brain and behavior," said Murat Yucel of ORYGEN Research Centre and the University of Melbourne, who led the study.' (Will Dunham, "Heavy marijuana use shrinks brain parts: study," AP, June 2, 2008) Reporters who get to question Obama should ask him how his hippocampus and amygdale are doing these days. Not well, we fear.

THE ROLL CALL OF THE STATES DECIDES THE NOMINEE – NOT DEAN

It was unthinkable that any responsible political leader would be willing to see Obama receive the nomination while the sword of Damocles of further scandals hung over his head. Larry Sinclair's videotape had been on the Internet since mid-January, and it had at various times been the object of discussion on something approaching a million websites. The issues are Obama's crack cocaine use, his bisexuality, his possible involvement in the Donald Young assassination, and the allegations of character assassination and harassment against Sinclair funded by the Obama campaign. There was also the matter of the Michelle Obama "hate whitey" tape. Karl Rove knew all about each one of these points, and there was no way to deter Karl Rove and his cohorts. So, although it might have incomprehensible to Obama's drooling acolytes, the interest of the Democratic Party was best served by thorough airing of these allegations to before the roll call of the states is held on August 27, 2008 — and this was exactly what Sinclair had been trying to do since mid-January. If Sinclair had been a GOP deployment, he would simply have waited for September or October to come forward.

There were of course those who lamented and regretted that it was necessary to dredge up the sordid details of a figure like Obama. They suggested that it was better to use political campaigns to talk about issues. This might sound plausible, but it is totally wrong, and the fault rests with

Obama. First, Obama does not campaign on issues in any systematic way. He presents himself as the Perfect Master, the Anointed One, the Savior, the Messiah, the Mahdi. His hysterical followers are obsessed, not with a political program or a set of issues, but with the personality cult of Obama. This means that any attempt to engage Obama on the issues is by definition an impotent and self-defeating tactic. The only useful objections that can be made to Obama are *ad hominem* biographical revelations designed to show that he is not so anointed after all, and that his ability to walk on water has been overestimated. Then there is also the matter of Obama's notorious duplicity and flip-flops even where he does have specific positions on certain issues. First Obama wanted a fixed schedule for getting out of Iraq, but Samantha Power revealed that this was not the case at all. Barky said he wanted a different kind of foreign policy, and then he pandered to AIPAC, probably lying through his teeth in the process. First Obama wanted to help the lower income brackets, but now he is talking about cutting the corporate income tax. Obama attacked free trade in Ohio and Pennsylvania, even as his top economic controller, Austan Goolsbee of the Friedmanite Chicago School reassured the Canadians that this was just election posturing; now Obama told *Fortune* magazine that he likes free trade and is devoted to "free markets."[189] First Obama was going to be tough on FISA; now he went going along with the Democratic congressional leaders as they attempt to appease Bush. Obama had built his career on ethics in government and reducing the role of political contributions; now he turned his back on the only meager legislative achievements by becoming the first presidential candidate in modern times to repudiate matching funds in the general election. Most dramatic was Obama's about face on Iraq, where he was now signaling an open-ended commitment. On all these points, to attempt a substantive debate with Obama is a fool's errand. The only way to pin Barky down was through pointed reference to crucial facts in his own background, biography, and associations which cannot be changed or swept under the rug. Any other approach was deliberate impotence and capitulation.

DEAN-BRAZILE MINORITY COUP SPLITS DEMOCRATS

On May 31, 2008 the Rules Committee of the Democratic National Committee took a giant step on the road to political suicide. Their decision to cut in half the voting strength of the Florida and Michigan delegations effectively disenfranchised the voters of these two vital and indispensable states, and reduced them to second-class citizenship. Even the infamous three-fifths compromise embodied in the US Constitution of 1787 treated a slave better than the Democratic National Committee was treating the voters of Florida and Michigan. Without these two states, any Democratic ticket was doomed to defeat in the November election. The Democratic Party does not exist for the primary purpose of obeying its own rules; it exists for the purpose of winning elections, and the goal of such winning is that the interests of the people may be served and defended. This basic truth of equity had now been trampled on by the Dean-Brazile-Obama Wall Street puppets.

Howard Dean, Donna Brazile, and their retainers argued that they owe it to black voters and to fervent youthful idealists to make sure that Obama gets the nomination. In reality, the Democratic National Committee has proven over and over again that it does not care a damn about black voters, nor about young voters either. Dean and Brazile get their orders from Wall Street bankers like Rockefeller and Soros and their associated think tanks, and it is these Wall Street interests that are demanding Obama be nominated to carry out a program of draconian domestic economic austerity and a final confrontation with Russia and China, as prescribed by the Brzezinski Plan. By their actions, Dean, Brazile, and the Obama campaign had already split the Democratic Party. It is they who had to assume the historical responsibility for the impending scission. If you exclude half of

Michigan and half of Florida, you have already split the party, and this is what the Obama camp had done.

Obama's candidacy was already beset by at least five distinct orders of scandal. First was the fact that he was the product of a nest of racist foundation-funded provocateurs associated with Reverend Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ, with the renegade theolib priest Father Pfleger being merely the latest in the series of these racist hate mongers to come to the attention of the public. Second was the fact that Obama was a product of a nest of Weatherman terrorists, including Obama's close friends Bill Ayers and Bernardine Dohrn, who have sponsored his career at a number of critical points. Third is the fact that Obama was sunk up to his eyeballs in a cesspool of corruption and graft associated with the Daley-Blagojevich Cook County Democratic machine and ongoing criminal conspiracy known as the Illinois bipartisan Combine, which features the Levantine gangsters Antoin Rezko, Nadhi Auchi, and former Iraqi Electricity Minister Aiham Alsammarae. Fourth was a complex of scandals involving murder, cocaine, and illicit sex, associated with the names of Larry Sinclair and of Donald Young, the gay choirmaster of Wright's church who was found murdered last Christmas morning. Fifth were the relations between the Obama campaign and terrorist patsy groups in the Middle East. The relations of Robert Malley with Hamas have already led Obama to dump Malley. The next phase may well involve the sponsorship in Washington of Ilyas Achmadov, the envoy of the murderous Chechen terrorist organization, by Obama's top controller and guru, Zbigniew Brzezinski. These five echelons of scandal meant that Obama was out of the question as a viable candidate of the Democratic Party.

According to a Rasmussen poll, about one third of Democrats and one half of Clinton supporters wanted Senator Clinton to be on the November ballot without regard to what the Democratic bosses might decree. These results were gathered in a situation when this option was totally taboo for the controlled corporate media. With some elementary mass political education, these numbers would rise considerably overnight. What was needed was the certain trumpet.[190]

FISA BETRAYAL WAS PREDICTABLE – WATCH THE HANDLERS

Some were surprised when Obama betrayed the pathetic faith of his duped supporters and broke his solemn promise to filibuster the new FISA law if it contained automatic immunity for telecom companies who had broken the law at the urging of the Bush-Cheney police state operators. There should have been no surprise: on this issue as on others, it is generally enough to look at who Obama's handlers and controllers are to see how he will come down in the end. In this case, the top issue controller was John Brennan, who had told *National Journal*: "I do believe strongly that [telecoms] should be granted that immunity," former CIA official John Brennan told National Journal reporter Shane Harris in the interview. "They were told to [cooperate] by the appropriate authorities that were operating in a legal context." Before leaving government to join the private sector, Brennan had been the head of the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC), a joint office operated by the CIA, FBI and other government agencies. At the time Brennan said this, his remarks were in direct conflict with the line that Barky was still spouting on the stump. In a serious campaign, Brennan would have been fired for bucking the party line. But within a few weeks, the stump speeches were forgotten and the orders from the handlers and controllers, in this case Brennan, prevailed. (Justin Rood, ABC News) We can use this method to repeat the firm prediction that Obama will attempt to privatize Social Security, based on the past track record of advisers like Jason Furman, Jeffrey Liebman, and Austan Goolsbee in that regard. Another case was that of the infamous genocide procuress Samantha Power, who had blurted out before Ohio that Obama's stump remarks on the timetable for Iraqi pullout were meaningless hot air, and that Obama would in

effect do whatever he wanted about Iraq. Samantha Power's remarks came true in early July, releasing a shock wave that might doom the Obama candidacy in its entirety. There was also NAFTA: Obama said he was critical, but Austan Goolsbee told Canadian officials that Barky was a free trader, and Goolsbee had been right, as Obama's *Fortune* interview showed.

OBAMA'S SHIFT TOWARDS ENDLESS WAR IN IRAQ

On July 3, Barack Obama revealed once and for all that he is an imposter and a con artist. From the very beginning, the foundation of Obama's campaign and his claim to possess superior strategic and moral judgment had been his claim to oppose Bush's Iraq war. In a North Dakota campaign event, Obama declared that he would consult with the generals and "refine his position" on the Iraq war. The *Washington Post* headlined: "Obama May Consider Slowing Iraq Withdrawal." But the real message was clear: Obama was moving rapidly away from his earlier 11-month or 16-month timetables for withdrawal and towards full support for endless war, endless bloodbath, and endless bankruptcy in Iraq. Samantha Power had confessed Obama's doubletalk on Iraq months ago. The handwriting was now on the wall: Obama would soon go to Iraq, meet with General Petraeus, and then announce his Baghdad road conversion to a policy of open-ended military occupation, oblivious to the immense human costs. Soon there would be no difference at all between Obama and McCain on the Iraq war, and the Democratic Party would have missed yet another historic opportunity to help the American people end Bush's and Cheney's failed criminal adventure. McCain gloated that Obama's flip-flop proved he had no principles, only opportunism and expediency, and that his much-touted soaring words meant precisely nothing. Democrats now had their last chance to reflect: did they really want to give their nomination to a little-known newcomer who had posed as a peace advocate, and had now unmasked as a warmonger and candidate for Bush's third term?

OBAMA'S BETRAYAL OF DEMOCRATS ON FISA, NAFTA, CAMPAIGN FINANCE, THE DEATH PENALTY AND MUCH MORE

From the instant that he felt that the Democratic nomination was in his hands, Obama moved relentlessly to the right in a breathtaking, stunning exhibition of cynicism and duplicity. Everything he was supposed to stand for was thrown overboard, and Obama's contempt for his own voters was now center stage. Obama had promised to stop Bush's assault on the Constitution and civil liberties, and end illegal wiretapping. Now, Obama voted for the rotten compromise on the FISA bill, including immunity for the telecoms – something he had vowed to filibuster. Obama had promised clean government and less corruption, but he broke his promise by opting out of public financing for his fall campaign, junking the cause of political reform he had claimed to champion. In Ohio and Pennsylvania, Obama posed as a critic of free trade sellouts like NAFTA, CAFTA, and WTO, but he now told *Fortune* magazine that he was a great friend of free trade. Obama now openly supported the death penalty, more of Bush's faith-based boondoggles, and the "merit pay" assault on teachers. He wanted to cut the corporate income tax, and opposed attempts to curb hand gun violence. His current team of economic advisers guaranteed that he would eventually come out for the partial privatization of Social Security camouflaged as "entitlement reform." In short, Obama intended to betray not just his own basic commitments, but the historical foundations of the Democratic Party going back to Franklin D. Roosevelt. All that remained to complete this panorama of betrayal was the choice of a Vice President: it was clear that Obama would reject Senator Clinton, the greatest primary vote getter in the history of the Democratic Party, and the candidate

who had won the popular vote in 2008. Instead, he was likely to choose a Republican – a Bloomberg, a Hagel, or a Lugar, putting a Republican just a heartbeat away from the presidency.

SLIPPERY, FLIP-FLOPPING WARMONGER OBAMA NOT A VIABLE CANDIDATE

If Obama imitated McCain on so many issues, the November election would come down to a choice between two individuals, and a shifty, slippery, flip-flopping Obama will not fare well against the war hero McCain and his carefully cultivated reputation as a straight shooter. McCain would point out that voters cannot trust the flip-flopper Obama, and on that McCain would be right. Fortunately, Obama has tipped his hand and dropped the mask too soon: there was no Democratic nominee until the Roll Call of the States on August 27, 2008 in Denver.

PUMA DEMOCRATS MOBILIZE AGAINST OBAMA

During June 2008, the Democratic Party split. There emerged a coherent movement of opposition to Obama and to the postmodern fascism he represented. These were the PUMA Democrats, who first emerged on May 31 when Soros' man Howard Dean had cut the Florida and Michigan delegations in half on the basis of his Wall Street doubletalk. PUMAs were suddenly all over cable television threatening to vote for McCain, but it was clear that what they really wanted was to prod Senator Clinton to come back into the race. They said they were not calling for some futile and self-defeating gesture, but rather pointing to the path that lead to victory in November. The preconditions for a Clinton resurgence were an open convention not subject to the totalitarian control of discredited and hated figures like Dean, Brazile, and the other machine bosses and hacks. Then, there had to be the chance to vote through a formal Roll Call of the States, the centerpiece of every American convention since time immemorial. But Dean and Brazile were already attempting to cancel the Roll Call of the States, and orchestrate a convention of mindless Obama hoopla, preventing even platform debate. Obama was demanding that he give his acceptance speech in the Denver ball park, and was trying to schedule a speech before the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin on his upcoming trip to Germany so he could posture as the new Kennedy.

175 PATRIOTS COULD STOP OBAMA ON THE FIRST BALLOT IN AN OPEN CONVENTION

At this point, the fate of the United States appeared to depend on a minimum of 175 delegates to the Denver convention willing to exercise their mature political judgment in the service of their country, and turn away from Obama to support Senator Clinton. By most accounts, Obama had about 2229.5 delegate votes, with 1766.5 pledged delegates and 463 superdelegates. Clinton had 1896.5 delegate votes, with 1639.5 pledged and 257 super delegates. Shift just 350 delegates from Obama to Clinton, and Obama's power grab would grind to a halt. After that, there would be the opportunity to deliberate and choose a competent candidate. Lexington and Concord were started by a few dozen farmers. Did the Democratic Party still have 175 patriots with the courage to take a stand? By July 2008, the PUMAs held the key to the situation.

New motivation for these efforts came from the polls, which suggested at the end of July 2008 that Obama remained a likely loser for the Democrats in a contested election against McCain. A *USA Today*/Gallup poll of likely voters showed McCain now ahead 49%-45%. Adam Nagourney of the *New York Times* posed the question of "Where's the Bounce" for Obama: 'It is a question that

has hovered over Senator Barack Obama even as he has passed milestone after milestone in his race for the White House: Why is he not doing better? …"They've known John McCain for years," Bill McInturff, a pollster for Mr. McCain, said of survey participants. "But people say in focus groups, 'Who the heck is Barack Obama? Had you heard of him before six months ago?' And he's 46 years old. He's somebody nobody knows about." … Mr. McCain is "running ahead of where he should be based on the environment," Mr. McInturff said. … Even Mr. Obama's advisers say they are uneasy about his difficulty so far in breaking the 50 percent barrier — a reminder, in poll after poll, that there many Americans who are not yet ready to cast their lot with him, and may never be.'[191] Nagourney was widely vituperated by Obama's nutroots Myrmidons. Taylor Marsh, by now firmly in the Obama camp, commented: 'See, for those who haven't been paying attention, American voters don't cheer for the champ or the smarty pants who *seems* full of himself, no matter how right, no matter how good the policies he's pushing. The do-gooder who can do no wrong. See Gore 2000, or Kerry.'[192] There was still time for Democrats to dump Obama.

CHAPTER X: OBAMA: A LOOMING WORLD TRAGEDY

> Brzezinski is "someone I have learned an immense amount from," and "one of our most outstanding scholars and thinkers". – Obama, 2007.
>
> "I'm not opposed to all wars." – Obama, 2002
>
> "Where did you get a public opinion that we should fully disarm and then, according to some theoreticians, such as Brzezinski, divide our territory into three or four states? If there is such a public opinion, I would disagree with it." –Russian President Vladimir Putin, June 4, 2007.

My book *Obama - The Postmodern Coup: The Making of a Manchurian Candidate* grew out of the realization on the weekend between the Iowa caucus and the New Hampshire primary that the Obama bandwagon was not a normal political campaign, but rather an application of the methods of the neo-imperialist and neo-liberal people power coup/color revolution (as we had seen them in Ukraine, Georgia, Lebanon, etc.) brought home to the United States. It was a postmodern coup under the cover of an election. A little digging showed that Obama's handlers and controllers – Zbigniew Brzezinski, Mark Brzezinski, Joseph Nye, Austan Goolsbee – represent the core of the Trilateral Commission-Bilderberger group, closely associated with the Rockefeller interests. Some of these people, especially Zbig and Paul Volcker, are the handlers who directed the catastrophic Carter Trilateral presidency thirty years ago.

LAKE AND DAALDER:
THE CONCERT OF OLIGARCHIES TO RULE THE WORLD

Another Obama handler and controller is Anthony Lake, a veteran Democratic Party foreign policy hack. Lake was Clinton's first NSC Director starting back in 1993, and he did not last long. One of Clinton's very good initial ideas was to appoint a US Special Ambassador to do something about ending the brutal British occupation of Northern Ireland. This had indeed been one of Clinton's popular promises on the campaign trail. Once they were in the White House, Lake told Clinton that such an envoy would be seen by the lordly British as an affront, since their line was that Northern Ireland was purely an internal affair of the United Kingdom. Therefore, Lake argued successfully, the special US envoy was out of the question, and the whole idea had to be dropped. Clinton caved in. In 1993, it was the ultra-imperialist British who were doing the human rights violations, so any intervention was unthinkable. Today, Brzezinski & Co. are eager to launch a whole series of interventions and invasions under left cover, human rights cover, and humanitarian cover against targets like Sudan, Burma, and China, including via Tibet. Under these conditions, Lake the Snake, as he was known by his opponents in the Clinton NSC, has become a true powerhouse of fervor for humanitarian interventions, utterly unlike the cautious fellow we saw back in 1993.

A May 19, 2008 op-ed by *Washington Post* deputy editorial page editor Jackson Diehl touted the efforts of Obama handlers Anthony Lake and Ivo Daalder to establish a "Concert of Democracies," to sanction military invasions of countries in Africa and Asia, generally using left, human rights cover. The "Concert of Democracies" hearkens back to the Castelreagh-Canning system of British imperial domination of Europe after the Napoleonic Wars. At that time, any state which threw off the oppressive yoke of the Quadruple Alliance could become the target of counter-revolutionary intervention by the British and their continental junior partners, headed by Prince Metternich of the Austrian Empire. Revolutionary states were deemed rogue states, in today's parlance, and they were

considered fair game for outside invasion. Such a system was naturally unworkable and dissolved in revolutionary chaos in 1848 – a chaos fomented by the British themselves in many cases. A similar idea was put forward in 1938 under the rubric of the "League of Democracies" as advocated by the US Anglophile financier Clarence Streit, who was Felix Rohatyn's father in law. There was also the Community of Democracies, a gaggle of US-UK satellites created under Clinton by Madeline Albright and Morton Halperin, Soros' man in Washington. But now, in 2008, the long-standing Anglo-American world domination was reaching the end of the line. Hence the desperation of crackpot plans like those embraced by Lake the Snake. Experience shows that, if Obama's handlers demand it, Barky will do it sooner or later.

Lake and his sidekick Ivo Daalder, also an Obama controller, have been working closely of late with the head of the neocon wing of the US ruling class, George P. Shultz, the man who picked Bush, picked Cheney, picked the neocon Vulcans, and then went on to pick Arnold Schwarzenegger to be Governor of California. The convergence between the center-left imperialists like Lake and the neocons like Shultz is the practical content of the "bi-partisanship" that Obama is always babbling about. This convergence is based on the very sober estimate that the Anglo-American empire is in a heap of trouble, and that further open divisions in the ruling class could well open the way to a popular movement for real reform. Therefore, the two wings of the ruling class, the Shultz-Rupert Murdoch-Warren Buffet neocons and the James Baker-Robert Rubin-Soros-Rohatyn wing have an urgent need to come together, to crush domestic opposition, and finally to take down the real centers of opposition, Moscow and Beijing.

THE SLAUGHTER PLAN

Daalder and Lake serve as honorary co-chairs of the Princeton Project on National Security, which came out, in the fall of 2006, for an Anglo-American-led Concert of Democracies to carry out preventive and preemptive wars of regime change around the world, outside the United Nations Charter.[193] Daalder, a fellow at the Brookings Institution, has collaborated top neocon Robert Kagan (an informal advisor to John McCain) to promote the aggressive interventionism inherent in this lunatic plan for a Concert of Democracies. The Princeton Project on National Security proposal for a Concert of Democracies was included in the project's final report by G. John Ikenberry and Woodrow Wilson School Anne-Marie Slaughter (*nomen est omen*, her name is her program), who is billed as a likely recipient of a plum job in a future Obama regime. (Imagine the headlines: Obama Proposes New World Order Based on Slaughter Plan!") The Slaughter Plan may have confidential protocols that represent the detailed program for an Obama regime, in the same way that the 1980s Project of the Council on Foreign Relations represented the script for the Carter administration.[194]

THE "ROGUE BLOC" – RUSSIA AND CHINA

The Concert of Democracies scheme was discussed by Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay, who argued in an article in *The American Interest* that it could encompass up to 60 nations, including 28 of the 30 largest economies. Bush the elder and Bush the younger carried out their imperialist adventures using what they called coalitions of the willing – ad hoc groups of states which could be cajoled, bribed, threatened, or coerced into joining in, usually with token contingents, on the side of the US-UK imperialist enforcers. These coalitions of the willing were often mocked as the coalitions of the shilling, since the majority were indeed shills for the Anglo-Americans. Daalder and Lake can see that they will never ram their adventurous plans through the United Nations, where the Shanghai Cooperation Organization powers – Russia and China – are ready to bar their

way with crossed vetoes. At the same time, the old neocon idea of the US, UK, and Israel at war with the rest of the world until the end of time simply will not work, because these powers are far too defeated, discredited, isolated, and bankrupt. Accordingly, the new idea is to institutionalize the coalition of the willing in permanent form, splitting the world into a US-UK "democratic" bloc, which will face off against a "rogue" bloc centered on Russia and China. The precondition to forming this bloc would be an unprecedented level of gullibility and servility on the part of Europe, Japan, and other parts of the planet. Lake, a kind of mini-Brzezinski, has motivated this new version of the Holy Alliance as follows: "One thing is clear," he wrote in the *American Interest*. "Crises in Iran, North Korea, Iraq and Darfur, not to mention the pressing need for more efficient peacekeeping operations, the rising temperatures of our seas and multiple other transnational threats, demonstrate not only the limits of American unilateral power but also the inability of international institutions designed in the middle of the 20th century to cope with the problems of the 21st." As Jackson Diehl comments, "… a post-Cold War and post-George Bush United States will not have the capacity or the legitimacy to unilaterally take on global crises. But working through the United Nations, as Bush himself tried to do for the past several years, is more often than not a recipe for paralysis, because of the resistance of non-democratic states. Take the past few months: China, helped by Russia, has stopped the Security Council from discussing a humanitarian intervention to rescue the 1.5 million Burmese endangered by the criminal neglect of their government following a cyclone. Strong sanctions against Iran for its refusal to freeze its nuclear program have been blocked by Russia. An attempted U.N. intervention in Darfur is failing, largely because of Chinese and Russian refusal to authorize stronger measures against the government of Sudan. Whether Obama or McCain, the next president will take office knowing that he inherits the messes in Darfur, Burma and Iran and also that new crises will erupt during his term. If he is unable to respond — if he, like Bush, ends up watching as tens or hundreds of thousands of people die in a weak or failed state while China and Russia block U.N. action — he will be harshly judged. That's why McCain has smartly begun to talk about his League of Democracies and promised early action to create it. If Obama is wise, he will make Daalder's Concert of Democracies part of his own campaign." (Jackson Diehl, "A 'League' by Other Names," *Washington Post*, May 19, 2008) And if Brzezinski finds this institutional camouflage useful for his apocalyptic confrontation with Russia, China, and their allies, we can be very sure that puppet Obama will comply.

Another prominent foreign policy adviser of the Obama campaign was the abrasive Susan Rice, who had been the Assistant Secretary of State for Africa during the Clinton Administration. Before she drank the Kool-Aid for Obama, Taylor Marsh recalled that 'along with [Anthony] Lake, Dr. Susan Rice is one of the people responsible for the disastrous policy towards Rwanda in the 1990s, for which Bill Clinton deservedly took so much heat and eventually apologized. As for Power, she obviously is simply unprofessional.' Rice attracted attention for her clumsy gaffe during the controversy about Clinton's Texas ad suggesting that Obama was not prepared to react to a 3 a.m. telephone call to the White House announcing a strategic emergency. Rice countered that charge by arguing in effect that both candidates were equally unqualified: "Clinton hasn't had to answer the phone at 3 o'clock in the morning and yet she attacked Barack Obama for not being ready. They're both not ready to have that 3 a.m. phone call." This performance caused Rice to be nominated by a least one blog for the dubious honor of being named the 'worst foreign-policy spokesperson ever." (March 6, 2008)

OBAMA THE APPEASER: FOR ONCE, BUSH WAS RIGHT

In late May, President George Bush gave an address to the Israeli Knesset on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of Israel's independence. We must leave aside the appalling historical mockery of Bush appearing in that place, given that his grandfather Prescott Bush had been one of the principal backers and financiers of the Nazi party and must thus be counted as one of the indispensable supporters of Hitler's seizure of power in January 1933. Those who wish to dig deeper into this background are invited to consult my book, *George Bush: The Unauthorized Biography* (1992), where the full story of Prescott Bush's support for National Socialism is detailed. In the course of his Knesset address, Bush remarked:

> Some seem to believe that we should negotiate with the terrorists and radicals, as if some ingenious argument will persuade them they have been wrong all along. We have heard this foolish delusion before. As Nazi tanks crossed into Poland in 1939, an American senator declared: "Lord, if I could only have talked to Hitler, all this might have been avoided." We have an obligation to call this what it is — the false comfort of appeasement, which has been repeatedly discredited by history. (Applause.)
> (http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2008/05/20080515-1.html)

Obama' handlers, eager to pick a fight with Bush, chose to interpret this remark as aimed specifically against them — hardly a clever move given the obvious liabilities of a young whelp of a senator who notoriously would not know the difference between a rocket propelled grenade and a bong. Even picking a quarrel with Bush was something that Obama had to do in a cowardly and tentative way, initiating the polemics with a carefully worded written statement which accused Bush of launching a "false attack" on the Perfect Master. In the course of several polemical exchanges with Senator McCain, Obama prevaricated, muddied the waters, and shifted his own position several times on this issue.

Apart from these verbal pyrotechnics, it must be recognized that Bush for once was quite correct, although for reasons which he himself could never have fathomed. The foreign policy which Brzezinski and Obama intend to carry out in regard to countries like Syria and Iran is indeed a carbon copy of the so-called appeasement policy followed by British Prime Minister Sir Neville Chamberlain, most notably at the Munich conference of September 1938, where much of Czechoslovakia was awarded to Hitler without any direct consultation of the government in Prague.

THE BRITISH APPEASEMENT POLICY MEANT ACTIVE SUPPORT FOR HITLER

In order to get to the heart of the matter we need to get rid of the term appeasement which is a very weak euphemism invented by British historians to put their own countries leaders in a somewhat better light. The essence of what is called appeasement was a policy of active support for Hitler and the national Socialist regime on the part of the Baldwin and Chamberlain governments of Britain during the 1930s. This support was comprehensive, and included financial assistance to the Nazis by the Bank of England under Lord Montague Norman, the Anglo German naval agreement of 1935, which scrapped the arms limitations imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles and gave German rearmament the official British stamp of approval, plus British approval of the remilitarization of the Rhineland, support for the unification of Germany with Austria, active support for Hitler's grab of Czechoslovakia, and a de facto hands-off policy when it came to Nazi aggression against Poland. The only condition suggested by the British for all this support was this

that Hitler should direct his aggressive intentions eastward in the direction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The essence of this British policy was to play Hitler against Stalin by encouraging Hitler to go east, and to hope to get rid of both of them that way, thereby guaranteeing the British Empire in another century or more of world domination. There was a parallel British policy of appeasement towards Japan, with the goal of embroiling Japan and the United States in the Pacific war for the greater glory of London. The British aristocracy was hysterically convinced that Hitler was a one-way gun who could only fire into the sunrise, never into the sunset. Naturally, this policy was sheer lunacy, and was destined to blow up in the faces of the British sooner rather than later. The center of this policy was notoriously the Astor family and their social circles, known as the Cliveden Set, which was the immediate social milieu inhabited by Sir Neville Chamberlain. Cliveden was a country house frequented on weekends not only by the Prime Minister, but also by Lord Astor and Lady Astor's guests, who included Lord Lothian, Lord Brand, Lord Halifax, the future foreign Secretary, and many more.[195] This is the faction referred to by Carroll Quigley as the Milner group, and they were closely allied to other aristocrats like the Duke of Hamilton, the nobleman whom Rudolf Hess was seeking to visit when he parachuted into Britain a few weeks before the Nazi attack on the Soviets.

All of this is amply documented for those willing to take a look. Carroll Quigley of Georgetown, Bill Clinton's history professor, wrote that the Astor group in question …was known in those days as the Round Table Group, and later came to be called, somewhat inaccurately, the Cliveden Set, after the country estate of Lord and Lady Astor. It included Lord Milner, Leopold Amery, and Edward Grigg (Lord Altrincham), as well as Lord Lothian, Smuts, Lord Astor, Lord Brand (brother in law of Lady Astor and managing director of Lazard Brothers, the international bankers), Lionel Curtis, Geoffrey Dawson (editor of *The Times*), and their associates. The group wielded great influence because it controlled the Rhodes Trust, the Beit Trust, *The Times* of London, *The Observer*,. the influential and highly anonymous quarterly review known as *The Round Table* (founded in 1910 with money supplied by Sir Abe Bailey and the Rhodes Trust, and with Lothian as editor), and it dominated the Royal Institute of International Affairs, called 'Chatham House" (of which Sir Abe Bailey and the Astors were the chief financial supporters, while Lionel Curtis was the actual founder), the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, and All Souls College, Oxford."[196]

The *Daily Express* published a picture of Lady Astor's Cliveden estate under the headline "Mr. Chamberlain spent the week-end here — and why." The article began ominously by noting that "France has her 'Cagoulards,' the hooded men who are supposed to be plotting a Fascist uprising there. And England has her 'Cliveden Set,' who are supposed to be plotting a Fascist regime here. Brrrrr!" wrote the *Daily Express*, which went on to dismiss the whole story as "a first-rate bogey." (*Daily Express*, March 28, 1938)

Cockburn loved to mock the Cliveden group as the "cagloulords" — Astor, Astor, Lothian, Londonderry, Brand, and Halifax. Cockburn's original thesis was that the Astor group viewed Hitler as a "one-way gun" — one which, they hoped, would only fire east towards Moscow. The infamy of Cliveden soon reached the United States. Hedley Donovan informed the readers of the *Washington Post*, under the headline "Empire's New Leaders Friendly to Fascism," that "the energetic Lady Astor occupies a position of great influence in Britain's councils." Donovan told his readers to prepare to read soon in their morning newspapers a news item like the following: "The British government has given its blessing to Hitler's impending annexation of German-speaking Czechoslovakia, it was learned here from a source close to Cliveden." (*Washington Post*, April 3, 1938) The *Minneapolis Journal* noted that "the Tory press have been shouting for years to let Hitler have his own way for central Europe and Russia. (April 3, 1938) The *Philadelphia Record*

described the Cliveden set as having been in existence in its current form for about 20 months, with a policy including an Anglo-German, bargain, British recognition of Franco's Spain, the final dismantling of the collective security features of the League of Nations, and a round of new loans to Germany from bankers — perhaps Brand — who are themselves Cliveden habitués. "The pro-dictator attitude of this clique," this article pointed out, "is the real reason that Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain refuses to tell Parliament and the world at what point England will fight." (*Philadelphia Record*, April 4, 1938) The *New York Times* article on Cliveden was headlined, "Friends of Hitler Strong in Britain," and noted that Chamberlain, more at ease with the pro-German element, had spent Easter with Lord Londonderry, an outspoken pro-German and an important official of the Conservative Party. (The wealthy elitist Lord Londonderry was about to publish his book *Ourselves and Germany*, a plea for Anglo-German rapprochement.). The author, Ferdinand Kuhn Jr., noted "British aristocracy by its very nature is more hostile to communism than to fascism. When men like Londonderry or Viscount Rothermere or Lord Astor have political nightmares the ogre of their imagination is Russia, not Germany. Menace to their wealth, their social position, as they see, it, is the creed of communism, and, in their minds, whatever endangers themselves endangers England." But what of the demagogue Hitler? Kuhn felt that "it is not difficult to see why so many British aristocrats today sympathize with Hitler. They may not approve particularly of his persecution of Catholics or Jews, but they do regard him as a St. George who killed the dragon of communism in Germany and prevented Russia from spreading her creed to Western Europe." (*New York Times*, April 17, 1938)

Lord Halifax of the Cliveden set met with Hitler, and offered cooperation against the USSR. According to a German Foreign Ministry memo on the Hitler-Halifax talks later published by the Soviets (although denied by the British), Halifax stated that Britain regarded Hitler as the chief bulwark against communism in Europe. He hinted that the UK was seeking a four-power combination of Britain, France, Germany, and Italy against Moscow. The Germans further understood from Halifax that Britain was ready to sacrifice Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland to the German sphere of influence if this could be done without war into which the Conservative Cabinet might become embroiled. [197]The British Communist house organ, the *Daily Worker*, revealed the guest book for this meeting of "the pro-Fascist clique that directs the policy of the Chamberlain government," naming the Astors, Lothian, Tom Jones, Neville Chamberlain, Sir Thomas Inskip, Cadogan, Lady Wilson, and Mrs. Tate, the MP from Frome. The *Daily Worker* was especially intrigued by the presence of Lady Ravensdale, the sister-in-law of Sir Oswald Mosely of the British Union of Fascists. The communist organ alleged that Lady Ravensdale's presence had been reported by early editions of Monday's *Evening Standard*, but suppressed in later editions. The *Daily Worker* further alleged that Cliveden was planning peace-time conscription or forced labor, citing Lord Lothian's comments to *The Times* of March 14 in favor of "universal national service." (*Daily Worker*, March 30, 1938)'[198] Compare this to Obama's extremely extensive program of national service discussed above. The British historian A.J.P. Taylor wrote obliquely about the Munich sellout of September 1938, where Czechoslovakia was sacrificed to the British appeasement policy: 'The settlement at Munich was a triumph for British policy, which had worked precisely to this end; not a triumph for Hitler, who had started with no such clear intention. Nor was it merely a triumph for selfish or cynical British statesmen, indifferent to the fate of far-off peoples or calculating that Hitler might be launched into war against Soviet Russia.[199]

But one year after Munich came the Molotov-Ribbentrop or Hitler-Stalin Pact, which meant that the British policy had blown up in the faces of Lady Astor and her crew. Hitler now had a free hand to turn west to crush France and the Low Countries, leading to the British debacle at Dunkirk. This

event also marks the great watershed in Brzezinski's personal life, since with the occupation of Poland by the Nazis and the Soviets his diplomat father, who had been posted to Canada, no longer had a country to represent. The Brzezinski family gravitated into the social world of the eastern European puppet governments in exile set up by the British. It is the twisted mentality of these revanchist aristocratic and British agent circles which lives on in Zbigniew and his clan, including Mark, Ian, Mika, and Matthew Brzezinski today, and which fuels their fanatical hatred of Russia. Josef Korbel, the father of former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and the mentor of Condi Rice, belonged to these same anti-Russian circles. For various reasons, Brzezinski blames these events on Stalin, although he must have some idea of the grave responsibility of the Astor-Chamberlain group.

The Italian historian Gaetano Salvemini concluded that the reverses suffered later on by the British 'were the logical consequences of a basic assumption, i.e. that Hitler, after swallowing Austria and Czechoslovakia, would go and meet his doom in Eastern Europe. If one ignores that assumption, British foreign policy after 1934 becomes a succession of absurd muddles. If one bears it in mind, the policies of the British Tories become clear and consistent.' Salvemini offered this verdict on the bungling geopoliticians of the British leadership: "…on the Conservative Government of Britain falls the responsibility of giving Hitler rope with the idea that he would hang himself. By throwing Central Europe piecemeal to the wolves they thought they were heading Hitler off eastwards to meet his doom in Russia: two birds killed with one stone.[200] The American historian Frederick Schumann concurred, pointing to the British desire to wipe out the Soviet leadership, which resembles the anti-Russian and anti-Chinese plans of the Brzezinski group: "The destruction of the Soviet counter-elite was a constant object of the [British] oligarchy after 1917…The USSR must be isolated. The ties between France and her eastern allies must be broken. France must be immobilized, for any French involvement in the clash to come would, for geographical reasons, entail British involvement — which was precisely what was to be avoided. The immobilization of France required the strengthening of Italy and Germany to a point at which Paris could not challenge them. Hence remilitarization of the Rhineland, threats to French communications in the Mediterranean, and Fascist victory in Spain were all useful devices to supplement British efforts to keep France neutral….In the end the Fascist Triplice [Germany, Italy, and Spain] must attack the USSR….This program could never be openly acknowledged by Tory officialdom because the masses whom the oligarchy ruled (and even some members of the oligarchy itself) had unfortunately been conditioned to respond favorably to such shibboleths as 'indivisible peace,' collective security,' and "League of Nations.'[201] More recent leftist historians have come to a similar conclusion: 'The alternative argument presented here is that those in the [British] ruling group before May 10, 1940 were bloody-minded protectors of privilege whose fixation with destroying communists and communism led them to make common cause with fascists. They were not honest, idiotic patriots; they were liars and traitors who would sacrifice human lives in their defense of property and privilege….Blame for the tragedy of World War II, including the Holocaust, must rest partly with Stanley Baldwin, Neville Chamberlain, Lord Halifax, and their close associates, who, far from being naïve appeasers anxious to avoid wars in Europe, were visceral anti-communists who single-mindedly pursued an alliance with Hitler.'[202] Future historians writing from the rubble of a post-World War III world will doubtless issue some similar indictment of Brzezinski and company for his contorted, contradictory, crackpot scheme to isolate China, and then play China (and Iran) against Russia and get rid of all of them that way, procuring another century of US-UK world domination.

BRZEZINSKI'S WORLD STRATEGY TO SAVE THE EMPIRE

The mental life of Zbigniew Brzezinski, the obsessive revanchist and anti-Russian fanatic who runs so many aspects of the Obama campaign, seems frozen in the amber of 1939. That was the year when this British plan was blown up by the signing of the Hitler Stalin pact, leading to the destruction of Poland and to the Brzezinski family's being marooned in Canada, thus visiting Zbigniew on the United States a few years later. Zbigniew today is determined to use an Obama regime to create a worldwide geopolitical constellation capable of crushing Russia, China, and any other states supporting the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the main pole of resistance to Anglo-American imperialism in today's world. For this purpose, Zbigniew has been busily provoking crises in Eastern Europe, designed to pit the European Union against Moscow. These include the independence of the Serbian province of Kosovo, under the control of an organization known as the KLA, notorious for its involvment in gun running, drug running, terrorism, and slave trading. The independence of Kosovo was designed principally as an affront and provocation to Moscow, and this is also true of Brzezinski's plan for a Polish missile crisis to be occasioned by the installation of alleged US anti-ballistic missiles on the territory of Poland. Many other provocations against Moscow are in the offing but this is only the beginning.

The first main task assigned to Obama is to kick the Chinese out of Africa, where the Chinese have been assiduously courting African states with offers of economic cooperation deals based on parity and equality of economic advantage. These deals have excited the rage of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, whose monopoly has thus been broken; but for Brzezinski the stakes are much higher. Brzezinski's design is to deprive the Chinese of all the oil, natural gas, strategic minerals, and strategic raw materials which they are presently purchasing in Africa. The chosen method is the destabilization and destruction of most African states as a means to forcing the Chinese out. Much of this will be done under the new US African command or Africom, which is about to be created in Ethiopia. Under the Brzezinski policy, Africa will become increasingly a battleground between China and the United States and the result is likely to be a continent in flames, with the levels of genocide against the sub-Saharan populations reaching unprecedented levels. As part of this design the CIA's gaggle of terrorist patsies known as Al Qaeda has surfaced in Algeria (one of the largest oil producers), Tunisia, and Morocco. The Mugabe government in Zimbabwe is being massively destabilized. Obamas own Luo tribe has become a vehicle for the destabilization of Kenya, previously one of the most stable African states, with the option of exporting civil war to other nearby countries where the Luo are also found. Obama's Luo cousin, the demagogue Omega, is implicated in terrorism and ethnic cleansing, but is supported by the State Department anyway. The three largest sub-Saharan African states, Sudan, Nigeria, and South Africa, are all targeted for comprehensive destabilization and Balkanization of their territory into impotent, squabbling petty states incapable of resisting the demands of any multinational oil company. The US, the British, and the Israelis have all been destabilizing Sudan for decades, but today the resulting humanitarian crisis in Darfur province is used by London and Washington as a possible pretext for humanitarian invasion. Naturally, the real goal of such an attack on Sudan would have nothing to do with the situation of Darfur province, and everything to do with cutting off the 7% of China's oil which now comes from Sudan. Left-wing CIA assets are already spreading the line that Chinese economic development in Sudan is committing "ethnocide" by destroying the alleged culture of impoverished villages, which are yearning for a way out of the inferno of the world oil crisis and the world food crisis. Indeed, an attack on Sudan unleashed by Obama would immediately enjoy the active support of many elements of today's so-called peace movement.

SHANGHAI COOPERATION ORGANIZATION TARGETED

Brzezinski's plan to strip China of all of her allies and sources for oil, minerals, and strategic raw materials is not limited to Africa but is to be carried out worldwide. Another country targeted using the same logic is Burma, whose government is allied with Beijing. Gene Sharp and the Albert Einstein Institute would like to use Burma as a staging ground for future destabilization attempts against mainland China itself, using the abundant stocks of fanatical Buddhist monks as cannon fodder. Indeed, this is what they are already doing in Tibet, where the insurrection against Chinese rule has been fomented by the left CIA and its foundations grouped around the national endowment for democracy. Venezuela is another target because it might make a deal with China. The neocon response is to bomb or invade Venezuela, but Brzezinski knows that the US is much too weak, isolated, and bankrupt to try that. He prefers to play Colombia against Venezuela, exploiting President Chavez's ill-advised support for the FARC rebels, the darlings of Richard Grasso, the former head of the New York Stock Exchange. By playing Colombia against Venezuela, both can be destroyed at scant cost to the US, and the oil to China effectively cut off.

Once China had been completely isolated and stripped of allies and economic partners, and also deprived of any foreign sources of oil, vital raw materials, and other strategic commodities, the final stage of Brzezinski's program would go into action. This final stage would be accompanied by vigorous attempts to weaken and destabilize the government in Beijing, attempts which are slated to begin in the summer of 2008 under the cover of the Summer Olympic Games. Brzezinski's endgame would be something resembling a de facto trade blockade of China, with Brzezinski prodding the Chinese to solve their oil shortage by invading Russia and eastern Siberia to seize the oil wells and mines which are located there in a country very sparsely populated by Russians. In other words, the goal of all of Obama's edifying and mellifluous peace rhetoric is nothing less than a cynical and deliberate unleashing of the Third World war, most likely fought out with thermonuclear weapons in the vast spaces of Siberia and Mongolia. Brzezinski imagines that by playing China against Russia in this way, he will be able to secure another century or more of Anglo American imperial world domination. This is the familiar refrain we already heard from Sir Neville Chamberlain, and here again the result will be the same: the plan is destined to blow up in Brzezinski's face, not least because the Russian and Chinese elites are already thoroughly informed of every particular, and have said so in the Russian case.

BRZEZINSKI WANTS TO PLAY IRAN AGAINST RUSSIA

So how does the question of appeasing Iran (and/or Syria) fit into the Brzezinski plan of which Obama is the steward? The answer has been blatantly evident since the final report of the Baker Hamilton Iraq study group was delivered at the end of 2006. That is the organism that recommended that the US urgently negotiate with Iran and Syria, lifting the absurd diplomatic embargo imposed by the fanatical neocons of the Bush regime. As James Baker openly and cynically pointed out at the time, he had successfully recruited Syria to be a member of the US-led coalition of the willing against Iraq in the first Gulf War of 1991. Baker's message was clear enough: I got you Syria then, and I could get you Syria now if given half a chance. Iran, by implication, was also susceptible to being "gotten." But gotten for what? Let us imagine a hypothetical conversation between President Achmadinejad of Iran and the US team of Brzezinski and Obama. The reader must imagine that Obama is seated on Brzezinski's lap in the guise of the ventriloquist's dummy in the posture made famous by such past practitioners as Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy, or Paul Winchell and Jerry Mahoney. It is therefore Brzezinski who is speaking,

even though the words seemed to come out of Obama' mouth. The reader must also imagine a tone of voice used to convey the American offer which is reminiscent of Jack Nicholson as the US president negotiating with the Martian leader in the cinema classic, *Mars Attacks.*

Obama/Brzezinski would speak to the Iranians thus: *"Why should we be enemies and adversaries? Why can't we be friends and cooperate and work together? Between the two of us, we could totally dominate the entire Middle East, and nobody could do anything here without our permission — not the Russians, not the Chinese, not the Indians, not the Pakistanis, not the Egyptians. Just think of it: the United States and Iran working together! Imagine the potential! What do we need to do for you to make it possible? What do we need to give you? Just for openers, we can free up those frozen assets that we have been holding in our banks for the past 30 years — they now add up to hundreds of billions of dollars. We need to have comprehensive diplomatic relations, a cultural exchange program, maybe a mutual nonaggression pact if that is what you would like. Of course we'd take you off that silly old terrorist list! Of course we can make sure that Hezbollah gets what they are entitled to in Lebanon! Of course we can make a whole series of other concessions to your various friends and proxies! But let's get to the really big issues. You want to have nuclear weapons. We can't approve that in public but we are willing to guarantee you right here and right now that we will give you a wink and a nod. If you run into problems along the way, we can help you solve your bottlenecks with the right kind of technology when you need it. Come to think of it, we could deliver a small stock of bombs if that is what you would like. Just like Iran-contra, but better! We have a new missile that we call the Brzezinski special — you fire it off from anywhere in the world and it flies straight to Moscow! We'd be glad to give you some of those right now! You just have to remember that your hereditary enemy has never been the Americans, but the Russians! Think how badly they behaved when they occupied the northern part of your country during World War II — that was really messy! We've never done anything like that, and we don't want to! We just want to be friends and make sure that you're strong enough to stand up against the real threats and all of those come from Moscow. By the way Mr. President, we see that your popularity has been a little anemic lately. But surely you know that the biggest resentment harbored by the Iranian people is their resentment against the Russians. Your Iranians hate those Russians much more than they hate the US and the British! So any time you pick a quarrel with Moscow you can count on pleasing a big majority of your own base! And we can help you to do it. Think of how bad those Russians treated you lately on that Bushehr reactor. They charged you too much in the first place, and then they withheld the parts, blackmailed you, and all the rest — a real humiliation! We would certainly never do that! So what else would you need? How about a nice new naval fleet in the Caspian Sea so you can sail right up to the ports of southern Russia and spit in their eye! With nuclear missiles, of course! Think of all the dandy incidents you could stage that way, poking at that Russian bear with your big Iranian pitchfork! That way you can stop them from stealing your Caspian oil! And if they ever fight back, don't worry — we'll be here to back you up! And then there are those Chinese! Why do you want to sell so much oil to them? Pretty soon you'll be selling them so much that they will have you in their pocket, and you wouldn't want that, would you? You're better off dealing with us, even if it is for dollars. We want you to know that we are honest in the worst way!"*

Thus the siren song of Brzezinski, intent on playing the Islamic fundamentalists of Iran against the Russians in the same way that he once played the Islamic fundamentalists of Afghanistan against the Soviet Union, destroying the latter and its entire world system of alliances. The line towards Syria would be similar, and would sound something like this: *"We are natural allies! We need to be friends! All we need to do is to remove a few little irritants and everything will be hunky-*

dory! Take for example that nasty little naval base that the Russians have on your Mediterranean coast in that little place called Tartus. All you need to do is take them out of there! Then not paying you anything like what that place is worth! Give us that base and we'll pay you triple what the Russians are giving you! We can even get the Israelis to give you back the Golan heights if you're willing to play ball with us! All you need to do is recognize that the Russians have always been the problem and always will be, and the quicker we get them out of the Middle East completely, the better off everybody will be! The same thing goes for those damn Chinese! And look how the North Koreans bungled everything they promised to do for you! Let's go back to those good old days when Henry Kissinger could say, 'God may punish me for it, but I still have a soft spot in my heart for Hafez Assad.'"

ISRAEL DEMOTED: FROM STRATEGIC HUB TO EXPENDABLE ASSET

Much of this is anything but fanciful, and has already been approximated by Trilateral Commission spokesmen in public statements. At about this time, former President Jimmy Carter, Obama's predecessor on the path of Trilateral puppetry, revealed that in his opinion the Israelis had about 150 nuclear weapons. Everyone had long known that the Israelis had three times as many as this, but Carter went on to ask: "What happens if, in three years time, Iran has a nuclear weapon," Mr Carter asked. "I'm not sure that is going to happen, but if it does, what do we do? They are rational people like all of us in this room. Do they want to commit suicide? I would guess not. So what we have to do is talk with them now and say to them we want to be their friends. The United States must let Iran know that we want to give them fuel and everything they need for a non-military nuclear programme. Twenty-five years ago we cut off trading with Iran. We've got to resume trading to show Iran we are friends." (*Independent*, May 26, 2008) Again, quite independent of how much of the strategy Carter personally understands, Brzezinski's goal is not a peaceful settlement of the Middle East, but rather the mobilization of Middle East countries against Russia and China in the framework of the apocalyptic global showdown which he is planning to execute under the aegis of an Obama presidency.

Soon after the appeasement flap began, Brzezinski accused members of the American Jewish establishment of "McCarthyism" in their attitude towards critics of Israel. He called the pro-Israel lobby "too powerful" and accused American supporters of Israel of being too ready to use the slur of "anti-Semitism" against critics of Israel. He stated that AIPAC, the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee has "consistently opposed a two-state solution and a lot of members of Congress have been intimidated and I don't think that is healthy." Brzezinski went on to say: "It's not unique to the Jewish community — but there is a McCarthyite tendency among some people in the Jewish community. They operate not by arguing but by slandering, vilifying, demonizing. They very promptly wheel out anti-Semitism. There is an element of paranoia in this inclination to view any serious attempt at a compromised peace as somehow directed against Israel." Reports noted that Obama has paid tribute to the aging Polish revanchist as "someone I have learned an immense amount from", and "one of our most outstanding scholars and thinkers". Alan Dershowitz of Harvard Law School and others had already called on Obama to dump Brzezinski as a campaign adviser, although of course in reality Zbig had hired Barky, and not the other way around. Zbig had earlier antagonized the Israeli lobby through his support for the work of Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer. This entire incident came shortly after the Obama campaign had dumped Robert Malley and Samantha Power, two thuggish foreign policy operatives with a history of clashing with the Israeli regime. Obama campaign co-chairman and top military adviser Merrill "Bomb Now, Die Later" McPeak complained about the influence of American Jews in the foreign policy debate,

commenting that the problem was not centered in the State Department or the White House, but rather among the Jewish voters of "New York City. Miami. We have a large vote — vote, here in favor of Israel. And no politician wants to run against it." McPeak also claims that a combination of Jews and Christian Zionists are manipulating U.S. policy in Iraq in dangerous and radical ways: "Let's say that one of your abiding concerns is the security of Israel as opposed to a purely American self-interest, then it would make sense to build a dozen or so bases in Iraq. Let's say you are a born-again Christian and you think that Armageddon and the rapture are about to happen any minute and what you want to do is retrace steps you think are laid out in Revelations, then it makes sense. So there are a number of scenarios here that could lead you in this direction. This is radical...." (Ed Lasky, 'Obama Advisor Accuses Jews of "McCarthyism," *American Thinker*.') Maybe, but then again, Brzezinski is crazier than any neocon.

Many of the criticisms leveled by the Obama camp against the Israelis and their US supporters are unquestionably true, but this does not make them any less opportunistic. The main objection against Israeli right-wing extremists of the Netanyahu type is that they are implacably opposed to a general peace settlement for the Middle East, and in this they agree completely with Brzezinski and Obama, who want to use the Middle East as a staging area for confrontation and possible war with Russia and China. The Israelis have acquired quite a few enemies for themselves by their brutal and arrogant behavior during the Bush regime era, but it is always a mistake to let one's outlook be distorted by hatred, and one senses that much of the anti-Israeli rhetoric is of this type. It helps to have some understanding for the subjective predicament of the Israelis themselves. Under Bush, Israel was the unquestioned strategic center of the world, with many exertions of the United States devoted to eliminating present adversaries and future challenges for the Israeli regime. With Brzezinski, by contrast, the Israelis are finding themselves radically demoted from the status of linchpin of the world to that of just another expendable pawn in the Polish revanchist's apocalyptic confrontation with Moscow and Beijing. In this, the Israelis are far from alone: Europe, Africa, the Middle East as a whole, and the United States itself are all seen by Brzezinski as expendable pawns in this apocalyptic struggle with the two capitals of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. It is simply a fact that the Iran which Brzezinski is intent on building up and then launching against Moscow may well surprise the old revanchist by striking out in completely unexpected directions, and Israel could very well be one of them. The Israelis therefore have every right to object vehemently to the new US imperialist line that takes so little account of their survival. Even worse, it is clear that Brzezinski regards Israel, with its 500 to 600 nuclear weapons, and relevant delivery systems, as a possible trump card to be played against the Russians. Naturally, in such a confrontation Israel's lack of geographic depths when measured against the immensity of the Eurasian superpower could well lead to the annihilation of the Israelis. All in all, the new hegemony of Brzezinski over US foreign policy spells nothing but trouble for the Israelis and for the rest of the Middle East.

We must however add that the Israelis need to steer clear of leaders like Netanyahu, and rather embrace the outlines of the Yossi Beilin -Yasser Abed Rabbo Geneva Accords of November 2003, which call for two independent, sovereign and inviolable states, quite possibly separated by cordons of foreign troops, with the demolition of all Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, and the strict abrogation of any Palestinian right to return into the future Israel. Both of these measures need to include substantial compensation for the people involved. What needs to be added to this plan is the idea of a regional Marshall plan for the economic developments and postwar reconstruction of the entire Middle East, including not just Israel and Palestine, but also such devastated areas as Lebanon, Iraq, and Sudan, and the redressing of the pernicious effects of many

years of economic sanctions against Iran and other regional nations. If American Jewish voters can understand this lesson, they can play a critical role in defeating the colossal and reckless adventurism of which Obama is the bearer.

In the midst of the appeasement flap, Zbigniew Brzezinski teamed up with his former NSC assistant William Odom to present the public cloak for the new Iranian policy in the form of a *Washington Post* op-ed. Compare this boilerplate to the real content of the Brzezinski plan as outlined above, and you will come to the unavoidable conclusion that Brzezinski is truly an accomplished liar, far more skillful in the arts of mendacity than a whole brigade of neocons, despite their claims to be the world champions of exoteric falsehood. Brzezinski and Odom write: 'Current U.S. policy toward the regime in Tehran will almost certainly result in an Iran with nuclear weapons. The seemingly clever combination of the use of "sticks" and "carrots," including the frequent official hints of an American military option "remaining on the table," simply intensifies Iran's desire to have its own nuclear arsenal. Alas, such a heavy-handed "sticks" and "carrots" policy may work with donkeys but not with serious countries. The United States would have a better chance of success if the White House abandoned its threats of military action and its calls for regime change. A successful approach to Iran has to accommodate its security interests and ours. Neither a U.S. air attack on Iranian nuclear facilities nor a less effective Israeli one could do more than merely set back Iran's nuclear program. In either case, the United States would be held accountable and would have to pay the price resulting from likely Iranian reactions. These would almost certainly involve destabilizing the Middle East, as well as Afghanistan, and serious efforts to disrupt the flow of oil, at the very least generating a massive increase in its already high cost. The turmoil in the Middle East resulting from a preemptive attack on Iran would hurt America and eventually Israel, too. Given Iran's stated goals — a nuclear power capability but not nuclear weapons, as well as an alleged desire to discuss broader U.S.-Iranian security issues — a realistic policy would exploit this opening to see what it might yield. The United States could indicate that it is prepared to negotiate, either on the basis of no preconditions by either side (though retaining the right to terminate the negotiations if Iran remains unyielding but begins to enrich its uranium beyond levels allowed by the Non-Proliferation Treaty); or to negotiate on the basis of an Iranian willingness to suspend enrichment in return for simultaneous U.S. suspension of major economic and financial sanctions. Such a broader and more flexible approach would increase the prospects of an international arrangement being devised to accommodate Iran's desire for an autonomous nuclear energy program while minimizing the possibility that it could be rapidly transformed into a nuclear weapons program. Moreover, there is no credible reason to assume that the traditional policy of strategic deterrence, which worked so well in U.S. relations with the Soviet Union and with China and which has helped to stabilize India-Pakistan hostility, would not work in the case of Iran. The widely propagated notion of a suicidal Iran detonating its very first nuclear weapon against Israel is more the product of paranoia or demagogy than of serious strategic calculus. It cannot be the basis for U.S. policy, and it should not be for Israel's, either. **An additional longer-range benefit of such a dramatically different diplomatic approach is that it could help bring Iran back into its traditional role of strategic cooperation with the United States in stabilizing the Gulf region.** Eventually, Iran could even return to its long-standing and geopolitically natural pre-1979 policy of cooperative relations with Israel. One should note also in this connection Iranian hostility toward al-Qaeda, lately intensified by al-Qaeda's Web-based campaign urging a U.S.-Iranian war, which could both weaken what al-Qaeda views as Iran's apostate Shiite regime and bog America down in a prolonged regional conflict. Last but not least, consider that American sanctions have been deliberately obstructing Iran's efforts to increase its oil and natural gas outputs. That has contributed to the rising cost of energy. An eventual American-Iranian accommodation

would significantly increase the flow of Iranian energy to the world market. Americans doubtless would prefer to pay less for filling their gas tanks than having to pay much more to finance a wider conflict in the Persian Gulf.' (Zbigniew Brzezinski and William Odom, "A Sensible Path on Iran," *Washington Post*, May 27, 2008, emphasis added) Shortly after this was published, Odom died.

GENERAL WILLIAM ODOM, ZBIG'S NSC ASSISTANT AND OBAMA BACKER

A word about Brzezinski's co-author in the case of this article may be in order. Zbigniew Brzezinski wrote in his memoir, *Power and Principle,* that he had been a sponsor of the career of William Odom starting more than three decades ago. Here is Zbig wrote: "… I wanted on the NSC staff some individuals who shared my broad strategic perspectives, and who could undertake the needed review of our military doctrine, of our basic assumptions about global power, and thus help to define new longer-range goals for the United States. Given the centrality of this undertaking, it was important that the staffers involved share some of my basic assumptions and be congenial to me personally. With this thought in mind, I recruited Colonel William Odom, who later became a general while on the NSC staff, from the US military Academy at West Point. I knew him from an earlier association with me at the research Institute on International Change at Columbia, I respected his views on Soviet military affairs and strategy, and I considered him to be an innovative strategic thinker." (*Power and Principle* [75]) Odom was a ghoulish technocrat of thermonuclear war who later was promoted to be the head of the National Security Agency, the center for electronic espionage. Like many other profoundly reactionary imperialist thinkers, Odom was able to reinvent himself and refurbish himself for a the new Obama era of left cover world strategy à la Carter by the simple expedient of declaring himself opposed to the Iraq war as it has been carried out, and to George Bush personally — both very safe, low risk bets in today's Washington. Predictably, however, Odom became the darling of the left liberal antiwar set who swoon when they think of the respectability to be gained by the fact that General Odom shares some of their most obvious opinions.

BRZEZINSKI TRILATERALS PURGE THE US AIR FORCE

On June 6, 2008 the Trilateral faction flexed its muscles, ousting the top civilian and military personnel of the US Air Force, who were too close to the neocons to be trusted to carry out Brzezinski's orders in the new phase. This extraordinary simultaneous ouster of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Air Force chief of staff, followed by the naming of Trilateral Commissioner and Carter administration veteran James Rodney Schlesinger to purge USAF generals and colonels, dramatically documented the fact that power in Washington DC was no long in the hands of the Bush-Cheney-neocon clique, but had passed to the Brzezinski-Trilateral faction.

PRINCIPALS' COMMITTEE RULES WASHINGTON; BUSH-CHENEY OUT

Defense Secretary Robert Gates announced the firing of Air Force Secretary Michael W. Wynne and Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. T. Michael Moseley, citing the failure of the Air Force to maintain the security of strategic nuclear forces, as shown in the infamous rogue B-52 incident of late August 2007, when a B-52 intercontinental strategic bomber with six nuclear armed cruise missiles, hijacked by the Cheney clique, flew from North Dakota to Louisiana totally outside of the purview of the USAF command control and communications systems. Gates, we recall, had been Brzezinski's office boy at the NSC between 1977 and 1979.Gates also mentioned that four high-tech electrical nosecone fuses for Minuteman nuclear warheads were sent to Taiwan in place of

helicopter batteries, along with other failures. Gates was a leading member of the Principals' Committee, an interagency group which now ran the US government from day to day with scant reference to the discredited outgoing lame ducks Bush and Cheney, who stayed on mainly as figureheads. The Principals' Committee had been in charge of the US government since no later than early May, around the time of the Indiana and North Carolina primaries, when the controlled corporate media began trumpeting that Obama was the winner of the Democratic nomination. The Principals' Committee was made up of Pentagon boss Gates, Secretary of State Rice, NSC director Hadley, Joint Chiefs of Staff head Admiral Mullen, and intelligence czar McConnell, along with a few others. Treasury Secretary Paulson of Goldman Sachs is also probably onboard. Attorney General Michael Mukasey appears to be cooperating as well, as does a majority of the justices on the Supreme Court. These figures are now marching to the tune of Trilateral Commission bigwigs like Zbigniew Brzezinski, Joseph Nye, and the Rockefeller family. These are the same forces who own and control the Wall Street Manchurian candidate Obama. It is notable that the high-profile purge of the USAF came less than 48 hours after Obama had unilaterally proclaimed himself the Democratic presidential nominee. The Principals' Committee rules in the name of a pan-oligarchical consensus.

The rogue B-52 flew with six nuclear cruise missiles from Minot AFB North Dakota to Barksdale AFB Louisiana on August 30, 2007. Source reports published by Wayne Madsen suggest that the B-52 was stopped by patriotic low-level USAF personnel. As the issue of whether to allow the plane to fly on to the Middle East went up the chain of command and expanded to involve the intelligence agencies, it transpired that the majority of the government and the establishment did not want the plane to attack targets in the Middle East. The scandal of the rogue B-52 broke on September 5, 2007, and a stand-down and nuclear census of the entire USAF soon followed. According to all indications, the B-52 was under the extra-legal control of the Cheney faction, which evidently planned to fly it to the Middle East and quite possibly use one or more of the nuclear cruise missiles in an attack on Iran and/or Syria, probably in cooperation or coordination with the Israeli air attack on Syria which occurred on September 6, 2007. The fact that the B-52 was blocked may have represented the last gasp of the Bush-Cheney-neocon faction, and the beginning of the hegemony of a different and far more dangerous group, namely the Brzezinski-Trilateral faction.

The Gates purge indicates that the new Trilateral masters of Washington DC do not trust the USAF generals who are so deeply compromised with the Bush-Cheney-neocon faction. The USAF was up to its neck in 9/11, and then in the rogue B-52 affair. The Trilaterals are accordingly driving out the old rogues, and replacing them with new rogue generals of their own, who are loyal to the insane Trilateral agenda. Brzezinski does not want nuclear weapons wasted on Iran, which he intends to turn into an expendable puppet or kamikaze pawn in his apocalyptic showdown with Russian and China. This is what Obama's appeasement of Iran actually aims at: Iran as a US asset to be played against Russia and China. Brzezinski wants to be in control of those nukes, since he may soon need them for use against Russia and China. Those who might celebrate the defeat of the Bush-Cheney-neocon group must rather face the fact that the US had just jumped out of the frying pan of conventional invasions and into the fire of looming thermonuclear confrontations among the great powers. This is the real nature of the change for which Obama is the public symbol. Obama's foreign policy will be dictated in every respect by Trilateral co-founder Brzezinski. Obama is now supported and surrounded by Trilateral members David Rockefeller, Jay Rockefeller, Joseph Nye, Paul Adolph Volcker, Jimmy Carter, and many more. With James "Rodney the Robot" Schlesinger now helping to purge the Pentagon, including its associated intelligence agencies, the Trilateral grip

on Washington DC is tightening. Obama's choice of a vice president, it was announced, would be dictated by long-time Trilateral stalwart Jim Johnson, a former aide to Trilateral operative Vice President Walter Mondale.

The last time the Principals' Committee or its equivalent was this powerful was back in 1999, when President Clinton had been forced to mortgage and sacrifice most of his constitutional powers in exchange for votes in the Senate to avoid being removed from office. At that time, the Principals' Committee had been composed of Vice President Gore, Secretary of State Albright, Defense Secretary Cohen, General Shelton of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and top bureaucrat Richard Clarke, with help from Bill Richardson and Richard Holbrook, among others. At that time, the main project which the Principals' Committee was promoting was the bombing of Serbia, which was seen as a means for humiliating the Russian government of Boris Yeltsin and promoting the further disintegration of Russia, in conformity with what we know today as the Brzezinski plan. Russian Prime Minister Primakov was flying across the Atlantic with a very high probability of arriving at a negotiated solution when the despicable Al Gore gave the order to begin the bombing of Serbia, causing Primakov to turn back over mid-ocean, and return to Moscow. At a later point, the scoundrel General Wesley Clark joined forces with British Prime Minister Tony Blair in order to secure a NATO invasion of Serbia by land forces, a move which would have led to extravagant casualties on the NATO side in the course of destroying that country. By this time, fortunately, Clinton had recouped enough of his powers to be able to block the move, which coincided with the Washington conference held to mark the 50th anniversary of the NATO pact. This time around, the task of the Principals' Committee was clearly the winding down of the Iraq war, and the ratcheting up of operations against Sudan, Zimbabwe, Burma, Venezuela, and ultimately against China and Russia.

The rogue B-52 incident was forecast by me in an essay entitled "Cheney Determined to Strike in US with WMD This Summer," issued on July 21, 2007, and widely distributed in July-August 2007 on the internet and in print form in the *Rock Creek Free Press* in Washington, as well as in other papers. This was followed by the Kennebunkport Warning, which was posted online in the evening of August 26, 2007, less than 72 hours before the rogue B-52 nuclear missiles were loaded. By September 3, the Kennebunkport Warning was posted on 110,000 web sites worldwide. The precision and timeliness of this warning represent an unprecedented intelligence achievement. But since October-December 2007, the danger of a US attack on Iran has steadily declined.

Brzezinski's hit list is much more ambitious, and includes Sudan, Pakistan, Burma, and China, all stepping stones to the final reckoning with Moscow. The main possibility of an attack on Iran in the present situation comes from disgruntled Israeli factions like the one around Netanyahu who are aghast that they are being demoted from their previous role as the hub of US strategy to the status of just another expendable pawn in Brzezinski's lunatic plan for confrontation with Beijing and Moscow. The Israelis are horrified by Obama, just as everyone in the world should be. The winning faction of the US-UK establishment does not want the attack on Iran, and the Israelis would be foolhardy to try it on their own. The threats today from former IDF chief and Israeli Transport Minister Shaul Mofaz, about an Israeli solo attack on Iran because of the failure of economic sanctions to stop nuclear development, indicate deep discontent, but the guess here is that they are a bluff. We will soon find out: if the Israelis do not strike Iran in the next few weeks, they will have lost their chance, as the Trilaterals continue to consolidate their power.

THE BRZEZINSKI PLAN FOR RUSSIA

Groaning under the weight of two lost wars, the terminal crisis of the US dollar, banking panic, and hyperinflation, the US ruling elite is attempting to unify itself around Obama for a breathtaking reversal of their entire strategic and ideological field. The intent is to largely jettison the post-9/11 enemy image of Islamic terrorism and the focus on the Middle East, and to shift target to Russia, China, and their allies in a vast global showdown or planetary end game for which Obama is supposed to be the figurehead.

As outlined by the cold warrior and Russia-hater Brzezinski, the first phase is to eject the Chinese from Africa, cutting off their access to oil and raw materials, and thus sabotaging their current rapid industrial development. All of Africa is rapidly becoming a battlefield of the US against the Chinese, and Obama is the ideal front man for this. Chinese allies like Sudan, and also Pakistan and Burma, are all being targeted as part of this plan. With Iran and Syria, the effort will not be to attack them, but to turn them against Russia and China. This Brzezinski design is why Obama says he wants to negotiate with Iran, but bomb Pakistan.

China is being weakened and destabilized by the Tibetan insurrection and other operations, and Zbig would like to stage a large-scale incident under the cover of the summer Olympics. In the final stage, Zbig thinks he can drive the oil-starved Chinese in on Russia's provinces of eastern Siberia, where there is much oil and few Russians. Obama is thus the bearer of a plan for Sino-Russian World War III that far surpasses the insanity of the neocons. Since Russia and China are both well aware of the Brzezinski plan, this entire lunatic project is sure to blow up in our faces, with cataclysmic results. The Iraq war will seem a tea party by comparison. The main grounds for aggression in the new phase will be humanitarian and human rights claims, not terrorism, so as to maximize left cover.

OBAMA'S ATTACK ON PAKISTAN

An example of the heightened aggressiveness that could be expected under the Brzezinski plan was the question of unilateral US bombing of Pakistan. Not a few observers spent the first half of 2008 worrying about an imminent attack on Iran. The reality was that the growing power of the Brzezinski faction in Washington made such an attack less and less likely, at least as far as the United States and the United Kingdom were concerned. But these same observers were largely blind to a program of systematic aggression being carried out by the United States and the British against Pakistan, a country that was almost 3 times larger than Iran, and became equipped with nuclear weapons and medium-range ballistic missiles to deliver them. Every gust of wind in the Persian Gulf was considered a harbinger of Armageddon, but the constant bombing raids in the northwest regions of Pakistan were considered a matter of scant importance.

The irony was that the bombing attacks on Pakistan had been demanded by none other than Obama. Speaking indeed the July 2007 Democratic candidates' debate held in Chicago, in a colloquy with Senator Christopher Dodd of Connecticut, Obama had stated: 'And, Chris, respectfully — and you and I are close friends — but the fact is you obviously didn't read my speech. Because what I said was that we have to refocus, get out of Iraq, make certain that we are helping Pakistan deal with the problem of al Qaeda in the hills between Afghanistan and Pakistan. But, Chris, if we have actionable intelligence on al Qaeda operatives, including bin Laden, and President Musharraf cannot act, then we should. Now, I think that's just common sense. I don't know about you, but for us to authorize — (cheers, applause) — (inaudible) --.'[203]

Senator Clinton had disagreed with this reckless and unilateral approach: '"You can think big, but remember, you shouldn't always say everything you think if you're running for president, because it has consequences around the world," Senator Clinton had retorted. Dodd had joined Clinton in criticizing Obama. Dodd said Obama's stance could undermine Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf, the country's military ruler, who has been a U.S. ally in the fight against al Qaeda. "While General Musharraf is no Thomas Jefferson, he may be the only thing that stands between us and having an Islamic fundamentalist state in that country," Dodd said. "So while I would like to see him change, the reality is, if we lose him, then what we face is an alternative that could be a lot worse for our country."[204]

Dodd added: 'I think it's highly responsible — or irresponsible for people who are running for the presidency and seek that office to suggest we may be willing unilaterally to invade a nation here who we're trying to get to be more cooperative with us in Afghanistan and elsewhere. So my views — and I say this respectfully to my friend from Illinois here — I think it was wrong to say what he did in that matter. I think it's important for us to be very careful about the language we use, make it clear that if this United States is going to build the relationships around the world, we're going to have to do so with allies, in some cases allies that we may not particularly like.'[205] Senator McCain had criticized Obama for making such a reckless and incendiary proposal. President Bush himself stated that he intended to work closely with President Musharraf in regard to all operations conducted by the United States on Pakistani territory.

JAKE TAPPER: OBAMA MORE AGGRESSIVE THAN BUSH

Since the tenant of the White House had ruled out the unilateral bombing of Pakistan which Obama had demanded, the matter appeared to be closed. Jake Tapper of ABC News found it striking that Obama, who was posing as the peace candidate for Iraq, should be so aggressive in regard to Pakistan. Tapper showed that Obama was raising the issue on the campaign trail, quoting him. '"I understand that President Musharraf has his own challenges," Obama said, "but let me make this clear. There are terrorists holed up in those mountains who murdered 3,000 Americans. They are plotting to strike again. It was a terrible mistake to fail to act when we had a chance to take out an al Qaeda leadership meeting in 2005. If we have actionable intelligence about high-value terrorist targets and President Musharraf won't act, we will." There it was again: unilateral US bombing of a sovereign state that had nuclear weapons. Tapper commented: 'In many ways, the speech is counterintuitive; Obama, one of the more liberal candidates in the race, is proposing a geopolitical posture that is more aggressive than that of President Bush.' (Jake Tapper, 'Presidential Candidate Pushes Aggressive Stance Toward Pakistan,' ABC News, August 1, 2007)[206] In other words, when it came to Pakistan, Obama was a bigger warmonger than any Republican or Democrat in sight, including Bush and McCain, to say nothing of Clinton.

Astoundingly, the power of Brzezinski in Washington grew so rapidly that Obama was destined to prevail, imposing his policy instead of the announced intentions of the man who kept calling himself the president of the United States. Late in March 2008, a press account revealed that the US had indeed gone over to unilaterally bombing northwest Pakistan: 'The United States has escalated its unilateral strikes against al-Qaeda members and fighters operating in Pakistan's tribal areas, partly because of anxieties that Pakistan's new leaders will insist on scaling back military operations in that country, according to U.S. officials. "We have always said that as for strikes, that is for Pakistani forces to do and for the Pakistani government to decide. . . . We do not envision a situation in which foreigners will enter Pakistan and chase targets," said Farhatullah Babar, a top spokesman for the Pakistan People's Party, whose leader, Yousaf Raza Gillani, is the new prime

minister. "This war on terror is our war." But Kamran Bokhari, a Pakistani who directs Middle East analysis for Strategic Forecasting, a private intelligence group in Washington, said the new government will almost certainly take a harder line against such strikes. "These . . . are very unpopular, not because people support al-Qaeda, but because they feel Pakistan has no sovereignty," he said. The latest Predator strike, on March 16, killed about 20 in Shahnawaz Kot; a Feb. 28 strike killed 12 foreign militants in the village of Kaloosha; and a Jan. 29 strike killed 13 people, including senior al-Qaeda commander Abu Laith al-Libi, in North Waziristan.' (Robin Wright and Joby Warrick, "US Steps Up Unilateral Strikes in Pakistan," *Washington Post*, March 27, 2008)[207]

Soon it became clear that this was a systematic US bombing campaign and represented a scandal as big in its own way as the Nixon-Kissinger secret bombing of Cambodia back in the early 1970s. This is no hyperbole; we must simply remember that a nuclear power, and not some banana republic, is being attacked! Soon it became clear that the US bombing campaign was being conducted with wild and reckless abandon, and that members of Pakistani paramilitary formations were getting killed: 'Pakistan is condemning a U.S. air strike which allegedly killed 11 Pakistani paramilitaries as a "completely unprovoked and cowardly act." U.S.-led forces killed Pakistani troops in an air strike along the volatile Afghan border that Pakistan's army condemned on Wednesday as "completely unprovoked and cowardly." U.S. officials confirmed that three aircraft launched about a dozen bombs following a clash between Taliban militants and Afghan and U.S.-led coalition forces late Tuesday. Pakistan says the strikes killed 11 of its paramilitary troops. The Pakistani army said the air strike hit a post of the paramilitary Frontier Corps in the Mohmand tribal region …. It launched a strong protest and reserved "the right to protect our citizens and soldiers against aggression," the military said in a statement. The statement said the clash "had hit at the very basis of cooperation" between the allies in the war on terror.'[208] The Pakistani government was now the one elected in the elections conducted after the death of Benazir Bhutto in December 2007. This was supposedly the regime the US had wanted to install, but Brzezinski was doing everything possible to humiliate, mortified, and thoroughly antagonize the new government in Islamabad. The *Frontier Post* of Pakistan reported: 'On June 10, 2008 US - led coalition forces along the Afghan border launched an air strike on a Frontier Corps Sheikh Baba border post in the mountainous Gora Prai region in Mohmand Agency. 11 Pakistani paramilitary troops including one major, 10 civilians killed and several injured. The incident took place inside Pakistan, near the border with Afghanistan. Pentagon confirmed that coordinated artillery and air strikes were carried out. On Jun 11 2008, Prime Minister Gilani condemned the deaths, telling parliament: "We will take a stand for the sake of this country's sovereignty, for the sake of its dignity and self-respect". He further revealed that "We do not allow our territory to be used. We completely condemn this, and will take it up through the foreign office."' ("NATO's Senseless Aggressiveness in FATA," *Frontier Post*)[209] By early July 2008, the US was making preparations tom escalate: US commandos are reportedly poised to launch raids against al-Qa'ida and Taliban targets in Pakistan as Washington moves an aircraft carrier into the Arabian Sea. The redeployment of the *Abraham Lincoln* and its escort vessels from the Gulf yesterday came after US military intelligence officials recorded an increase in the number of foreign fighters travelling to Pakistan's tribal areas to join with militants.'[210]

What was Brzezinski doing? He was obviously using a pretext of bin Laden, Al Qaeda, and the Taliban in order to destroy the central government of Pakistan, and promote civil war, Balkanization, partitioning, and subdivision in that country. The goal was evidently the division of Pakistan into three or four or five petty states, including such areas as Sind, Pushtunistan, Baluchistan, and so forth. This operation had nothing whatsoever to do with bin Laden, Al Qaeda,

the Taliban, or the "global war on terror," but had everything to do with the fact that Pakistan was a traditional Chinese ally and economic and trading partner. Pakistan had to be destroyed as part of the Brzezinski strategy to strip China of all of her allies, and promote the isolation and encirclement of the Middle Kingdom. By this time, northwest Pakistan was one of the very few parts of the world where the US continued to rely on the bin Laden-Al Qaeda myth to justify its policy. Elsewhere, considerations of humanitarian intervention and human rights were on the front burner.

GOP: LAME DUCK BUSH REDUCED TO CHILD'S PLAY

In the late spring and early summer of 2008, a series of events further underlined the degree to which Bush, Cheney, and the neocons had indeed lost power to Brzezinski and company. Bush and Cheney appeared to have about as much power as the White House janitor or the groundskeeper at the Naval Observatory. Bush and Cheney were variously described as finished, washed up, lame ducks, figureheads, and kaput. Some Republicans were becoming concerned that Bush had lapsed into a figurehead-lame-duck status, and impotence and passivity so extreme that they might become a negative factor for McCain in the upcoming election. One columnist noted: 'Some of President Bush's allies tell the Political Bulletin they are embarrassed and angry that the White House seems to be wasting Bush's time on frivolous events when much of the country is suffering through economic hard times. "Look at the schedule for Monday," says an outside Bush adviser. "A highlight of his day was witnessing a tee ball game. ... He is being reduced to child's play." The adviser says Bush also signed a supplemental appropriations bill for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan on Monday, but he adds that it didn't get much coverage and that the tee ball game set the wrong tone. There is growing concern among Bush allies that the Democrats will effectively portray the President and GOP candidate John McCain as out of touch. Some GOP insiders now predict that the Republicans will lose at least five seats in the Senate and 15 to 20 in the House, and it could get worse if gasoline prices continue to soar and the public remains in a disgruntled mood.'[211]

THE NORTH KOREA DEAL: CHENEY VANQUISHED, APOPLECTIC

A leading symptom of this loss of power by Bush and Cheney was the announcement by Secretary of State Rice, another member of the Principals' Committee, that a deal had been reached with North Korea (the DPRK) concerning the termination of the North Korean nuclear weapons program, in exchange for which the United States had pledged to remove North Korea from the State Department list of terrorist states. The remaining neocons were apoplectic to the point of foaming at the mouth. The British press revealed that the diehard Cheney had fought tooth and nail to block this deal, but had been vanquished by Rice — and thus by the superior power of the Principals' Committee, in our view: 'Vice President Dick Cheney fought furiously to block efforts by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to strike a controversial US compromise deal with North Korea over the communist state's nuclear program… Mr Cheney was so angry about the decision to remove North Korea from the terrorism blacklist and lift some sanctions that he abruptly curtailed a meeting with visiting US foreign experts when asked about it in the White House last week, according to the *New York Times* "I'm not going to be the one to announce this decision. You need to address your interest in this to the State Department," he reportedly said before leaving the room. "The exchanges between Cheney's office and Rice's people at State got very testy. But ultimately Condi had the President's ear and persuaded him that his legacy would be stronger if they reached a deal with Pyongyang," said a Pentagon adviser who was briefed on the battle.' Top neocon John Bolton was beside himself with rage, and saw this deal with the DPRK as a harbinger of the neocon *Götterdämmerung*: '"It's shameful," said John Bolton, Bush's former U.S. ambassador to the

United Nations. "This represents the final collapse of Bush's foreign policy." (CBS-AP, June 26, 2008) the mood of his fellow neocon Richard Perle was equally apocalyptic: '"Usually the word 'meltdown' applies to a nuclear reactor. In this case it applies to Bush administration diplomacy which once aimed to halt the North Korean program and has now become an abject failure," Richard Perle, chairman of the Pentagon defense policy board in the run-up to the 2003 Iraq invasion, told the *Telegraph*.' (*Daily Telegraph*, June 28, 2008)

At the same time, a pattern of intense diplomatic activity had emerged across the Middle East, even as the Israeli politician Shaul Mofaz was threatening Iran with an inevitable nuclear attack if it were to persevere in its alleged attempts to procure nuclear bombs. The Israelis were known to be negotiating with Syria in a series of talks mediated by the Turkish government. The Israelis were also making deals with Hamas and Hezbollah, something that was formally speaking a violation of the strict Bush doctrine in this regard. Remarkably, the top levels of the US government issued some unusual warnings to the Israelis, telling them to back off from any plan to strike at Iran: "President Bush and the top U.S. military commander warned Israel... against bombing Iran, suggesting the U.S. doesn't want to get involved in a third war. "This is a very unstable part of the world and I don't need it to be more unstable," Adm. Mike Mullen, the Joint Chiefs chairman [and leading member of the ruling Principals' Committee], said at a briefing. Bush said, "I have made it clear to all parties [including Israel] that the first option is diplomacy," in getting Iran to stop enriching uranium that could be used for a nuclear weapon. The warnings came after the disclosure that Israel had conducted air operations over the Mediterranean that could simulate a strike on Iran.'[212]

In addition to these public warnings, there were also reports of private messages telling the Israelis to back off. One was delivered by Joint Chiefs Chairman Admiral Mullen of the Principals' Committee: 'The US did not give the green light for an Israeli attack on Iran, Prof. Anthony H. Cordesman, a former Pentagon official and currently the top defense analyst at the ABC TV network, said…. Cordesman was speaking during a meeting with Israeli defense analysts held by the Institute of National Security Studies. He said IDF Chief of General Staff Lt.-Gen. Gabi Ashkenazi was notified of the United States' stance regarding Iran by Admiral Michael Mullen, the top uniformed US military officer, during Mullen's visit here at the end of June. The US has opted at this point to stick to the diplomatic track in its efforts to keep Iran from going nuclear, and has made clear to Israel that it shouldn't attack Iran without White House approval, Cordesman said. He added that the current US policy is likely to remain unchanged at least until the next US president is sworn in. Israeli officials confirmed that Cordesman's statements indeed reflected the current tone of US policy.'[213]

There were also indications that Iran was being offered the possibility of continuing to enrich uranium at the level of its present capacity to do so, while opening a negotiation with Solana of the European Union. This was welcomed by the Iran Foreign Minister Mottaki, and was widely regarded as the prelude to a deal or modus vivendi between the US under Brzezinski and the Iranians: "Iran agreed …to enter into talks with the European Union about its nuclear program before the end of the month, Iranian state-run media said. The EU, which recently placed sanctions on Iran, has offered a package of political, economic and security incentives to Iran if it halts uranium enrichment. Iran's top nuclear negotiator, Saeed Jalili, called EU foreign policy chief Javier Solana to tell him the response to that offer was coming, according to Iran's Islamic Republic News Agency, and Solana's office characterized Jalili's tone as friendly and positive. The EU has proposed suspending further sanctions if Iran takes a six-week break from installing or manufacturing any more centrifuges that enrich uranium. Iran would be allowed to continue to run

the more than 3,000 centrifuges it already has but could not manufacture more ("Iran ready to discuss EU's nuclear offer," CNN, July 4, 2008)[214] In the midst of these negotiations, Iran launched a number of medium and short range ballistic missiles. The neocons tried to beat the drum, but the response of Secretary Gates of the Principals' Committee was as low-key and placid as could be imagined: 'The United States is no closer to confrontation with Iran after Tehran test-fired missiles it says could reach Israel and U.S. assets in the Middle East, Defense Secretary Robert Gates said Wednesday. Asked if the United States was any closer to confrontation, Gates told reporters: "No, I don't think so." Gates also said it was "highly unlikely" that Russian air defense missiles would be in Iranian hands soon. An improved air defense system would make a strike on Iran more difficult.' (Reuters: "Pentagon chief: US no closer to Iran confrontation," July 9, 2008)[215] Gates also mentioned the terrible consequences which any hostilities with Iran would have. The following day, there were press reports that the US was allowing the Israelis to use Iraqi airspace to ready an attack on Iran. These reports were quickly denied by the Pentagon. An Israeli attack could not be ruled out, but there was no doubt that the US and the British were strongly opposed to the idea, which would undercut Brzezinski's entire plan of turning Iran against the Russians.

On July 11, 2008, it was reported that Treasury Secretary Paulson had convinced Bush that the administration policy of hostility to Fanny Mae and Freddie Mac, the twin mortgage lenders whose debts amounted to some $5.3 trillion, was risking a systemic crisis of the US banking system – a financial Armageddon. Paulson reportedly told Bush that if he insisted on driving Freddie and Fannie into liquidation, he would be Hooverized in very short order, long before he left office. At this point, wheels were set into motion and the Federal Reserve that Freddie and Fannie might get access to the discount window of the US central bank. This story is highly relevant here because it shows the degree to which the members of the Principals Committee are now running the government and telling Bush what to do on most the major issues. A few weeks later, Paulson also forced Bush to drop his threat to veto a bill to bail out the giant mortgage lenders, a measure stridently demanded by Wall Street. It is clear that Brzezinski and his fellow oligarchs intend to maintain and consolidate the current preeminence of the Principals' Committee under a possible future Obama administration, and also if McCain becomes president, although that variant is much less promising for their hopes of giving US imperialism a hyper-demagogic facelift.

NEOCONS DISPLACED BY TRILATERALS, 2006-2008

The erosion of neocon power had proceeded apace, starting around the time of the 2006 US congressional elections. Around that time, British intelligence began signaling the urgent necessity of shifting target towards Russia by staging two bombastic intelligence circuses in the form of the Politkovskaya murder and the Litvinenko affair, both of which were immediately blamed on Russian President Putin. The British also stepped up their subversion efforts inside the Russian Federation under the cover of cultural exchanges conduited through the Foreign Office front organization, the British Council. As a result of the new Democratic majority in the Congress, the discredited neocon faction leader Rumsfeld was forced out and replaced by Robert Gates, a Sovietologist who had served as the Russophobe Zbigniew Brzezinski's office boy at the National Security Council during 1977, 1978, and 1979. Gates had also been active in Brzezinski's mujahedin operations against the Soviets, operations which had been given birth to the CIA Arab Legion, Al Qaeda. At the end of 2006, the report of the Iraq study group, also known as the Baker-Hamilton commission, signaled a change in oligarchical policy and with it the beginning of the end of the neocon dominance in Washington. The Iraq study group recommended that there be no US attack on Iran, and that negotiations with Syria and Iran be begun immediately. James Baker, a former

secretary of state under Bush the Elder, stated explicitly that he had procured Syria as an ally for the United States during the first Gulf War, and that he could do so again. Neocon press organs screamed that Baker and Hamilton were "surrender monkeys," but the handwriting was now on the wall. The middle of the year saw the fall of the crypto-neocon Tony Blair, a creature of Rupert Murdoch and the last of the major European leaders who had cooperated with Bush and the neocons to unleash the Iraq war in the first place. The last serious attempt of the neocon faction to launch war with Iran probably occurred at the end of August and the beginning of September 2007, when rogue forces allied with Cheney in effect hijacked a B-52 intercontinental strategic bomber carrying six nuclear armed cruise missiles, and flew it from North Dakota to Louisiana. One or more of these missiles was probably destined to join in the Israeli attack on Syria which occurred on September 6. The fact that this B-52 was not allowed to proceed, and that a consensus against letting it leaves the United States rapidly emerged in the higher levels of the oligarchy, probably represented the last gasp of the US - UK neocons as far as starting a wider war was concerned. Bush's outbursts in October and November about World War III were partly directed against Putin, and partly expressed his frustration that no strategic attacks on Iran were likely. This overall impression was solidified in December 2007 with the issuance of the National Intelligence Estimate on Iran, which concluded that there was no longer any active Iranian program to build nuclear bombs.

In 2008, attention was already shifting to such classic Brzezinski gambits as Kosovo independence and the emerging Polish missile crisis, along with the Tibet insurrection, threats to attack Sudan, and a clear desire to use a humanitarian emergency in Burma as a pretext for a humanitarian invasion and regime change using the story that the Burmese junta was not an efficient distributor of relief supplies. During these same months, the US Supreme Court was handing down the majority opinions striking down the Bush-Cheney military commissions plan for alleged terrorist captives, and then asserting the right of habeas corpus for the prisoners being held in the US exclave of Guantánamo Bay Cuba. Once again, the neocons howled in their impotence. Then came the deal to de-list North Korea as a terrorist state, followed by increasing indications of an imminent deal with Iran, even as the attacks on Pakistan escalated and that country teetered on the brink of civil war and partition. The years had not been kind to the neocons: Scooter Libby had been convicted, and only escaped prison through Bush's highly controversial pardon. Lord Conrad Black, arguably an even bigger neocon then Libby, was now actually serving a multi-year prison sentence in a US federal penitentiary for embezzling money from his companies. Lord Black had been one of the major funders of the American Enterprise Institute, where no less a personage than Lynn Cheney, as well as Richard Perle and Michael Ledeen, had been employed. As for Ledeen, his problems might only be beginning: a report from the Senate Intelligence Committee alleged that Ledeen and his old Iran-Contra friend Ghorbanifar had conspired to manipulate US intelligence during the run-up to the Iraq war. This report had no doubt received much personal attention from the Committee Chairman, who was none other than Senator John D. Rockefeller IV, of the Trilateral-Rockefeller faction which also included Brzezinski. These were some of the steps by which the Trilaterals had ousted the neocons from their previous positions of power, had neutralized Bush and Cheney, and had generally introduced a demagogic left turn in the entire posture of Anglo American foreign policy, propaganda, and intelligence operations. Now, all they needed was a figurehead to become the spokesman for this deceptive and cynical left turn — and this was obviously the role assigned to Obama.

If the American people could imagine no conflict worse than the Iraq war, they were obviously suffering from a severe poverty of imagination. Zbigniew Brzezinski's imagination was richer than that. He could and did imagine a drive to break up both Russia and China, reducing both to a

congeries of warlords and petty states, all absolutely impotent to resist the Anglo-Americans. That would give London and Washington another century of world domination. Brzezinski would always claim that his intention was to accomplish all this using proxies, surrogates, and pawns, and without embroiling the US in war with Russia and China. His approach had all the defects of the old Cliveden set of the 1930s, who were convinced that they could build up Hitler, turn him east, play him against Stalin, and destroy both Germany and the USSR in the process. Unfortunately, they had been too clever by half, and their plan had blown up in their faces when Hitler turned west before going east.

That had been World War II. Now, it was clear that Brzezinski's fantastic strategy was also destined to blow up in his face, and in all our faces. An Obama regime was therefore a probable one-way ticket to thermonuclear war, an outcome several orders of magnitude worse than anything the neocons had ever plotted. Brzezinski and his friends were more aggressive, more adventurous, more intelligent, and more insane than the neocons. The American people, if they succumbed to Obama, were about to leap out of the frying pan and into the fire.

BRZEZINSKI WARNS OF WORLD WAR IV UNDER MCCAIN

Perhaps responding to criticisms like the ones developed here, Brzezinski has attempted to refurbish his image as a relative dove. He has warned about the temptation to try to win militarily in Afghanistan, which is the trap he himself used to destroy the USSR. Brzezinski means to say that the point of waging war in Afghanistan is not the permanent occupation and subduing of Afghanistan, but rather using the Afghan war to destroy Pakistan, along with Afghanistan itself. Above all, Brzezinski wants to avoid being exposed as the most dangerous warmonger of them all, stating: "Well, if McCain is president and if his Secretary of State is Joe Lieberman and his Secretary of Defense is [Rudolph] Giuliani, we will be moving towards the World War IV that they have been both favoring and predicting," he said, calling that an "appalling concept" (and adding that by their lights, the Cold War counted as World War III). "So it depends on who are the principal officers. If it's [Richard] Armitage, or if it were to be Brent Scowcroft, I think it would be very different." Asked who he would like to see in a potential Obama cabinet, Brzezinski said: "I think [Sen. Chuck] Hagel. I would like to see a bipartisan cabinet. I think we need one very badly — and we did well in the Cold War when we had one. I would say Hagel and [Sen. Dick] Lugar would be very good Republicans [for Obama]." He also cited Sen. Joe Biden as a potential Secretary of State, in which case it would also be possible to "keep [Secretary of Defense Bob] Gates in the job for a few months." Brzezinski said such a cabinet would be an important step in redressing the increased partisanship of foreign affairs in recent years, adding: "I think there is a tendency, because of the very complexity of the issues, for solutions to become polarized and more extreme. ... Republicans move toward neocon-ish formulas, and Democrats [follow] idealistically escapist formulas. In either case you don't end up with the necessary mix of idealism and realism."[216] In other words, we need a united oligarchy in order to guarantee another century of empire. It is the neocon project of world domination, in a form that is more clever and more insane at the same time.

CHAPTER XI: OBAMA AS SOCIAL FASCIST

> "…the oscillations among the responses could intensify in such a way as to threaten to destroy both ideals and institutions…. This situation could lead to a two-phase dialectic involving intensified efforts to reform government, followed by intensified frustration when those efforts produce not progress in a liberal-democratic direction, but obstacles to meeting perceived functional needs. The weakening of government in an effort to reform it could lead eventually to strong demands for the replacement of the weakened and ineffective institutions by more authoritarian structures more effectively designed to meet historical needs. Given the perversity of reform, moralistic extremism in the pursuit of liberal democracy could generate a strong tide toward authoritarian efficiency." Samuel Huntington, 1981
>
> "If it will take fascism, we'll have to have fascism." Weatherman Ted Gold, 1969
>
> The argument that Obama would be another Pétain-like Carter, offering his noble qualities only to be overwhelmed by ignoble reality, is the deepest fear about him, or at least the one that most resonates with me. – James Fallows, *Atlantic Monthly*, September 2008

Much of the American public will object to this book's thesis that Barack Hussein Obama must be considered as a postmodern fascist, or as a neo-fascist, a fascist lite or simply as a fascist. Left-liberals will predictably be the most vehement in their rejection of this theme, since it is they who have embraced the New Messiah with the greatest willful blindness and hysteria, refusing to listen to any reasoned arguments to the contrary. How can Obama be a fascist when he has cultivated a pose of being the true anti-war candidate – apart from such trifles as his demand that Pakistanis be slaughtered with reckless abandon in their own country without notification to their government. How can he be a fascist when he is some kind of leftist, and when he poses as an insurgent? Rightists will object that Obama is really a Moslem. Other rightists will claim that he is a Marxist or crypto-communist. Many ordinary people will tend towards the view that he is just another American pragmatist like the rest of us, but with views that are somewhat extreme and radical on a range of subjects – making Obama someone to vote against perhaps, but not a fascist. In order to clarify this issue, we need to go back and look at what fascism was. To make matters simpler, we will concentrate on the Italian fascists, partly since it was they who invented fascism, and partly since we can conduct a calmer analysis if we do not make Hitler and the Nazis the prime examples – although we will mention them from time to time to illustrate what we are saying about fascism in general.

Obama's signature mass rallies are perhaps the factor that first alerted some right-wing journalists to the nature of the Obama pseudo-movement. For many, this awareness began to emerge in February 2008, when the Obama postmodern coup was already well underway, despite temporary reverses. David Brooks, for example, wrote: "The afflicted had already been through the phases of Obama-mania — fainting at rallies, weeping over their touch screens while watching Obama videos, spending hours making folk crafts featuring Michelle Obama's face. These patients had experienced intense surges of hope-amine, the brain chemical that fuels euphoric sensations of historic change and personal salvation. But they found that as the weeks went on, they needed more and purer hope-injections just to preserve the rush. They wound up craving more hope than even the Hope Pope could provide, and they began experiencing brooding moments of suboptimal hopefulness. Anxious posts began to appear on the Yes We Can! Facebook pages. A sense of ennui began to creep through the nation's Ian McEwan-centered book clubs. Up until now The Chosen One's speeches had seemed to them less like stretches of words and more like soul sensations that

transcended time and space. But those in the grips of Obama Comedown Syndrome began to wonder if His stuff actually made sense. For example, His Hopeness tells rallies that we are the change we have been waiting for, but if we are the change we have been waiting for then why have we been waiting since we've been here all along?" (David Brooks, *New York Times*, February 19, 2008)

The other aspect of the Obama lemming legions which has attracted the attention of some commentators is a specious rage with which they turn on those who do not share their fanatical devotion to the Perfect Master. Professor Paul Krugman is surely one of the more intelligent of these critics when he writes: "Why, then, is there so much venom out there? I won't try for fake evenhandedness here: most of the venom I see is coming from supporters of Mr. Obama, who want their hero or nobody. I'm not the first to point out that the Obama campaign seems dangerously close to becoming a cult of personality. We've already had that from the Bush administration — remember Operation Flight Suit? We really don't want to go there again." (Paul Krugman, *New York Times*, February 11, 2008)

Obama's general demeanor and rhetorical style has been compared to that of Mussolini, the first fascist to seize power in a major country. David Plotz of Slate.com was shocked by the mob rule overtones of the Obama agitation: 'The deputy editor of a major online magazine spent time in a weekly podcast explaining how the style of Senator Barack Obama shares much in common with the speech of fascist dictators like Benito Mussolini. "That's slightly fascistic," David Plotz, the deputy editor at Slate.com said in the magazine's weekly podcast when one of his fellow editors brought up Obama's style. "That's a very, like, let's rally the nation. I don't want to be rallied." After his fellow Slate editors lightly gibed him for his statement, he continued the point: "My brother who is an academic wrote this wonderful book about crowds, and crowd theory. And one of the sort of lessons that he's always imparted to me is just that crowds are terrifying. Crowds are horrifying for the most part because they have a will of their own, and they act independently of rationality. And I think that Obama relies hugely on that. That's not to say, I don't, I still support him, but I don't like that fascistic, I like him not for the fascistic elements of his candidacy, which I think are profound."' (Michael Roston, "*Slate* editor calls Obama speech style 'fascistic,'" (Rawstory, February 4, 2008) An untenable position, we note in passing, since fascism, once identified, must surely be opposed.

DIALECTIC OF HOPE AND DESPAIR IN FASCISM FROM MUSSOLINI TO OBAMA

One of the most reliable indications of Obama's fascist ideology can be found in his obsessive preoccupation with the theme of "hope." One of the staples of fascist demagogy from Mussolini to Hitler, and especially in the latter, is a constant attempt to mobilize the latent and conscious despair of the target audiences into a form of frenzied activism or flight forward in the service of the Fascist party and the fascist cause. One of the favorite themes of National Socialist propaganda was the idea that Hitler represented the last hope of the despairing masses after the torments of World War I, the great hyperinflation of 1923, and the great deflationary depression starting in 1929. This theme was used in some of the NSDAP's most effective posters. In Obama's case, his ability to appeal to the despair of his followers is significantly enhanced by his own existentialist background, as indicated by his interest during his college years in the existentialist-terrorist works of Frantz Fanon. As has already been mentioned, a thoroughgoing existentialist is in grave danger of sliding into fascism under the impact of a social crisis including military defeat and acute economic

depression, as was seen in the case of the leading European existentialist, Martin Heidegger, who became an active Nazi propagandist. Every day, existentialists and other radical irrationalist subjectivists who have been supporting Obama are sliding towards fascism like passengers careening down the steeply sloping decks of the *Titanic* in its last throes.

Once again it is Georg Lukacs who, pre-eminently among the historians of European philosophy, has pointed to the intimate interface between radical existentialism and fascism. Lukacs writes: 'no matter how distorted the presentation may be because of the solipsism of the phenomenological method, we are dealing with a social fact: the internal situation of the bourgeois individual (especially the intellectual) in the crumbling world of monopoly capital, faced by the perspective of annihilation. Heidegger's despair thus has a dual character: on the one side the implacable exposure of the inner nothingness of the individual in the crisis period of imperialism; on the other hand — because the social causes of this nothingness are fetishized away as timeless factors having nothing to do with the social situation — the resulting feelings can very easily kick over into a despairing reactionary activity. It is surely no coincidence that Hitler's agitation continuously appealed to despair. Of course, this mainly addressed the economic-social situation of the working masses. In the case of the intelligentsia, this mood of nothingness and despair, whose subjective validity constitutes the starting point for Heidegger's philosophy, and which he elevates to the conceptual level, transfigures into philosophy and canonizes as 'authentic," represents the most fertile soil for the effectiveness of Hitler's mass agitation.' (Lukacs 441)

Existentialism, reinforced by the postmodern consensus in the Anglo-American academic world frequented by Obama, represents a perfect culture medium for the postmodern fascist mentality. The general nature of this dynamic was already clear many decades ago: "Agnostic irrationalism… has as its final result a passionate rejection of objective truth of the same type that we see in Hitler with other motives and with other justifications. In the interface between existentialist irrationalism and the fascist world outlook we are not dealing with individual epistemological findings…but rather with a general intellectual atmosphere of radical doubt about the possibility of objective knowledge, about the value of reason and understanding, and with a blind belief in intuition-based, irrational 'revelations' that contradict reason and understanding. We are dealing with an atmosphere of hysterical-superstitious gullibility, in which the obscurantism of a struggle against objective truths, against understanding and reason, is presented as the last word of modern science and of the most 'progressive' epistemology." (Lukacs 633) These considerations should help make clear why he Obama personally finds the postmodern fascist outlook to be congenial and coherent with his general attitude towards life. As has already been shown, Michelle Obama represents an even more militant version of this same fundamental worldview.

A DISTANT MIRROR: THE PEACE FASCISM OF SIR OSWALD MOSELEY

One large difficulty in evaluating Obama as a postmodern fascist comes from the present-day tendency to identify fascism almost totally with militarism and military aggression. Obama has called successfully for the bombing of northern Pakistan, although most of his followers seem to be unable to comprehend his role in this regard. Of course, fascist movements, once they were well established and consolidated, did tend overwhelmingly towards military aggression. But this does not tell us anything about what these movements looked like in their earliest phases, before they had taken power and before they were in a position to start military adventures. There is also the problem of fascist movements in countries like Great Britain and France, who had been among the winners of World War I. These fascist movements did not take power, but might have done so

under slightly different circumstances. In order to evaluate the Obama phenomenon of 2008, we must realize that overt jingoistic militarism is not necessary for fascism to arise.

Many assume that all fascists must necessarily be first and foremost aggressive warmongers, but this is not necessarily the case. As one scholar has noted, "most fascist parties in stable, prosperous western European countries with mature colonial empires preached a kind of 'peace fascism,' unlike their counterparts in central and eastern Europe."[217] Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945* [Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995], 298 Stanley G. Payne elaborates on the question of fascism and militaristic aggression as follows: "Fascism is usually said to have been expansionist and imperialist by definition, but this is not clear from a reading of diverse fascist programs. Most were indeed imperialist, but all types of political movements and systems have produced imperialist policies, while several fascist movements had little interest in or even rejected new imperial ambitions. Those which appeared in satisfied national or imperialist states were generally defensive rather than aggressive. All, however, sought a new order in foreign affairs, a new relationship or set of alliances with respect to contemporary states and forces, and a new status for their nations in Europe and the world. Some were frankly oriented towards war, while others merely prized military values but projected no plans for aggression abroad. The latter sometimes sought a place of cultural hegemony or other nonmilitary forms of leadership." (Payne 11) If we insert soft power and subversion after cultural hegemony, we may be close to understanding the postmodern fascist ideology of a possible Obama regime.

Examples of "peace fascism" included the French *Parti Populaire Français*, originally a proto-fascist formation which emerged from the defeat of the mass strike upsurge of June 1936, the biggest strike wave in France before 1968. The PPF grew in reaction to the socialist-communist popular front regime of Léon Blum, which soon disappointed its own left-wing followers. This PPF received "considerable financial backing from big business interests, which sought to encourage a popular nationalist and anti-communist force. The *chef* or leader was Jacques Doriot, a former communist. "The new state envisaged by the PPF was to be 'popular' and authoritarian but decentralized, honoring the family, the community, and the region, with the latter being strongly emphasized." The PPF had its own approach to reforming broken souls: "PPF propagandists did encourage an activist and vitalist philosophy and the creation of an *homme nouveau* (new man), and the movement drew the support of some accomplished fascistic intellectuals like Pierre Drieu LaRochelle." (Payne 298) The PPF shows that it is possible to be fascist and anti-war at the same time: "…though the PPF preached vitalism and activism, together with the military virtues, it was – like all the French nationalist groups from the fascists of Bucard to the most conservative – a 'peace party' that discouraged talk of war and sought no particular territorial aggrandizement for France." (Payne 298)

To see what fascism looked like in the English speaking world during the 1930s, we have the case of Sir Oswald Mosley and his British Union of Fascists, which was formed in 1932 and was banned by the government when the Second World War began in 1939. British fascism was not explicitly pro-war: "Like other fascist movements in satisfied imperial powers, the BUF never preached war and expansion, but peace and prosperity. Mosley was obsessed with overcoming social, economic, and cultural decadence, and he believed that only the disciplined nationalism and new cultural dynamism of a fascism on the Italian model could achieve it." Also like Obama, the BUF embraced corporatist solutions for the world economic crisis of the Great Depression: "The BUF was one of the most thoroughly programmatic of all fascist movements, with elaborate corporatist economic proposals. Its thrust was decidedly modernist, paying serious attention to economic theory and concepts of 'scientific production,' while also espousing equal pay for women.

The BUF also preached vitalism and the Shavian superman [i.e., the superman concept of the playwright and essayist George Bernard Shaw], while stressing Britain's civilizing and imperial mission in the world 'to rescue great nations from decadence, and march together towards a higher and nobler order of civilization.'" (Payne 305) Strip away this imperial rhetoric and replace it with Obama's Afrocentric multicultural relativism, and the similarities are striking.

PALINGENESIS: THE FASCIST QUEST FOR UTOPIA

Fascism has been described by some writers as being "palingenetic," meaning that it represents an attempt to launch a rebirth of the national spirit, culture, and society. (Payne 5) Fascism generally proposes to do this through a form of cultural populism which rejects ideology, rejects parliamentary methods, and claims to merge the interests of different social and economic classes under the heading of national unity. It was always concerned with promoting and fostering mass mobilization for national goals.

In 2003, Dr. Lawrence Brit listed "Fourteen Defining Characteristics of Fascism," with the implication that they established that the Bush administration was a fascist regime. This list has been widely read and reproduced on the internet. Brit's characteristics of fascism include powerful and continuing nationalism; disdain for the recognition of human rights; identification of enemies/scapegoats as a unifying cause; supremacy of the military; rampant sexism; controlled mass media; obsession with national security; religion and government intertwined; corporate power protected; labor power suppressed; disdain for intellectuals and the arts; obsession with crime and punishment; rampant corruption and cronyism; and fraudulent elections. This list captures some aspects of a consolidated and established fascist society, but it misses others totally or even turns them on their head. Take for example the supremacy of the military: Hitler's entire dictatorship contradicts the ideas that professional military people should direct wars: supreme power was kept in Hitler's own hands, to the point that the German Army tried to assassinate him, and he retaliated by liquidating many of the most famous commanders, including Rommel. Key traditionalist members of the German General Staff like Halder were ousted or forced to kow-tow to Nazi hacks and yes-men like Keitel and Zeitzler. Or again: disdain for intellectuals and the arts would hardly apply to Italian fascism, which was founded in part by leading writers, sculptors, architects, and artists like D'Annunzio and Marinetti. Other characteristics listed by Brit would apply to many kinds of dictatorships and authoritarian governments, and not just fascist ones.[218]

CONFUSION ABOUT FASCIST MASS MOVEMENTS

An attempt to obscure the real nature of fascism as an anti-establishment, anti-parliamentary mass movement came from the former CIA employee Ray McGovern. McGovern was one of those left-liberal personalities who had stubbornly refused to go beyond the CIA's blowback theory of 9/11 to examine the more realistic alternative explanations of the MIHOP school.[219] In the March-April 2008, McGovern authored an article entitled "History's Lessons: Creeping Fascism – Lessons from the Past." (consortiumnews.com) Here McGovern presented the question of fascism solely and exclusively as a problem of top-down police state measures, with no reference whatsoever to historical fascism as a mass movement of idealistic students, goons, and guttersnipes backed by financiers and operating under anti-politician and anti-establishment cover. Fascism for McGovern was a matter of Bush's violation of the FISA wiretap law and similar top-down measures. Interestingly, McGovern cited the late, notorious, British agent of German nationality, Sebastian Haffner. Haffner had written about the National Socialist seizure of power in 1933, criticizing the

"sheepish submissiveness" and the "cowardly treachery" of the labor-based Social Democratic Party. Haffner found that "it is in the final analysis only that betrayal [by the Social Democrats] that explains the almost inexplicable fact that a great nation, which cannot have consisted entirely of cowards, fell into ignominy without a fight." But it is very easy for modern-day left liberals with CIA connections to fault the German labor politicians of 75 years ago. Haffner did not mention that his British paymasters had thrown their support to Hitler, as in the case of Lady Astor and her Cliveden Set. What can we say of Howard Dean, Pelosi, Jay Rockefeller, Ted Kennedy, and the other rotten Democratic politicians who have rushed to support postmodern fascism in the form of the Obama campaign long before any seizure of power? The modern American politicians do not fare well in this comparison.

THE MASS MOVEMENT IS CRITICAL FOR THE ADVENT OF FASCISM

A more basic objection to Brit's entire approach is that this method might be some use for a dreamer or time traveler who suddenly woke up or landed in a given society and wanted to know if that society were fascist. But that is not our problem. In practice, the only way to enter a fascist society is through the successful activity of a fascist mass movement, and it is here that the characteristics listed by Brit not only fail utterly, but actually become dangerously misleading. The only way real fascism has ever been created is through an irrationalist, demagogic, anti-parliamentary mass movement or reasonable facsimile thereof, stressing togetherness and the negation of class struggle and partisan haggling. Such movements have seen heavy representation of fervently idealistic young students, unemployed workers, artists and intellectuals, disgruntled veterans and crazed petty bourgeois (like bankrupt stock brokers, real estate agents, and salesmen). Many of the first fascists have generally been leftists, or political neophytes with little ideological coloration. Brit's total omission of any mention of the fascist mass movement makes his list a factor of confusion and disorientation among many left liberals and libertarians today, who continue in many cases to imagine that fascism is a purely top-down phenomenon, when in reality it is the grass-roots and protest movement aspects of fascism which constitute its essence and make it so menacing. Brit may be describing Italy in 1938, when the regime had become consolidated and fossilized, but he is not saying anything worthwhile about Italy in 1919-1922, when fascism was clawing its way to power in society. He may have some insights into Germany in 1938, but not Germany in 1929-1933, when fascism was struggling to seize power.

Once again, there is simply no comparison between just another bourgeois regime, no matter how bellicose, no matter how corrupt, no matter how oppressive, and the leap into the abyss of fascism. Payne distinguishes among fascists (the German Nazi party and the Italian National Fascist Party), the radical right (Hugenburg, Chancellor von Papen, and the Stahlhelm organization in Germany, and the Italian Nationalist Association in Italy), and the conservative right (President Hindenburg and Chancellors Brüning and von Schleicher in Germany, and Prime Ministers Sonino and Salandra in Italy). Payne attempts to describe the resulting confusion in the following terms: "Comparative analysis of fascist-type movements has been rendered more complex, and often more confused, by a common tendency to identify these movements with more conservative and rightist forms of authoritarian nationalism in the interwar period and after. The fascist movements represented the most extreme expression of modern European nationalism, yet they were not synonymous with all authoritarian nationalist groups. The latter were pluriform and highly diverse, and in their typology they extended well beyond or fell well short of fascism, diverging from it in fundamental ways. The confusion between fascist movements in particular and authoritarian nationalist groups in general stems from the fact that the heyday of fascism coincided with a general

era of political authoritarianism that on the eve of World War II had in one form or another seized control of the political institutions of most European countries. It would be grossly inaccurate to argue that this process proceeded independent of fascism, but neither was it merely synonymous with fascism." (Payne 14-15) In other words, top-down dictatorship and fascist seizure of power by a grass roots radical movement of street fighters are emphatically not the same thing and should not be confused. Although Brit's list was valuable is prodding many people to think about fascism in relation to current US reality, we must stress here that any notion that the Bush regime already represented fascism would be dangerously wrong. Bush has no mass movement and will never have one. Imagine Bush attempting a Mussolini balcony speech to an oceanic crowd of millions of screaming fanatics. It has not happened and will not happen. With Obama, by contrast, the mob oration is the very essence of his agitation. His supporters are not asked to endorse a program of government; they are required to surrender themselves to the will of the Perfect Master, and they are rushing to do it by the millions.

OBAMA FULFULLS THE FASCIST MINIMUM

In 1992, the Italian writer Emilio Gentile formulated a list of 10 detailed points in an attempt to arrive at an orientative definition of fascism.[220] He was working towards a minimum common denominator of fascist movements across Europe and the world. Let us use these points as a kind of scorecard to evaluate to what degree Obama and his movement can be fairly classified as fascist.

1. "A mass movement with a multi-class membership in which prevail, among the leaders and militants, the middle sectors, in large part in new to political activity, organized as a party militia, that bases its identity not on social hierarchy or class origin, but on the sense of comradeship, believes itself invested with a mission of national regeneration, considers itself in a state of war against political adversaries and aims at conquering a monopoly of political power by using terror, parliamentary tactics, and deals with leading groups, to create a new regime that destroys parliamentary democracy."

   The Obama movement aims at seizing the presidency and does not speak of a total seizure of power, but Obama hints at pervasive control of individual life, including the cars people drive, the food people eat, and the setting of the thermostats in their homes. It is generally understood that the motivation for these totalitarian interventions will be based on the Malthusian demagogy of the Al Gore global warming-climate change fraud. As for a state of war and violence against political adversaries, there has been little violence so far, but the venom and inflammatory rhetoric directed against political adversaries, especially Senator Clinton, represent an extraordinary phenomenon in American politics. Al Gore's Green Army and Obama's own Green Corps and grandiose plans for volunteer organizations substantially fulfill the party militia requirement.

2. "An 'anti-ideological' and pragmatic ideology that proclaims itself anti-materialist, anti-individualist, anti-liberal, anti-democratic, anti-Marxist, is populist and anti-capitalist in tendency, expresses itself aesthetically, more than theoretically, by means of a new political style and by myths, rites, and symbols as a lay religion designed to acculturate, socialize, and integrate the faith of the masses with the goal of creating a 'new man.'"

   Obama is certainly anti-democratic, since he wants to ignore the primary elections in Michigan and in Florida. He is anti-materialist, as seen in his own and Michelle Obama's veiled calls for austerity and sacrifice. Michelle also refers to the need for people to transform themselves as individuals under an Obama presidency, which raises the question

of the new man. Anti-Marxism is not a central issue for Obama's followers, but Obama has been thoroughly exposed to Marxist ideology and certainly does resolutely reject any politics of class defense, class conflict, or class-based organization. The new political liturgy of the Obama Nuremberg rally campaign style has attracted wide attention.

3. "A culture founded on mystical thought and the tragic and activist sense of life conceived as the manifestation of the will to power, on the myth of youth as artificer of history, and on the exaltation of the militarization of politics as the model of life and collective activity."

   The feckless and callow youth fanatics who fill the ranks of Obama's lemming legions have been widely discussed. Their mystical outlook is that of New Age, Age of Aquarius, etc., as purveyed by a thousand petty hucksters from Oprah Winfrey to a whole phalanx of swamis. The militarization aspect is present in the Al Gore Green Army proposal as well as in Obama's own Green Corps, and it can be expected that these features will be further accentuated as the economic crisis deepens.

4. "A totalitarian conception of the primacy of politics, conceived as an integrating experience to carry out the fusion of the individual and the masses in the organic and mystical unity of the nation as an ethnic and moral community, adopting measures of discrimination and persecution against those considered to be outside this community, either as enemies of the regime or members of races considered inferior or otherwise dangerous for the integrity of the nation."

   Obama operates within the totally relativistic concept of multiculturalism which has been favored by the US ruling elite as a counterinsurgency strategy over the last four decades, as we have shown. But relativistic multiculturalism is already distorted within Obama's own thinking by the aggressive and militant Afrocentrism and Black liberation theology purveyed by his mentors, including the foundation-funded racist provocateur Jeremiah Wright and his co-thinkers. So far, Obama has been deeply associated with spokesman for white collective guilt and the need reparations to be paid to the black community alone because of slavery and discrimination in the past, which amounts to discrimination or persecution against other ethnic groups. At least two factors, however, suggest that this may be destined to change. One is the indifference or hostility to Obama exhibited by Hispanic and Asian voters, which may point to conflicts ahead. Obama is of course a creature of the Trilateral Commission, where one of the leading planners is Samuel Huntington, Brzezinski's subaltern in the Carter National Security Council. In Huntington's infamous tome, *The Clash of Civilizations*, he argued that Latin America, precisely because it was thoroughly Spanish and Catholic, could not be considered as a part of Western civilization, but had to be viewed as a separate Latino-Hispanic entity all its own. This thesis is so wildly absurd and ridiculous from a historical point of view that Huntington's evil intent could not have been more obvious. Huntington's 2004 book *Who Are We?* developed this same crackpot racist theory further, arguing that the greatest threat to the future of the United States came from Latin American and especially Mexican immigrants. Huntington thus appears to be thinking in terms of a divide-and-conquer strategy to maintain financier rule in the United States under conditions of aggravated depression breakdown crisis in which nativism will play a decisive role: this would allow the white and black population to be played off against the rapidly growing Hispanic component. Obama, needless to say, is already well-positioned to lead such an anti-Hispanic and anti-Asian

backlash. Senator Clinton, by contrast, enjoys broad support among Hispanics and Asians and would not be suitable for the strategy Huntington appears to have in mind.

5. "A civil ethic founded on total dedication to the national community, on discipline, virility, comradeship, and the warrior spirit."

   The element of communitarianism and comradeship in of Obama's rhetoric has been widely noted and is very strong, even though the militaristic and warrior elements have been relatively muted. More regimentation, however, can be expected as the notions of the Gore Green Army/Green Corps began to take hold under depression conditions. In addition, we should bear in mind the precedents for "peace fascism" in countries like France and Great Britain.

6. "A single state party that has the task of providing for the armed defense of the regime, selecting its directing cadres, and organizing the masses within the state in a process of permanent mobilization of emotion and faith."

   So far Obama has not talked about a one-party state. However, one of the most powerful components in the intelligence community coalition that is backing Obama is indeed National Endowment for Democracy, which represents a fusion of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, and can to that extent be regarded as the harbinger for a *de facto* one-party state. In addition, if Obama were to seize the White House thanks in all probability to a series of scandals conveniently timed to destroy his Republican opponent in the general election, the likely simultaneous heavy Republican losses in the Congress might produce a situation where a decimated Republican minority would be unable to block or delay legislation, provided that the Obama at White House and the Democratic Congressional leadership concurred. Such a situation, although perhaps temporary (barring the declaration of martial law by Obama under some pretext), would already begin to approximate the workings of a one-party state in practice.

7. "A police apparatus that prevents, controls, and represses dissidents and opposition, even by using organized terror."

   Obama's successful Senate campaign in Illinois in 2004 was based entirely on the timely intervention of domestic police state forces to eliminate his Democratic primary opponent, Marson Blair Hull, and then his Republican general election opponent, Jack Ryan. In 2008, the FBI carried out a sensational Gestapo operation against Governor Eliot Spitzer of New York State, who was a leading opponent of the Wall Street finance oligarchs and their abuses, and was also a Democratic Party super delegate pledged to support Mrs. Clinton. Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska had been under investigation for a long time, but his indictment in late July 2008 was timed perfectly to signal that the ruling class wanted the Republicans out and Barky and Pelosi in power. Another instance is the strange death of Deborah Palfrey, the so-called DC Madam, which was immediately classified as a suicide with the help of the dubious Dan Moldea, who claimed that the death was a suicide. The attack on Kwame Kilpatrick, the black mayor of Detroit, may fit into a pattern of FBI operations designed to intimidate black elected officials in the framework of the infamous Frühmenschen program. Some observers concluded that some Democratic superdelegates were being blackmailed by the FBI to secure their support for Obama, the darling of the winning faction of the intelligence community. It is widely believed that these secret police interventions are coordinated with Obama's backers for the purpose of effectively

terrorizing his political opponents. Obama critic Larry Sinclair was arrested at the close of his June 18, 2008 National Press Club appearance on the basis of a politically motivated warrant signed by Beau Biden, the Attorney General of Delaware. This was an enemies' list operation that went beyond anything Richard Nixon had attempted as a candidate. There are also some signs that Obama may be preparing an attempt to purge and police the internet for thought crime against the Perfect Master. On June 8, 2008, the *New York Times* wrote that Obama's retainers had declared war on freedom of speech on the internet: "One area in particular where Mr. Obama is adding muscle is a team that is tasked with tracking down rumors and erroneous statements circulated on the Internet. The growth of the Internet, which has been a fabulous asset for helping to build the Obama community, is also a place where erroneous e-mails live," said Anita Dunn, a senior campaign adviser. "That's a challenge I don't think previous campaigns have had to deal with to the extent that the Obama campaign has." The Obama campaign is already reputed to have deployed an army of between 500 and 1500 internet trolls to spread slander and defamation of Obama's critics on the internet, countering revelations about the mystery candidate Obama with cascades of obscene abuse and threats. These trolls have generated spamming charges as a means of shutting down anti-Obama blogs. Many of these pro-Obama mercenary bloggers are said to reside in Gaza, where they are organized to work at coolie wages by Obama's friends in the Hamas regime there. Others are said to operate out of Bangalore, India, and other third world internet sweatshops. The many ungrammatical postings by pro-Obama scribblers who are obviously not native speakers of American English strongly suggest that these reports are accurate.

8. "A political system organized by a hierarchy of functions named from the top and crowned by the figure of the 'leader,' invested with a sacred charisma, who commands, directs, and coordinates the activities of the party and the regime."

   From the time he came on the scene, Obama has always been presented as the Messiah, the Savior, the anointed one, and the Perfect Master, The One most emphatically endowed with sacred charisma. The highly centralized and hierarchical qualities of the Obama campaign have generally not been visible to the public, but they have been dominant behind the scenes, where the political hack Axelrod has acted as a brutal and unscrupulous enforcer, reportedly threatening whistleblowers like Larry Sinclair, shutting down websites and My Space pages which the campaign could not control, and ejecting persons attending Obama rallies if they departed from the strict Obama party line.

9. "A corporate organization of the economy that suppresses trade union liberty, broadens the sphere of state intervention, and seeks to achieve, by principles of technocracy and solidarity, the collaboration of the 'productive sectors' under the control of the regime, to achieve its goals of power, yet preserving private property and class divisions."

   During Obama's career as a foundation-funded poverty pimp, he sought to organize ghetto victims into corporatist community development corporations under the pretext of creating a few jobs, but really for the purpose of neutralizing their antiestablishment political potential. He now proposes to do this on a national scale. In the current phrase, the Obama campaign has embraced corporatism in the form the Rohatyn-Rudman National Infrastructure Reinvestment Bank, an idea which descends from Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's finance Minister. At the same time, Obama makes clear his rejection of the New Deal by pledging to be more respectful of "the market" than Senator Clinton.

10. "A foreign policy inspired by the theme of national power and greatness, with the goal of imperialist expansion." (Payne 5-6, n. 6)

    One of Obama's favorite themes is that the international prestige and power of the United States have sharply declined because of the reckless and incompetent policies of the Bush administration. Obama explicitly proposes to restore the world standing of the United States, including through such initiatives as the indiscriminate bombing of certain parts of Pakistan without the permission of the Musharraf government, allegedly in order to pursue the mythical Osama bin Laden. These are thinly veiled proposals to administer a cosmetic, public-relations facelift to the widely discredited forces of Anglo-American imperialism, and to give them a new lease on life on the world scene.

Other characteristics of fascist movements which have received wide attention include the "espousal of an idealistic, vitalist and voluntaristic philosophy, normally involving the attempt to realize a new, modern, self-determined, and secular culture." This corresponds closely to the "Yes we can!" and "Si se puede" chants which are indispensable components of the typical Obama rally.

As we can see, Obama may not completely fulfill each and every point in this highly articulated definition of a common basis of fascist movements during the time between the two world wars of the last century. Nevertheless, Obama does fulfill a very large proportion of these criteria, more so than any politician seen in the United States in the last half-century. Obama's relation to fascism is much too close for comfort, especially when we take into account the numerous areas where Obama's agitation presents proto-fascist precursor forms, seed crystals, and signs pointing towards imminent fascist developments in the near future. We must also recall that the fascism required by the crisis ridden Anglo-American imperialism of the early 21st century will necessarily diverge in certain critical areas from the fascism that was appropriate for the needs of the Italian or German finance oligarchs of the inter war period.

It is also important to recall that Italian fascism, especially in its earlier phases, was relatively free of race theory and anti-Semitism. For Mussolini, the main vehicle for fascist activity was the totalitarian state, and not any concept of race. Later, when Mussolini became an ally of Hitler, elements of the Nazi approach to race were incorporated into Italian laws and political life. In other words, the notion of fascism without significant elements of anti-Semitism (at least initially) would not represent in any way a radical departure from the main historical models and prototypes of fascism.

All fascist movements were set apart from other political formations by the tremendous stress they placed on the liturgical, symbolic, and aesthetic elements of politics. As Payne writes, "The novel atmosphere of fascist meetings struck many observers during the 1920s and 1930s. All mass movements employ symbols and various emotive effects, and it might be difficult to establish that the symbolic structure of fascist meetings was entirely different from that of other revolutionary groups. What seemed clearly distinct, however, was the great emphasis on meetings, marches, visual symbols, and ceremonial or liturgical rituals, given a centrality and function in fascist activity which went beyond that found in the left revolutionary movements. The goal was to envelop the participant in a mystique and community of ritual that appealed to the aesthetic and the spiritual sense as well as the political. This has aptly been called a theatrical politics, but it went beyond mere spectacle towards the creation of a normative aesthetics… More than any other new force of the early 20th century, fascism responded to the contemporary era as above all a 'visual age' to be dominated by a visual culture." (Payne 12-13) Lukacs noted that a hallmark of fascism was the aesthetization of politics, which he proposed to counter with a politicization of aesthetics.

FASCISM AS HATRED OF WOMEN

Given the Obama campaign's systematic vilification of Senator Clinton, Chelsea Clinton, Geraldine Ferraro, and many others as women, it is interesting and significant to find that contempt for women was a common characteristic of fascist movements. As Payne writes, "Another fundamental characteristic was extreme insistence on what is now termed male chauvinism and the tendency to exaggerate the masculine principle in almost every aspect of activity." This aspect of fascism has been termed "radical misogyny or flight from the feminine, manifesting itself in a pathological fear of being engulfed by anything in external reality associated with softness, with dissolution, or the uncontrollable." In Payne's view, "No other kind of movement expressed such complete horror at the slightest suggestion of androgyny." Part of the problem was perhaps bit more than a few of the German fascist leaders were themselves closet homosexuals, as in the case of Ernst Röhm, the leader of the SA Brown Shirts, and one of Hitler's most formidable rivals for leadership of the National Socialist movement. Obama has been widely accused of the Internet of being a secret bisexual. His attempt at bowling before the Pennsylvania primary called forth such epithets as prissy, dainty, effete, and languid from media observers, with the Wonkette blog asking, "If he bowls like a fag, does that mean he is one?"

FASCISM AS YOUTH CULT

The Obama campaign has been described by commentators as a youth movement, although there appears to be some question about how accurate this is. If this is true, it is yet another strong similarity between Obama and the earlier fascists. Payne writes: "Fascist exaltation of the youth was unique, however, in that it not only made a special appeal to them but also exalted youth over all other generations, without exception, and to a greater degree than any other force based itself on generational conflict. This no doubt stemmed in part from the lateness of fascism and the identification of the established forces, including much of the left, with leaders and members from the older, pre-war generation. It also stemmed in part from the organic concept of the nation and of youth as its new life force, and from the predominance of youth in struggle and militarization." (Payne 13-14)

Even though fascist ideology was populist, the visible leadership structure of fascist movements was overwhelmingly elitist, to say nothing of the bankers and financiers who provided the indispensable cash support for these demagogic political formations. As Payne notes, many sociologists have pointed out that "nearly all parties and movements depend on elites and leadership but some recognize the fact more explicitly and carry it to greater lengths. The most unique feature of fascism in this regard was the way in which it combined populism and elitism. The appeal to the entire people and nation, together with the attempts to incorporate the masses in both the structure and myth, was accompanied by a strong formal emphasis on the role and function of an elite, which was held to be both uniquely fascist and indispensable to any achievement." (Payne 14)

Today in the United States it is stubbornly assumed that fascism must always be an extreme right-wing movement, but this is far from an accurate description of the genesis of fascism. Italian fascism was the prototype for all other fascism, and was extremely influential internationally, and Italian fascism was initially much more of a left wing phenomenon than a right-wing one. The important fact to remember is that Italian leftists had played a very important role in efforts to have Italy intervene in World War I on the side of the British and French, and this made left wing nationalism a potent and aggressive force after the war had ended.

Benito Mussolini, in some ways the inventor of fascism and the first fascist dictator, was anything but a typical right-wing reactionary. He was born in 1883 in the Romagna, an area of Italy which was noted for its radical, left-wing and anti-Roman Catholic politics. His parents admired the Mexican leader, Benito Juarez, for whom they named their son. Mussolini was an elementary school teacher and a leading member of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI). He worked as a newspaper editor in the city of Trieste, which at that time was part of the Austrian Empire; he was expelled by the Austrians because of his militant Italian nationalist viewpoint. He was part of the self-styled revolutionary and anti-reformist leadership group which took control over the PSI in 1912. At this time he and his associates received the enthusiastic endorsement of no less a personage than the Russian revolutionary leader V. I. Lenin, who shared Mussolini's dislike for parliamentary methods. Mussolini became the editor of the PSI daily newspaper, *Avanti!* Mussolini broke with the PSI official line of anti-militarism and non-interventionism after the start of World War I; in mid-November 1914, he launched his own newspaper, called *Il Popolo d'Italia*, with money from the British, the French, and from the arms manufacturers and other pro-war business interests. This new daily paper campaigned incessantly for Italy to enter the war on the side of Britain and France. In May 1915, Mussolini helped to organize the Radiant May (*maggio radioso*), a series of demonstrations in Rome designed among other things to attempt to discredit former Prime Minister Giolitti, the main moderate conservative nationalist, and to intimidate the parliament into declaring war, which soon occurred.

MUSSOLINI FOUNDS ITALIAN FASCISM, MILAN, MARCH 23, 1919

The foundation of the first Italian fascist organization is widely agreed to have occurred in Piazza San Sepolcro in Milan on March 23, 1919 with the creation of a new revolutionary nationalist movement called the Fasci Italiani di Combattimento (very roughly, Italian fighting groups) at a meeting attended by some 200 persons. The majority of those present were either leftists or former leftists who had gone over to more nationalistic agitation. The participants in this landmark meeting would largely be drawn from four distinct groups. The first were revolutionary syndicalists and national syndicalists, people we might today call extremely aggressive trade union militants with anarchist, antistate (or "libertarian") and anti-politician overtones. There were a number of former members of the Italian Socialist Party who had left that party in order to support Italian entry into World War I. Among these was Mussolini himself. A third important group were the Futurists, who were members and political supporters of an important school of visual arts and literature, sometimes also called the cubo-futurists. We can think of these people as avant-garde painters, writers, and composers; the most famous of them was Marinetti. A fourth and final group were the *arditi*, veterans of the special forces commando units of the Italian Army during World War I. Many of them still wore their distinctive black uniforms, and this launched the idea of fascism as black-shirts, giving rise to the notion of fascism as a shirt movement with each national group favoring shirts of a special color. The majority of the participants were between 20 and 40 years of age, and the largest single professional group represented were the writers and journalists – quite possibly the media whores of the day. The creative class, as we can see, turned out in force to help found fascism. Mussolini described this new group as an "anti-party," and criticized customary political methods as rigid and sterile. The program of this new group has been described as "basically leftist, sometimes revolutionary," and is a far cry from what organized fascism later advocated. It was in any case a program explicitly presented in support of Italian imperialism. At this early phase, Mussolini was primarily concerned with recruiting large numbers politically naïve young people from the widest possible area of the left and the center. "The Fasci were in fact neither fish nor fowl, nationalist but leftist…." (Payne 89 ff.)

D'ANNUNZIO'S FASCIST PILOT PROJECT IN FIUME, 1919-1920

If Mussolini was gaining the support of Marinetti, the most famous Italian painter, the most famous Italian poet, the decadent Gabriele D'Annunzio, was creating his own separate pilot project for fascism. D'Annunzio, joined by several thousand disgruntled war veterans and fervently idealistic students, seized control of the city of Fiume on the Adriatic Sea near Italy's eastern border, where he functioned as the ruler of a quasi-independent city state for some 15 months. D'Annunzio's constitution for Fiume took the form "a relatively democratic structure of corporatism" which strove to be three things — "corporatist, nationalist, and nominally democratic." (Payne 92-93) It was under these partially leftist auspices that D'Annunzio elaborated much of what was to become a typical fascist aesthetic: "…D'Annunzio succeeded in creating a new style of political liturgy made up of elaborate uniforms, special ceremonies, and chants, with speeches from the balcony of city hall to massed audiences in the form of a dialogue with the leader. In other key contributions to what soon became 'fascist style,' D'Annunzio and his followers adopted the black shirts of the *arditi* as their uniform, employed the Romans salute of raising the right arm, developed mass rallies, brought out the hymn *Giovinezza* (Youth), organized their armed militia precisely into units, and developed a series of special chants and symbols." (Payne 92)

The marked left wing tendencies of Italian fascism began to disappear towards the end of 1920 and the beginning of 1921, but some of these elements persisted well into the late summer of 1921. As late as May 1921, Mussolini "was still thinking of the possibility that the movement would crystallize in a possible 'Fascist Labor Party' or 'National Labor Party.' On May 22 he announced that the republicanism of the Fasci must be accentuated and raised the possibility of a new agreement with the Socialists — assuming they would shed their internationalism and class revolutionism.… Mussolini… still could not imagine taking a categorically anti-leftist position." Mussolini had to jettison his "lingering leftist loyalties" before he could create the National Fascist Party (PNF) in November 1921. (Payne 99-101) it was only in the early 1922 that Mussolini announced that "il mondo va a destra" – the world is turning right, while parliamentary democracy and socialism were in decline. The 20th century, Mussolini argued, would be an aristocratic century dominated by new elites — notions which are not alien to Obama's elitist and anti-blue collar supporters today.

One more phase of Il Duce's career deserves attention, and that is the final phase. Mussolini was ousted as dictator of Italy in July 1943, and was imprisoned on a mountain in southern Italy called the Gran Sasso d'Italia. He was rescued by Otto Skorzeny and his SS commandos and taken behind the German lines. Here Mussolini created a German-controlled puppet state in northern Italy which called itself the Italian Social Republic (RSI). This regime turned out to be much more radical than anything the Duce had tried during his 20-year dictatorship in Rome. The RSI, also known as the Salò republic after the small town which was its nominal capital, introduced corporatist self-management by workers acting through assemblies and councils. The old National Fascist Party (PNF) was re-baptized as the Revolutionary Fascist Party. According to one commentator, "This represented Mussolini's revenge against the bourgeoisie and the rightist elite whom he believed had thwarted fascism." Ernst Nolte, one of the leading theoreticians of fascism, felt that Mussolini had remained in many ways a Marxist as long as he lived: "The *finalità* [goal] of Marxism continued to live in him, even if he was not aware of it." (Payne 413) In sum, it can hardly be denied that leftism and fascism cannot be seen as polar opposites or incompatible impulses, but must rather be regarded as inextricably intertwined. The implications for the Obama phenomenon are obvious and ominous.

Today's Obama campaign may be considered as a vaguely left of center force to shore up US imperialism and restore the lost prestige and power of the United States in the world. Obama, it must be repeated, has successfully imposed the current US government policy of indiscriminate bombing and killing of Pakistanis in the North West areas of that country. Obama's demand for a unilateral bombing of Pakistan makes him unquestionably the most aggressive warmonger in the 2007-2008 Democratic field, and also makes him a more extreme warmonger than Bush. Many Obama supporters seem happy with imperialist efforts intervene in the internal affairs of Pakistan for the purpose of overthrowing the Musharraf regime. Many Obama supporters are urgently calling for the bombing Sudan for reasons connected with the situation in Darfur. Many of them also support the Brzezinski plan of kicking the Chinese out of Africa. The rationale for this among Obama's supporters is their idea that the Chinese are carrying ethnocide or cultural genocide by building the railroad and road infrastructure which Africa has always lacked. Needless to say, there are also large numbers of Obama supporters who are demanding a US confrontation with the People's Republic of China in support of the demands of the Dalai Lama, a feudal monster and a spokesman for one of the most hideously parasitical landlord classes to be found anywhere in the world today. The Obama lemmings do not like the war in Iraq, but on Pakistan, Darfur, and Tibet many Obama supporters are much more aggressive than Bush-Cheney. Once we recognize that the Obama movement is in fact a vaguely left of center mobilization in support of a new set of aggressive imperialist adventures, its similarity to the early phases of Mussolini's fascism becomes more evident.

FALLOWS: OBAMA IS LIKE MARSHAL PÉTAIN AND JIMMY CARTER

James Fallows of the *Atlantic Monthly*, a Carter White House veteran who may have helped with the *malaise* speech of July, 1979, and a keeper of the Obama flame, has published a remarkably frank assessment of the Perfect Master, in which Fallows confesses that he sees Obama as similar in many ways to Marshal Pétain of France, the leader of Vichy France, the Nazi puppet state in southern France between 1940 and 1943. Pétain escaped execution as a Nazi collaborator (the Prime Minister of Vichy, Pierre Laval, was in fact shot for treason) primarily because he was aged and had been the hero of Verdun in World War I. Pétain was a puppet, a defeatist, and a pessimist, and his Vichy regime is one of the variants which are generally used to make generalizations about fascism. This makes it all the more notable that Fallows sees common ground among Pétain, Carter, and Obama. Fallows writes: 'I am very sensitive to the perils of this approach because the man I worked for, Jimmy Carter, was elected in large part as a national savior—a good, religious, "never lie to you" president to fill the moral void created by Richard Nixon, Watergate, and Vietnam. Charles Peters, of *The Washington Monthly*, once compared Carter to the figurehead leader of Vichy France, Marshal Pétain. Each man, in this view, offered to save the nation through his own personal qualities. In Carter's case, those turned out to be no match for the disasters of the late '70s. For instance: in the spring of 1980, as Carter ran for reelection, the prime interest rate was 20 percent. The argument that Obama would be another Pétain-like Carter, offering his noble qualities only to be overwhelmed by ignoble reality, is the deepest fear about him, or at least the one that most resonates with me. The greatest hope is that before his brief time in the U.S. Senate, he absorbed more practical skills and sensibilities than Carter did in Georgia. Michael Janeway, who as dean of the Medill Journalism School at Northwestern knew the Chicago establishment figures who nurtured Obama's rise in the 1990s, speaks of "the Chicago way"—"getting all the parties together and taking responsibility for finding a solution." Under the Chicago way, the fact that Obama's most important speeches are short on eight-point action plans is a strength rather than a weakness: it's a sign that serious business will be done.'[221] Of course, the "Chicago way" in reality is nothing

but the method of the Illinois Combine, an ongoing criminal organization of racketeers who are also elected officials. As for the alleged noble qualities of Pétain and Obama, it is hard to see what they might be.

THE OBAMA PROJECT AND IMPERIAL DECLINE: A ROMAN PARALLEL

Contemporary American opinion seems to regard the prospect of a member of a minority group assuming state power as president as a totally unmixed blessing. But a glance at the history of prominent world empires suggests that this turn to minority rule may be fraught with many dangers, and may indeed represent a symptom of Imperial decline, especially when the aspiring candidate has no significant reform agenda, but rather intends to increase the virulence of the self-destructive tendencies already present in the system. The general pattern is that when the core imperial ethnic group begins to lose vitality and to veer into decadence and lethargy, the expedient of bringing in foreign adventurers as imperial bureaucrats is tried, quite often with very unsatisfactory results. Sometimes the ethnic group which dominates the imperial oligarchy (i.e., the senatorial class) is also so discredited that it needs to hide behind the mask of some other ethnicity. The Chinese Empire had a very long history of absorbing foreign conquerors, and the details of this are far too complex to be even mentioned here, but it is true that the last Chinese dynasty, the Manchu, was founded by a peripheral minority people who were not identical with the mainline Han Chinese. The Ottoman Turkish empire always had a tendency to give key administrative jobs to Greeks, Venetians, and Armenians, but there is some indication that this tendency increased as the empire declined.

The British Empire paid a great deal of attention to the Copts, Greeks, Armenians, and Jews of the Ottoman Empire, since it sought to mobilize these ethnic minorities against the Ottoman Central Government. The Copts, for example, were a favorite choice of the British when it came to appointing the governments of their Egyptian protectorate, as we can see in the case of the Boutros-Ghali family. In the last half-century of the British Empire, some of the same ethnic groups began to take over important administrative functions in the court, the foreign office, and the city of London, and we are doubtless on firm ground in a surfing that this increased ethnic diversity did nothing to slow the collapse of the empire. The Prussian ruling class of the German Empire was more interested in cultural uniformity and less willing to tolerate ethnic diversity than most imperial ruling classes, and therefore the coming of a ruler in 1933 who was Austrian and not Prussian or even German (based on the map of the time) was a radical departure, and it was of course followed are the most catastrophic results. We have already noted that when the foreign policy of the Russian Empire began to be managed by people like Pozzo di Borgo, Nesselrode, and Kapodistrias, who were not Russians, but a Corsican, a German, and a Venetian Greek, that empire was in serious decline. Therefore, the fatuous and superficial optimism of many US observers about the notion of a president for the first time from the Afro-American minority group may be completely unjustified.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF COLLECTIVE GUILT

St. Thomas Aquinas was on the right track when he declared that no guilt can attach to any person for the actions of others not under his or her control. After 1945, it became fashionable to argue in some quarters to argue that there was a German collective guilt for the crimes of the Hitler regime – meaning that the German housewife or factory worker somehow just as responsible for the Nazi crimes as bankers like Schacht and Thyssen, or politicians like von Papen. It is necessary vigorously to reject any notion of German collective guilt (*Sippenhaft* or *Kollektivschuld*) for

National Socialism. People are responsible for their own actions, and not for the actions of others. The theory of German collective guilt is a deliberate mystification, first of all because it places helpless little people on the same level of responsibility with powerful individuals who could have and should have influenced the course of events in another way. German collective guilt also masks the responsibility of important foreigners. Americans like Prescott Bush and John Foster Dulles were important backers of Hitler's seizure of power in January 1933. The most active support for Hitler came from Lady Astor, and their Cliveden Set, where we find Lord Brand, Lord Lothian, Lord Halifax, and Sir Neville Chamberlain. Another key British backer of Hitler was Lord Montagu Norman, the Governor of the Bank of England, who made possible the financial stabilization of the Nazi regime during its first months in power. Henry Deterding, the boss of Royal Dutch Shell, was another prominent backer of National Socialism. German collective guilt is therefore a cover story for the main culprits.

By the same token, we must formally and categorically reject any idea of the collective guilt of the American people. The crimes of the Bush regime, for example, are the crimes of the Bush regime. They are the crimes of the individuals who actually carried them out, and not of the American people as a whole, who actually voted twice to defeat Bush, but were overruled by a very effective vote fraud machine, with the help of the same controlled corporate media who are swooning for Barky today. The American people who are alive today are not responsible for slavery, or other crimes and abuses of the nineteenth century. The slave system was maintained by a three-cornered cooperation among southern planter oligarchs, New York City bankers and cotton brokers, and City of London interests. This is who was responsible for slavery, and not some poverty-stricken southern sharecropper or northern "mudsill," as they used to be called. Individuals have free will, and they are responsible for what they do and do not do, but they are not responsible for the actions of others, and certainly not for actions carried out long before they were born. Anyone who attempts to impose a theory of collective guilt on the American people is fabricating a big lie, very likely with the goal of provoking some irrational backlash of ill-considered reaction, quite possibly in the form of some subsequent phase of fascism. Those who preach collective guilt are, in short, provocateurs.

A DISTANT MIRROR FOR OBAMA: SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS, ROMAN EMPEROR

A distant mirror for these questions may well be provided by the history of the Roman empire.[222] The reign of the Emperor Commodus (180–192 AD), who was the son of the famous Stoic Marcus Aurelius and who survived one assassination attempt before succumbing to another, brought the Antonine dynasty to an end, and marked the transition from a period of stagnation and slow decline into a time of more acute crisis. The murder of Commodus is associated with the end of the *Pax Romani*, or "Roman Peace," and the onset of the long decline of the Roman Empire. The end of Commodus began the Year of the Five Emperors in 193, when there were five contenders for title of Roman Emperor. The five were the City Prefect Pertinax, Didius Julianus, Pescennius Niger in Syria, Clodius Albinus in Britain, and Septimius Severus in Pannonia.

Septimius Severus was by most accounts a dark-skinned native of Libya in North Africa; some Afrocentric historians have identified him and celebrated him as the first black emperor of Rome. But being black or nearly black did not prevent him from representing a catastrophic turning point in Roman history. Septimius Severus had allied himself with a prominent Syrian family by his marriage to Julia Domna. In the same way, Obama's marriage to Michelle allied him with the Daley machine, her family business. Septimius Severus may not have been the only dark-skinned contender at this point, as suggested by the name of his rival Pescennius Niger, since "niger" means

black or dark, and he is described as a "black man" in some translations of the contemporary writer Cassius Dio. But there are others who say that this was just a nickname, and that Pescennius Niger was not African. After disposing of all of his rivals, Septimius Severus assumed power and founded a dynasty that would extend through increasingly troubled times to include himself (193–211), his notoriously cruel and vindictive son Caracalla (211–217), Macrinus (217–218), the monster Elagabalus or Heliogabalus (218–222), and Alexander Severus (222–235).

SEPTIMIUS' LARGER ARMY AND PAY HIKES START THE GREAT ROMAN HYPERINFLATION

Because of his status as an outsider and a general, Septimius Severus decided to lean on the praetorian guard in the Roman army, while freezing out many representatives of the Roman Senate, where the leading oligarchs assembled. In order to win the loyalty of the Army, he substantially increased the rates of pay, creating a very serious budget deficit that was the main cause contributing to the beginning of hyperinflation. The hyperinflation which was launched by Septimius Severus kept going for 300 years, and was one of the biggest causes of the final collapse of the Roman empire and of western civilization itself. He also substituted equestrian officers for senators in key administrative positions. Not surprisingly, Septimius Severus' relations with the Senate were very poor, and to compensate for this he had to appeal to the city mob as well as to the army, which cost even more money. Septimius Severus also abolished the local regular standing jury courts, which dated back to Republican times. He was also an energetic persecutor of Christians and Jews.

Obama for his part has promised to increase the size of the United States Armed Forces by about 100,000 troops — a very sinister and hugely expensive detail which many of his fawning left-liberal acolytes are incapable of comprehending. There are, however, widespread reports of grave discontent and deep suspicion on the part of top generals and admirals towards the *parvenu* Obama. How might Obama attempt to secure support from the Pentagon, or at least stave off a mutiny or a military counter-coup? One way would clearly be to imitate Septimius Severus and radically raise military pay rates, benefits, and bonuses in the form of a thinly disguised bribe for the officer class. The record of the dynasty founded by Septimius Severus suggests that once a bidding war of this type has begun it is almost impossible to stop, and often ends with tremendous political instability as the monetary demands of the praetorian class become greater and greater, notwithstanding the evident economic crisis of the empire.

CARACALLA'S POLITICAL REPRESSION

For our analytical purposes here, it will be convenient to compare Obama to the three most important figures of the Septimius Severus dynasty, namely Septimius Severus himself, his son Caracalla, and the notorious Heliogabalus. When Septimius Severus died, there was a violent succession fight which ended when Caracalla succeeded in killing his brother Geta. Caracalla was noted for lavish bribes to the praetorians, and also for his legendary cruelty, which was expressed in the form of numerous assassinations of his real or imagined enemies and rivals. Michelle Obama may find her own distant mirror among the strong-willed and ambitious women of the Severan dynasty, beginning with Septimius Severus's wife Julia Domna, who schemed and plotted to help her husband become Emperor. Among the other influential women of this disastrous dynasty we find Julia Maesa, sister of Julia Domna, and Maesa's two daughters, Julia Soaemias, mother of the

monster Heliogabalus, and Julia Avita Mamaea, mother of Alexander Severus. It was in fact this feminine cabal that secured the throne for Heliogabalus in 218.

HELIOGABALUS: TEENAGE EMPEROR AND MONSTER

Heliogabalus provides lasting proof that the participation of young people in politics is not necessarily a good thing, since he was only about 15 years old when he seized the Imperial throne, and racked up his entire record of monstrous slaughters and perversions before he was liquidated somewhat short of the age of 20. Heliogabalus ranks with Nero and Caligula as one of the greatest monsters to rule Rome. According to some reports, he suffocated the guests at one of his dinner parties by releasing masses of rose petals on them from above. He married one of the vestal virgins, a very serious violation of Roman tradition and law. Like Nero, he also married one of his own male lovers. He is said to have prostituted himself inside his own Imperial Palace. One of Heliogabalus' obsessions was his quest to obtain a sex change operation so that, like Tiresias, he could also experience life as a woman. Heliogabalus has often been characterized by modern writers as transgender, most likely transsexual. The parallels to Obama's reported homosexuality and bisexuality are evident. With Heliogabalus devoting so much time and energy to these lascivious activities, the administration of the empire fell into the hands of his grandmother and mother (Julia Soamias). Late in his reign, Heliogabalus replaced Jupiter, the central figure of the Roman pantheon, with a new Oriental god, *Deus Sol Invictus*, whose original name, Elagabalus or El-Gabal, happened to be identical with the Emperor's own assumed name. Heliogabalus forced the Roman notables to comply with these changes, meaning that by praying to the new god they would be praying to the Emperor at the same time. Julia Maesa in particular was aware that the outrageous behavior of Heliogabalus was likely to trigger a rebellion, and could easily lead to the loss of power by the family as a whole. She therefore organized a conspiracy which led to the assassination of Heliogabalus and the installation of Alexander Severus, the last of the dynasty, in 222. Alexander won some successes against the Persian Empire in the East, but his increasing inability to control the money-hungry army led eventually to its mutiny and his assassination in 235. Heliogabalus' religious edicts were reversed and the statue of El-Gabal, which Heliogabalus had erected for public worship, was removed from Rome. Women were barred from ever attending meetings of the Senate. The extreme sanction of *damnatio memoriae*—erasing and expunging a person from all public records—was decreed upon Heliogabalus.

THE BREAKDOWN CRISIS OF THE THIRD CENTURY, 235-284 AD

The death of Alexander Severus began a period of about half a century which can be considered the first collapse of the Roman Empire. This period is known as the crisis of the third century, extending from 235-284 AD. It is also called the period of the "military anarchy." During this time, as a direct consequence of the abuses and failures of the Septimius Severus dynasty, the Empire underwent military, political and economic crises and began to collapse. The leading factors in this collapse were a constant series of barbarian invasions by Germanic tribes coming out of Central Asia, a civil war inside the empire, and the galloping hyperinflation which had been triggered by Septimius Severus' increase in the size and pay scales of the Army. The crisis of the third century was marked by acute political instability, with about 25 Emperors seizing and losing power, usually by assassination, in a period of 50 years. Many of these emperors were lower-class adventurers, and a number were quite exotic, such as the Emperor Philip the Arab. The western provinces of the empire broke away to form an ephemeral empire of Gaul, while the Eastern provinces created an equally unstable empire of Palmyra.

At the same time, a series of barbarian invasions by Carpians, Goths, Vandals, and Alamanni occurred, supplemented by attacks from the Sassanid Persians in the east. The strength of the empire was undermined by the runaway hyperinflation caused by many years of debasing the coinage. This had started earlier under the Severan emperors who enlarged the army by one quarter and doubled the base pay. As each new upstart barracks Emperor took power, they had to loot the treasury and the merchant class to quickly raise the money needed to pay the expected "accession bonus" to the troops, and this was often accomplished by clipping coins and minting new coinage with more copper and lead. The easiest way to do so was by simply cutting the silver in coins and adding less valuable metals. This total crisis of the empire is often thought of as marking the transition between classical Greco-Roman civilization and late antiquity, or the beginning of the dark ages. A relative stabilization of the empire was reached about 284 with the coming of Diocletian, but then in such a way that guaranteed the final collapse a couple of centuries later.

The reforms of Diocletian boiled down to preserving a semblance of imperial power based on a zero-growth totalitarian military autocracy that was doomed to an eventual collapse. One of the main problems was that during the crisis of the third century, lawlessness, piracy, and brigandage had expanded to such a scale that the Roman roads and the sea lanes of *mare nostrum* (the Mediterranean) were no longer safe for merchants to travel, while the currency crisis made any system of payments unstable and chaotic. Trade inside the empire had suffered a collapse from which it would never recover. This led to tendencies towards local self-sufficiency, giving rise over time to the manorial system, accompanied by the dominance of the feudal aristocracy who ruled over a population of proto-serfs who had given up most of their liberty in exchange for food and protection. In late Roman times these serfs became a half-free class of citizens known as *coloni*. Even though a semblance of political unity was restored under Diocletian, dozens of important cities in the western part of the empire had been largely destroyed, and their populations forced to flee. Most of these cities would never recover for centuries to come. The atmosphere of general insecurity is reflected by the city walls that had to be put up to defend important commercial centers, including Rome itself.

ULPIAN: WHAT PLEASES THE PRINCE HAS THE FORCE OF LAW

For a sampling of the political mentality of these times, we can turn to the Roman jurist Domitius Ulpianus (died 228), known as Ulpian. Ulpian was appointed by Septimius Severus to the Council of State, and under Caracalla was master of the requests (*magister libellorum*). He was driven out of office by Heliogabalus but brought back by Alexander, whom he served as chief adviser. He was killed by the soldiers in 208 AD when he tried to crack down on some of the abusive privileges enjoyed by the praetorian guard. Some of Ulpian's sayings are simply edifying propaganda of the hope and change variety such as his one-liner "Law is the art of the good and the fair." *(Jus est ars boni et aequi.)* Much more to the point is another saying which expresses the spirit of every totalitarian regime down to the present day: "The sovereign is not bound by the laws." *(Princeps legibus solutus est.)* Bush believes that, and his fellow megalomaniac Obama probably will lodge a similar claim. Another of Ulpian's sayings captures some of the spirit of the 20th century dictators: "What pleases the prince has the force of law." (*Quo principi placuit legis habet vigorem.*)

All of these developments can be thought of as a result of the institutional and economic processes which had been set in motion by the dynasty founded by Septimius Severus. If this phase of Roman history can provide any insight into our own time, we may be facing a process of

galloping hyperinflation, the breakdown of internal order, institutional dissolution, military defeat abroad, civil war, and social chaos under a possible Obama regime.

A WEATHERMAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE?

Character is destiny. Biography is destiny. We have no crystal ball to predict the detailed evolution of a future Obama regime; we have nothing but the certainty that it will be a disaster. Obama is drawn to his terrorist friends Ayers and Dohrn not just because he needs their money, their network support, and their access to foundation funding. Obama is close to Ayers and Dohrn because he genuinely finds them congenial, not just at the level of small talk and parenting, but rather at the level of the deepest psychological affinities and philosophical commitments which a person like Obama is capable of. The terrorist Weathermen, during their heroic or terrorist phase, were the most concentrated expression of the class hatred for American working people on the part of the financier elites and their dupes and retainers in affluent suburbia. The Weatherman outlook had passed far beyond the cynical hypocrisy of a Nixon to attain a cynical nihilism that was fascist in every way. Ayers and Dohrn expressed this hatred with their bombs, with their praise of Manson, with their fork salutes. Ward Churchill, another Weatherman who figures in the lives of Ayers and Dohrn, expressed the same hatred with his desire for the annihilation of the United States from the planet. James Cone, the teacher of Wright, acted out this hatred with his fervent prayer for a god who would kill white people. All of these figures are the provocateurs and ideologues of a dying imperialism in the process of transforming itself into a death cult. This is the outlook which Barack Hussein Obama, with his background in Rousseauvian anthropology, diluted Marxism, Nietzschean protofascism, postmodernist rejection of reality, and Fanon's existentialist worship of violence, finds in himself. This is why he can so successfully read from the Teleprompter the fascist rantings composed by his Goebbels detachment, Axelrod and Favreau. This is why Obama talks like a fascist and is a fascist in the tradition of the young Mussolini, and why, with the help of Trilateral-Bilderberger media, money, and networks, he has already gone far towards assembling a fascist mass movement (or reasonable media facsimile thereof) around himself.

So, if we want to know his real program of government, we need to go back to the last Weatherman war council in Michigan, before the townhouse blew up and before they all went into clandestine safe houses. We need to recall the speech by Ted Gold, the leader of the Mad Dog faction, who had only a few months left before he would blow himself into eternity in his Greenwich Village bomb factory. As we have noted, Gold said in 1969 that the Weatherman program was that "an agency of the people of the world" would be set up to run the U.S. economy and society after the defeat of U.S. imperialism abroad. Today that would be an agency directed by people like Soros, the Rockefellers, and the other Wall Street financial parasites. They would say that the savage austerity, the declining standards of living, the growing immiseration, the strangulation of production, are all in the name of solidarity and aid for the developing countries. They would probably add something about global warming, climate change, the polar bears, and the ice caps at the North Pole to explain to people why their starving children have no health care.

But Gold's perspective, it will be remembered, was too much even for some of those attending that last Weatherman debate more than forty years ago.

"Well," replied Gold, "If it will take fascism, we'll have to have fascism."

This, we submit, is the best guide we have to Obama's intentions. His best friends in life have been Weatherman terrorists, genuine murderers, practitioners of purgative violence in the tradition of Nietzsche's blond beast. Or else they have been professional paid haters kept in business by the

foundations. Obama's campaign logo, the blue oval like a portal with stripes on the ground appears as a hybrid of the Weatherman rainbow and lightning bolt tattooed on Ayers' back and the lightning bolt in a circle which was the symbol of Sir Oswald Mosely's British Union of Fascists back in the 1930s. Obama's foreign policy will be the apocalyptic showdown with Russian and China demanded by his chief controller, Zbigniew Brzezinski. His economic policy will be to flay the American people alive with drastic economic austerity. Those who think that nothing could be worse than Bush will have to concede that when it comes to pure evil, the Trilateral Commission has a lot more imagination than they do.

The infinity of obstacles, delays, defeats, and reverses which Obama has already had to face suggest that, outside of the decadent and degenerate elites who look to Wall Street, the media, and academia for leadership, ordinary American working people are still anti-fascist. There are still vast untapped anti-fascist resources which can brought to bear to ward off Obama's monstrous project.

But now a seizure of power by the Obama postmodern fascist coup is imminent. It is time for persons of good will to mobilize.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: PRESS STATEMENT OF LARRY SINCLAIR, NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON DC, JUNE 18, 2008

Good afternoon, my name is Larry Sinclair and I am a former recreational drug user and trafficker, a convicted felon for crimes of forgery, bad checks and theft by check. I am also an American who loves this country and I cannot stay silent regarding Barack Obama knowing what I know.

Today I will discharge my obligation as a citizen to witness this knowledge to you and raise questions for others to investigate and consider. I am going to briefly describe my background, my experience with Senator Obama in 1999, what appears to me to be a coordinated effort to discredit me and finally a list of questions. After this brief statement, I will take and try to answer any reasonable questions. Background

I am 46 years old and I currently reside in Duluth, MN. I am a US Citizen, and I have made mistakes in my lifetime. I have been convicted and served prison sentences for writing bad checks, forging checks, using stolen credit card numbers in Arizona, Florida and Colorado. These event's occurred over twenty (20) years ago between 1980 thru 1986. After going public on the internet with these claims against Senator Obama earlier this year, I became aware of a warrant out of Florida from 1986 which I have resolved and it has now been dismissed. I also have an active "Colorado Only" warrant for alleged "Theft and Forgery". I am not ignoring this warrant but am addressing it with the Court in Colorado as well as with the DA's office. I have a pending motion to dismiss this warrant which I am waiting to have calendared by the Colorado Court.

I have lived and worked under three different names. My birth name is Lawrence W. Sinclair. Later on, I had my name legally changed first to La-Rye A. Silvas, and then La-Rye Vizcarra Avila. The last two were legal name changes granted by the court in Penal County Superior Court, Florence Arizona. I legally returned to my birth name in the Fremont County District court, Canon City, Colorado in 1997. Obama Incident

I flew out of Colorado Springs, Colorado to Chicago on November 2, 1999, arriving in O'Hare early in the morning of November 3, 1999. I went to the Chicago area to attend the graduation of my god son (my best friend's son) from basic training from the Great Lakes Navy Training Center. I made reservations at the Comfort Inn and Suites in Gurnee, IL based on location to the Navy Training center. On November 5, 1999, I hired the services of Five Star Limo. I had hired them for both November 5 and November 6. On November 6, 1999, I asked the limo driver – whose name I now reveal for the first time – Paramjit Multani, if he knew anyone who would like to socialize and show me Chicago. Paramjit Multani understood that I was not looking for someone who knew Chicago and would enjoy socializing. Paramjit Multani said he knew someone who was a friend of his.

On November 6, 1999 after picking me up at the Hotel in Gurnee– and this is significant – Paramjit Multani used his cellphone to make a call. That call was made to then-Illinois State Senator Barack Obama to set up an introduction between me and Senator Obama. Upon arriving at the bar and exiting the Limo, Senator Obama was standing next to Paramjit Multani and I was

introduced to Senator Obama. Later that evening at a bar which I believe was called Alibis, I mention I could use a line or two to wake up. Senator Obama asked me if I was referring to "coke" and after stating I was, Obama stated he could purchase cocaine for me and then made a telephone call – and this too is significant — from his cellphone to a presently unknown individual during which Senator Obama arranged the cocaine purchase.

Senator Obama and I then departed the bar in my limousine and proceeded to an unknown location where Senator Obama exited the limousine with two hundred fifty dollars ($250) I had given him and returned a short while later with an "eightball" of cocaine which he gave to me. I did ingest a couple of lines of cocaine, and shortly thereafter Senator Obama produced a glass cylinder pipe and packet of crack cocaine from his pants pocket and Obama smoked the crack cocaine. I performed fellatio on Senator Obama in the limousine during the time Senator Obama was smoking crack cocaine, after which I had the driver take me to the my hotel, The Comfort Suits, Gurnee, Illinois.

The following day, November 7, 1999, Senator Obama appeared at my hotel room where we again ingested cocaine and I again performed fellatio on Senator Obama. Significantly, both the driver's telephone call to Senator Obama and his call to the drug dealer should appear on the driver's and Senator Obama's cellphone billing statements. Fall 2007

In September 2007 I contacted the Presidential Campaign of Barack H. Obama, to request solely that Senator Obama publicly correct his stated drug use record to reflect his use of crack cocaine with me in November 1999. When I made that first contact I left with the Presidential Campaign of Senator Barack H. Obama a telephone number for the campaign to return my call. The first number I provided was a Texas cell phone number. From the period of Labor day weekend 2007 through November 18, 2007 I did rovide a total of four (4) different call back numbers to the Obama campaign, as I had moved and had changed the numbers to reflect locally my place of residence at the time. In late September to early October 2007, I received a call from a male who identified himself as a "Mr. Young" stating he was calling in regards to calls I had made to the Obama campaign. This first call was in fact an attempt by "Mr. Young" to obtained from me the identities of anyone I had contacted concerning my 1999 allegations against Senator Obama. This first called shocked me in that this "Mr. Young" asked me why I had not asked Senator Obama to disclose the sexual encounters I had with Mr. Obama in 1999. I was shocked as I had never mentioned to the campaign or anyone working for the campaign any sexual encounters as my call was prompted by drug allegations only. The call ended with "Mr. Young" stating I would hear from someone in a few days.

In mid to late October 2007, I received a second call from this "Mr. Young" at which time I clearly became aware that this individual was personally involved with Senator Obama rather than just an employee of his campaign. The tone of the conversation had a sexual nature. "Mr. Young" did not once advise me how he obtained my phone number which by this time had now changed to a Delaware number.

In late October 2007, I received a text message from the gentleman identified as "Mr. Young" in which he stated he was intimately involved with Senator Obama and that Obama was discussing with him and his pastor how to publicly acknowledge Senator Obama's drug use in 1999 and that Obama wanted to be sure I had not discussed the sexual encounters or drug incidents with any media at that time.

In mid to late November 2007, in another text message from "Mr. Young" , he advised me that Senator Obama will publicly correct his statement as to he last time he used drugs and I did not need to concern myself with publicly disclosing it myself. The last contact I had with "Mr. Young" was in early December 2007 when he made it clear to me that Senator Obama had no intentions of publicly acknowledging his 1999 use of crack cocaine and that "Mr. Young" was in fact doing nothing more than milking information from me for Senator Obama's use.

I later learned that a Donald Young was the choir director of Reverend Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ – Obama's now-former church — and was openly a homosexual. I also learned that he was murdered on December 23, 2007. I have cooperated with the Chicago Police Department in this matter by providing them the telephone numbers I was using during the fall of 2007 and I release them now publically in the hope that someone may be able to connect the dots between these telephone numbers and Mr. Young. Those numbers are: 954-758-1105, 956-758-1885, 956-758-8002, 02-685-7175; 612-466-1043.

In what I now realize was a naive and un-counseled decision, I posted in January 2008 a video on YouTube.com where I related the above information regarding my liaisons with Senator Obama in 1999. The response was overwhelming and I quickly became the recipient of what in hindsight appears to have been a coordinated attack on my character with ever increasing falsehoods circulating on the internet.

In response I agreed to take a polygraph test from Whitehouse.com. The results of that test have been partially revealed to the end of labeling me a liar and taken as gospel by all. I would like to make the following comments about that polygraph test. First, I have been subsequently advised that Whitehouse.com was a website dedicated to anti-Clinton pornography until earlier this year. Second, I have now come to understand that lie detectors are junk science at best which is why courts of law refuse to use them. Third, a review of the results by George W. Maschke, Ph.D. of AntiPolygraph.org raises serious questions about the legitimacy of the examination. Indeed, overlooked by almost everyone is that hitehouse.com's own examiner, Dr. Gordon Barland, observed that on the drug question regarding Senator Obama that the computerized score found that there was less than a 1% probability of deception by me. That's about as high a passing score as one can possibly attain.

Finally, in February 2008 I was told anonymously that Dan Parisi of Whitehouse.com received $750,000 from the Obama campaign through AKR Media to organize an effort to publically discredit me. When I confronted Dan Parisi with this allegation, he did not deny it but instead withdrew the second exonerating polygraph report of Dr. Gordon Barland, failed to post the video of my polygraph as he and Whitehouse.com promised they would do, and even removed posts from their web site altogether, claiming that they had "had enough of the attacks by Sinclair's supporters and Sinclair himself."

The polygraph results - as misrepresented – were immediately seized upon by the blogger community and I became the subject of vicious lies about me. I was forced to file a lawsuit in an attempt to stop those lies about me that have been circulating. That lawsuit sought to obtain the proof of what I was saying about my contact with Senator Obama through subpoenas for the identities of the anonymous bloggers so they could be linked to the Obama campaign and relevant records of the cellphone companies to prove the truth of my allegations. To date, though the lawsuit

is now over ninety days old, Judge Kennedy has refused to permit the suit to move forward so this evidence may be obtained. Conclusion

In sum, you can discredit my story and then make your decision on who should be the next President of the United States. The burden is now off me as I have told my story without the distortions that have been intentionally heaped on me in what my lawyer tells me is an ad hominem attack – shoot the messenger so you don't have to hear the message he is bringing. I am now done. It is for others to find the corroborating evidence of my story by locating the limousine driver – Jagir P. Multani – and the telephone numbers related to Donald Young and/or Senator Obama. I leave you with these questions that I have asked of Senator Obama but which he – who wants to be the next President of the United States – has refused to answer:

1. Why won't Senator Obama provide his cellphone numbers and telephone records for all his personal and official cell phones held by him for the time period of November 3, 1999 thru November 8, 1999, when we met?

2. Why won't Senator Obama provide his cellphone numbers and telephone records for all his personal and official cell phones held by Senator Obama or September 2007 – December 23, 2008, the murder of Donald Young?

3. Why won't Senator Obama provide all email communication both personal and campaign related to and/or from AKP Message & Media from January 18, 2008 through February 29, 2008 for Senator Obama, David Axelrod and David Plouffe?

4. Why won't Senator Obama provide proof of all payments made from AKP Message & Media, Obama for America, David Axelrod, David Plouffe, and Senator Obama's accounts for the period of January 18, 2008 through February 29, 2008?

On my website – larrysinclair.org – you will find the documents that I have referred to in this statement. A copy of the home page for that website is attached. Thank you for your time and attention this afternoon and I will now take any questions.

- E n d -

APPENDIX II. PRESS RELEASE OF PHILIP J. BERG, PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST 21, 2008

Philip J. Berg, Esq. Files Federal Lawsuit Requesting Obama Be Removed as a Candidate as he does not meet the Qualifications for President

Suit filed 08/21/08, No. 08-cv-4083

(Lafayette Hill, Pennsylvania – 08/21/08) - Philip J. Berg, Esquire, [Berg is a former Deputy Attorney General of Pennsylvania; former candidate for Governor and U.S. Senate in Democratic Primaries; former Chair of the Democratic Party in Montgomery County; former member of Democratic State Committee; an attorney with offices in Montgomery County, PA and an active practice in Philadelphia, PA], filed a lawsuit in Federal Court today, **Berg vs. Obama, Civil Action**

No. 08-cv-4083, seeking a Declaratory Judgment and an Injunction that Obama does not meet the qualifications to be President of the United States. Berg filed this suit for the best interests of the Democratic Party and the citizens of the United States. "Eighteen million Democratic Primary voters donated money, volunteered their time and energy, worked very hard and then not only supported Senator Clinton, but voted for her and often recruited other supporters as well. All the efforts of supporters of legitimate citizens were for nothing because this man lied and cheated his way into a fraudulent candidacy and cheated legitimately eligible natural born citizens from competing in a fair process and the supporters of their citizen choice for the nomination.

Philip J. Berg, Esquire stated in his lawsuit that Senator Obama:

1. Is not a natural-born citizen; and/or

2. Lost his citizenship when he was adopted in Indonesia; and/or

3. Has dual loyalties because of his citizenship with Kenya and Indonesia.

Berg stated: "I filed this action at this time to avoid the obvious problems that will occur when the Republican Party raises these issues after Obama is nominated.

There have been numerous questions raised about Obama's background with no satisfactory answers. The questions that I have addressed include, but are not limited to:

1. Where was Obama born? Hawaii; an island off of Hawaii; Kenya; Canada; or ?

2. Was he a citizen of Kenya, Indonesia and/or Canada?

3. What was the early childhood of Obama in Hawaii; in Kenya; in Indonesia when he was adopted; and later, back to Hawaii?

4. An explanation as to the various names utilized by Obama that include: Barack Hussein Obama; Barry Soetoro; Barry Obama; Barack Dunham; and Barry Dunham.

5. Illinois Bar Application – Obama fails to acknowledge use of names other than Barack Hussein Obama, a blatant lie.

If Obama can prove U.S. citizenship, we still have the issue of muti-citizenship with responsibilities owed to and allegance to other countries.

Berg continued:

Voters donated money, goods and services to elect a nominee and were defrauded by Senator Obama's lies and obfuscations. He clearly shows a conscience of guilt by his actions in using the forged birth certificate and the lies he's told to cover his loss of citizenship. We believe he does know, supported this belief by his actions in hiding his secret, in that he failed to regain his citizenship and used documents to further his position as a natural born citizen. We would also show he proclaims himself a Constitutional scholar and lecturer, but did not learn he had no eligibility to become President except by means of lying, obfuscations and deceptions. His very acts proves he knew he was no longer a natural born citizen. We believe he knew he was defrauding the country or else why use the forged birth certificate of his half sister?

Americans lost money, goods and services donated in their support of a candidate who supposedly was a natural born citizen simply because the DNC officers and party leaders looked the other way and did not demand credentials to answer the questions and prove whether or not Senator Obama was a legitimately natural born citizen, even in light of recent information that has surfaced on websites on the Internet suggesting Senator Obama may not be eligible to become President and questioning his status of multiple citizenships and questionable loyalties! If the DNC officers and.or leaders had performed one ounce of due diligence we would not find ourselves in this emergency predicament, one week away from making a person the nominee who has lost their citizenship as a child and failed to even perform the basic steps of regaining citizenship through an oath of allegiance at age eighteen [18] as prescribed by Constitutional laws!

The injunctive relief must be granted because failing to do so, this inaction defrauds everyone who voted in the Democratic Primary for a nominee that is a fair representation of the voters. Failure to grant injunctive relief would allow a corrupted, fraudulent nomination process to continue. It not only allows, but promotes an overwhelming degree of disrespect and creates such a lack of confidence in voters of the primary process itself, so that it would cement a prevailing belief that no potential candidate has to obey the laws of this country, respect our election process, follow the Constitution, or even suffer any consequence for lying and defrauding voters to get onto the ballot when they have no chance of serving if they fraudulently manage to get elected! It is unfair to

the country for candidates of either party to become the nominee when there is any question of their ability to serve if elected.

All judges are lawyers and held to a higher standard of practice than a regular lawyer. It is this Judicial standard that demands injunctive relief prayed for here. This relief is predicated upon one of the most basic premises of practicing law which states no lawyer can allow themselves to be used in furthering a criminal enterprise. And by that gauge alone, failing to give injunctive relief to the 18 million supporters of the other candidate, a true natural born citizen eligible to serve if elected, this court must not allow itself to be used to further the criminal and fraudulent acts to continue and be rewarded by becoming the Democratic Nominee. Failure to give the injunctive relief prayed for will insure that a corrupted Presidential election process will only guarantee a show of unfair preference of one group of people over another group by not demanding the same rules be applied to all groups equally and fairly, especially in light of the fact that both candidates are each considered a minority.

Philip J. Berg, Esquire
555 Andorra Glen Court, Suite 12
Lafayette Hill, PA 19444-2531

APPENDIX III: ON THE ASSASSINATION OF BILL GWATNEY, ARKANSAS STATE DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN

IS THE DEATH OF THE ARKANSAS DEMOCRATIC PARTY CHAIRMAN PART OF AN OBAMA BODY COUNT?

By Webster G. Tarpley

Washington DC, Aug. 13 -- This afternoon, Arkansas Democratic Party Chairman Bill Gwatney fell victim to what was evidently a political assassination. Gwatney was a major ally of Hillary and Bill Clinton, and was a leader of the strongly pro-Clinton Arkansas delegation to the upcoming Denver Democratic National Convention. Some had expected Gwatney to lead anti-Obama floor operations at the upcoming Denver convention.

Gwatney's Arkansas delegation was known to be a hotbed of anti-Obama sentiment, and was reportedly ready to walk out of the Denver convention if Senator Clinton were not to be treated fairly by the pro-Obama Howard Dean-Donna Brazile DNC leadership.

Observers in Washington are now asking whether the assassination of Gwatney can be read as attempted intimidation of the anti-Obama forces which are now gaining strength before the Denver convention.

Is the death of Bill Gwatney part of an Obama body count, which already includes the names of Donald Young (the murdered gay choirmaster of Rev. Wright's church) and possibly others?

[These suspicions solidified a few days later, when Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones of Ohio, one of Senator Clinton's most prominent black supporters, collapsed and died while driving her car. Her death was ruled the result of an aneurism. But this did nothing to quell suspicions that arose when two of the most important floor leaders of the Clinton forces died just days before the Denver convention, where the Obama clique was known to fear rebellion, protests, and walkouts by disenfranchised and bullied Clinton delegates.]

APPENDIX IV: MOTORMOUTH JOE BIDEN: WARMONGER, WORDMONGER, AND POLITICAL HIT MAN

By Webster G. Tarpley

Washington DC, August 28, 2008 – The vice presidential candidate chosen to run with Obama is Senator Joe Biden of Delaware, a discredited, sleazy, and shopworn political hack -- and therefore an anti-climax for all the callow and feckless youth who got the word via text message at 3am in the morning. The ability of the Trilateral-Bilderberg machine which controls Obama to put up a person like Biden already reflects the further degradation of US political life over the past 9-12 months, largely as a result of Obama's own demagogic, no-issues, personality cult agitation.

A year ago, there was wide agreement in the US middle class that Bush and Cheney should be impeached, that the police state be rolled back, and that the Iraq war should be ended as soon as physically possible. Thanks largely to the advent of the vapid and messianic Obama, these issues have now been thoroughly deflated. Biden is himself an incurable warmonger who voted for the Iraq war and blathered ceaselessly in favor of Bush's aggressive adventure to all who would listen. Naming Biden is a brutal insult to the antiwar majority of the Democratic Party, and Obama is obviously hoping that the Iraq war issue is dead, so nobody will care. Last year, Obama promised that he would work against the mentality that produced Iraq; if anyone incarnates that mentality, it is Biden. Biden is an incurable imperialist and an eager advocate of the discredited Bush-Cheney "war on terror." He even tried to use one of the Democratic debates last year to whip up hysteria in favor of attacking Sudan over the Darfur issue, and with some success. "I went there. I sat in the borders. I went in those camps. They're going to have thousands and thousands and thousands of people die. We've got to stop talking and act," Biden postured in Manchester New Hampshire on June 3, 2007 in an apparent call for bombing Sudan, a coup in Khartoum, or an invasion. Incredibly, the crowd applauded wildly.

Biden remains convinced that it is up to the United States to dictate the form of government and economic system of virtually every country in the world. His specialty is blatant interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, with left-cover of soft power issues like human rights and humanitarian concerns furnishing his favorite pretexts. Biden has learned nothing from the Iraq debacle except that Iraq was not the right victim; more appropriate victims and more effective methods will have to be found, argues Biden. The real lesson of Iraq (and Lebanon 2006) is that US-British imperialism and world domination are finished historically, but this is lost on Biden.

Biden is the author of the odious plan to balkanize, partition, and subdivide Iraq into three zones: a Kurdish state designed to carve up Iran, Syria and Turkey as well as Iraq; a landlocked and oil-poor Sunni desert entity; and an oil-rich Shiastan in the south that might absorb the Arabistan or Achwaz province of Iran is a later breakup scenario for Iran. Biden's plan is a continuation of the

Bernard Lewis plan to break up the existing states of the Middle East in a way destined to create a mosaic of pseudo-independent, squabbling mini-states or micro-states. This approach places Biden squarely behind the Zbigniew Brzezinski "dignity" doctrine of breaking up the existing nation states of the world in favor of a crazy quilt of micro-states based on ethnic and religious parochialism and particularism; not one of these micro-states could stand up to Exxon-Mobil or JP Morgan Chase.

BIDEN IS MORALLY INSANE ON GEORGIA

Biden's ample track record as an agent provocateur against Russia goes back more than a decade to the time he mobilized his mouth to help demonize Milosevic of Serbia as part of the Albright-Holbrooke-Wesley Clark anti-Russian campaign of those years, which ended with the NATO bombing of Serbia, an act of unprecedented historical vandalism. In the past week, warmonger Biden has rushed to the side of the latest tin pot mini-Mussolini of the Brzezinski-Soros faction, the infamous war criminal and gangster Mikhail Saakashvili of Georgia. "I left the country convinced that Russia's invasion of Georgia may be the one of the most significant events to occur in Europe since the end of communism," raved Biden on his return, documenting his own moral insanity by siding with the aggressor. "The claims of Georgian atrocities that provided the pretext for Russia's invasion are rapidly being disproved by international observers, and the continuing presence of Russian forces in the country has severe implications for the broader region," added the Orwellian senator.

BIDEN: $1 BILLION FOR MADMAN SAAKASHVILI

In presenting Biden, Barky reveled in Biden's "tough message" for Russia; we are sure Putin is trembling. Biden wants to prop up the madman Saakashvili with $1 billion of the US taxpayers' money, a gesture which is every bit as obscene as the worst Bush-Cheney excesses. $1 billion would get us on the road to fully funding a program like WIC (high-protein foods for expectant mothers) or Head Start, but this thought does not occur to Biden when he is trying to provoke Russia. We can see the cruel elitism of a financier-controlled Obama regime taking place before our eyes.

Obama and Biden resemble each other closely, Both are insufferable windbags besotted with their own rhetorical verbiage. Biden's celebrated gaffes will provide comic relief, as long as they do not gaffe us into World War III, which is always a distinct possibility. Obama and Biden are addicted to the sound of their own voices, and this may turn out to be the fatal flaw that sinks them when the voters get sick of the endless parade of speeches. Obama and Biden are in danger of drowning in their own endless blabber. Each one has more than a touch of megalomania, which prevents them from seeing their limits. Biden's middle name is Robinette, which is close to the term for a faucet tap in French. Biden has never been able to find the tap to turn off his own mouth.

BARKY AND BIDEN: BOTH ON THE TAKE FROM THE REZKO-CARI GANG

By now the whole world knows the story of Tony Rezko, the Chicago racketeer and gangster who has been Barky's political godfather for almost twenty years. Rezko, now a convicted felon awaiting sentencing in October, is an integral part of the bipartisan criminal enterprise known as the Illinois Combine, one of the filthiest cesspools of graft and corruption in the United States. It transpires that Joe Biden has a political godfather of his own who closely linked to Rezko, and who has also become a convicted felon by pleading guilty in the Operation Board Games investigation by the Chicago US Attorney's office. This is Joseph Cari Jr., described by the *Washington Times* of

August 28, 2008 as a "former national finance chairman for the Democratic National Committee and a longtime supporter and political adviser to Mr. Biden." Cari had extorted an $850,000 kickback from JER Inc., a Virginia investment firm that wanted to manage $850 million of retirement funds belonging to Illinois teachers. This shakedown took place under a pension fund setup which State Senator Obama had helped to put into place when he was in Springfield under the cover of giving minority firms more representation. Cari has given some $200,000 to Democratic candidates over the years, including $4,000 directly to Biden, with whom hen is closely linked. So the basis of this year's Democratic ticket is the colossal graft of the Illinois Combiner and its looting operations known under the heading of Operation Board Games. Is Biden, like Barky, subject to indictment at any time, and thus guaranteed to follow the orders of the banking establishment? The safe bet was that he is indeed.

TWO PLAGIARISTS ON THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET

Obama and Biden are both plagiarists; words are their stock in trade, and even the words are fake. It emerged this spring that Obama was spouting verbatim the canned speeches of Governor Deval Patrick of Massachusetts, his fellow clone from the Trilateral stable. Biden is a picaresque paladin of plagiarism. His 1988 presidential campaign was aborted when he was found to have stolen paragraphs of a speech by the Labour Party leader, Neil Kinnock. He had also embroidered his campaign biography. Biden had also been guilty of plagiarism at the Syracuse University law school which he attended, but he had somehow talked his way out of those charges.

BIDEN A CREATURE OF THE WORST CREDIT CARD GOUGERS

Biden represents Delaware in the US Senate. Delaware is not a state, but a giant post box for Dupont, General Motors, and many of the giant corporations and Wall Street firms. The state politics of Delaware are dictated down to the most minute detail by the bankers and their corporate lackeys, since everything depends on keeping a pro-oligarchical political climate in the state. Biden personally is a tool of MBNA, a credit card issuer that was recently absorbed by the Bank of America, which presumably now also owns Biden. Biden got at least $215,000 from MBNA over the past decade. MBNA is notoriously one of the biggest predatory lenders and interest rate gougers in the entire usurious world of credit cards, and Biden's services to them are precisely in this area: Biden was a big supporter of the 2005 bankruptcy law which makes it much harder for working families to escape debt bondage and debt slavery – just what the looters at MBNA ordered. Biden has also boasted that he wrote the ban on assault weapons, a measure that is sure to cause problems among the bitter clingers of Appalachia who are concerned about gun ownership.

Obama has voted for the rotten compromise on FISA illegal wiretaps ordered by Bush that grants retroactive immunity to the telecoms. Biden is also an enthusiastic police state totalitarian. In 1995, after the Oklahoma City false flag bombing, Biden submitted an oppressive police state bill, in many ways a precursor of Bush's infamous Patriot Act. "I drafted a terrorism bill after the Oklahoma City bombing," boasts Biden. "And the bill John Ashcroft sent up was my bill." Biden's only regret is that he was not able to undermine political freedom as much as he wanted to.

Obama's drooling acolytes have argued all summer that to name Senator Clinton to the ticket would negate Barky's profile of youth, change, hope, and so forth. Clinton has been a national figure for almost twenty years, but she has been dumped in favor of Biden, who has been in the US Senate for about 36 years and is about as stale and hackneyed as a political figure could be. The difference is that Biden's track recor5d established him as an obedient servant of the Wall Street

banks that have their post box headquarters in his state; the Clintons, by contrast, represent the closest thing we have to political combination not wholly owned by Wall Street and capable of saying no to the bankers when they demand austerity and aggression, as they are assuredly doing now. Rockefeller and Soros do not want Sen. Clinton in the presidential succession under any circumstances, and this is an important positive qualification for the New York senator.

BEAU BIDEN, THE CORRUPT ATTORNEY GENERAL OF DELAWARE

Joe Biden's son is Beau Biden, the current attorney general of Delaware. Beau is involved in one of the dirtiest enemies' list operations in recent memory against Larry Sinclair, who has come forward with explosive charges of gay sex and crack cocaine use in 1999 on the part of Obama. When Sinclair came to the National Press Club in Washington on June 18 to make his case, he was arrested on a trumped-up warrant issued by Beau Biden. Sinclair is being threatened with a long jail term, essentially because he has spoken out against Obama. It was a clear bid to do a favor for Barky and get Joe Biden on the ticket in the veep slot. That has now occurred – on the basis of a police state operation against an outspoken political opponent which goes beyond Nixon or Bush-Cheney, since Obama is not yet president and may well never be.

The Biden announcement was thoroughly botched and bungled by Axelrod, Plouffe, and Favreau. The text message gimmick is drawn straight from the Kiev Orange revolution of 2004 and the Tiflis Roses revolution of 2003, the models for Obama's attempt to seize power. The proceedings were a carnival of gaffes and Freudian slips, all ignored by Obama's loyal brigade of media whores. According to Barky, Joe Biden would help enact "a new energy policy to freeze ourselves from our dependence on foreign oil" – a chilling prospect.

"BARACK AMERICA" AND OTHER FREUDIAN SLIPS

Barky made another revealing Freudian slip: "the next President… the next Vice President – Joe Biden." Does Barky know that Biden will act as his resident in-house controller? Biden, evidently mindful that he will have to sell the radical subversive Obama as a wholesome product of the heartland, returned the gaffe by calling the presumptive nominee "Barack America" or "Barack American." Perhaps he was trying to imitate the old Subliminal Man of Saturday Night Live, but was too slow.

Behind Barky's Freudian slip is the fact that Biden will evidently run foreign policy for the clueless Obama in much the same way that Brzezinski ran foreign policy above and behind Carter, or that Cheney has run foreign policy above and behind Bush. Obama is so ignorant and cognitively impaired that he could hardly understand the instructions that bankers' spokesmen like Brzezinski and Soros will be shouting to him on the phone. This is where an experienced hack like Biden is needed. The media, in a transparent attempt to portray an apostolic succession for Biden, are still feeding the illusion that Biden was chosen by Caroline Kennedy. In reality, the choice was probably made by Trilateral-Bilderberg operative Jim Johnson, who was forced to retreat from his announced role as The Vetter by revelations about a sweetheart mortgage, but probably just kept going behind the scenes.

The Obama campaign has repeated *ad nauseam* its mantra that McCain is running for Bush's third term. McCain has answered that Obama is running for Jimmy Carter's second term. The reality may be that Joe Biden is running for Dick Cheney's third term as the resident controller of a lazy and shallow puppet president – Obama, the Manchurian candidate of the Trilateral Commission.

NOTES

[1] See http://www.duboisweb.org/greatbarrington.html
[2] Berg is a former deputy Attorney General of Pennsylvania, former candidate for Pennsylvania governor and US senator in the Democragtic primaries, former Democratic county chairman for Montgomery County, PA, and former Democratic State Commiteeman for Pennsylvania. A summary of Berg's highly persuasive arguments are included in the appendix to this book.
[3] Ruth Ndesandjo, originally Ruth Nidesand, was born in U.S. in the late 1940s, and became the third known wife of Barack Obama Senior. Ruth works today as a private Kindergarten director in Kenya. Ruth's two sons by Barack Obama Senior are Mark and David; she has another son named Joseph Ndesandjo (born around 1980) from a subsequent marriage to a Tanzanian. David died young. Mark Ndesandjo has resided since 2002 in Shenzhen, China, where he runs an Internet company called WorldNexus.
[4] Jerome Corsi points out (*Obama Nation*, p. 218) that Stanley Armour Dunham's mother, Ruth Armour Dunham, committed suicide in 1926 when she was 26 years of age after having been abandoned by her husband. It was Stanley who discovered the body of his own mother. Corsi notes that David Axelrod's father also took his own life, and suggests that Obama Senior drank and drove himself to death.
[5] Michelle Obama blurted out on July 10, 2008 in regard to Obama's mother Ann that she had been "very young and very single when she had him." http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/07/10/michelle-obama-talks-abou_n_111975.html
[6] Even Obama's birth is shrouded in mystery. The alleged birth certificate exhibited by Obama on his campaign web site lacks the raised seal which is indispensable to demonstrate authenticity. This leaves open such issues as: was Obama born in the US? Is he in fact a stateless person? The blogger Texas Darlin propounds the following questions for Obama: 'Where did Ann Dunham live while she was pregnant with Barack, especially the 6 months from Feb. to Aug. 1961? Reportedly her parents were embarrassed and upset about her pregnancy. Obama Sr. was reportedly living in a dorm at the time. Where did Ann deliver Barack? His "birth certificate" doesn't say, and I guess he's lost the original? (Although, it's very interesting to note that Obama provides details of his birth weight in *Dreams from My Father* — where did that info come from?) Wikipedia and other sources say that Barack was born at Kapiolani Medical Center in Honolulu, but are there any records of this? Why does Barack's "certification of birth" say "Date Filed" at the bottom, when the other Honolulu birth certificate on the same form that we found says "Date Accepted"? Is it possible that Barack was born someplace outside Honolulu, perhaps someplace outside the country (maybe someplace closer than Kenya), and that Ann applied for a "late arrival" birth certificate after-the-fact, which the State of Hawaii apparently allows under certain circumstances? Is it possible that leftist/Marxist foreign friends of Ann's at the Univ. of Hawaii referred her to a location outside the US to complete her pregnancy and deliver her baby? Did Ann drop out of the University when she was pregnant? If so, for how long? Does the fact that Ann was a minor when Barack was conceived relate to these events? What was the legal age for getting married in Hawaii in 1961? Who was with Ann at the time she delivered Barack? Parents, Obama Sr., or both? Why did Ann travel to Mercer Island with her newborn, and did Obama Sr. or her mother accompany her? Why hasn't the Obama campaign made Ann's mother (and Barack's grandmother), Madelyn Dunham (now 84), available? Don't presidential candidates at least minimally introduce immediate relatives to the general public? It seems that Obama is treating his grandmother like a big mystery. Why did Barack Obama make a big to-do about, and act as CO-SPONSOR for, legislation in early 08 that was introduced by his supporter Claire McCaskill resolving questions about McCain's eligibility to be President? Is it true that Obama favored a law that would allow any citizen born outside the US to be eligible for POTUS? Why did McCaskill, rather than a Republican, introduce this legislation?' (Texas Darlin, http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/23/obama-birth-mystery-cont/#more-3196) Texas Darlin later published an essay by "Judah Benjamin" which argued that 'Barack Obama was adopted by Lolo Soetoro, his Indonesian step-father, and "Barry Soetoro" acquired Indonesian citizenship as a result of that adoption AND

that he (Soetoro/Obama) may STILL hold Indonesian citizenship today. (http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/07/30/the-paper-trail-obamas-indonesian-background/#more-3881)

[7] See also Reverend James David Manning, "The Trinity of Hell," May 10, 2008, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ejTmistHFw0.

[8] http://theobamafile.com/ObamaReligion.htm

[9] http://theobamafile.com/ObamaReligion.htm

[10] http://laotze.blogspot.com/2007/01/tracking-down-obama-in-indonesia-part-3.html

[11] http://larrysinclair0926.wordpress.com/2008/04/25/chicago-pd-meet-to-be-scheduled-more-high-price-lawyers-diggcom-served/#comments

[12] Fanon citations are from *The Wretched of the Earth*, chapter VI, conclusion, transl. Dominic Tweedie.

[13] Reasononline, September 5, 2008, http://www.reason.com/news/show/128461.html.

[14] http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/07/us/politics/07community.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&hp

[15] John Judis has noted that by the time Obama was ready to quit his foundation-funded community organizer job to advance to the higher levels of counter-insurgency, he had become well aware of the futility, hopelessness, and despair which are the typical product of the hyper-parochial, anti-political, and anti-authoritarian or anti-leadership Alinskyite model of divide and conquer politics. At a conference of Alinskyite operatives held at Harvard in October 1987, Obama told fellow operative Jerry Kellman that he was bailing out in favor of a law degree, a career, a family, and financial stability. Obama appears to have used the race issue to cover his retreat: he spoke of the fact that some Alinksyite micro-projects had turned to anti-black racism. One of these was the Save Our Neighborhoods/Save Our Cities (SON/SOC, created in early 1984) counterinsurgency project, which accused real estate brokers of block-busting previously white blue-collar ethnic neighborhoods to promote an influx of super-exploited blacks. Obama pretended to be shocked by the racist outbursts that came out of the SON/SOC, and obviously found this a welcome pretext for departing for the Harvard boutique. In reality, racism of some kind is very frequently a product of the Alinsky particularist-parochialist micro-organizing method. As Judis points out, one of Alinsky's original projects, the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council, had supported the racist populist George Wallace during the 1960s. This kind of fragmentation along racial and localist lines is exactly what the financiers who fund these projects desire and are willing to pay for. The SON/SOC case is merely the *reductio ad absurdum* of bankruptcy and counter-productive nature of the entire Alinsky method. According to Judis, Obama summed up his views in an article published in the now defunct magazine *Illinois Issues*; the article would eventually appear in an the anthology edited by Peg Knoepfle and entitled *After Alinsky: Community Organizing in Illinois* (Springfield, IL: Sangamon State University, 1990), online at http://www.edwoj.com/Alinsky/AlinskyObamaChapter1990.htm and http://civic.uis.edu/Alinsky/AlinskyHomePage.htm. Judis, perhaps because he is now himself funded by the Carnegie Endowment, cannot see that the goal of the whole Alinsky exercise is to keep subject populations impotent in the face of the institutions controlled by international finance capital. The alternative to the dead end of Alinsky methods is a broad national coalition or united front of the main components of working people and their allies, such as the FDR coalition or the convergence of the student movement, the peace movement, the black movement, and the labor movement that Martin Luther King was trying to promote at the time of his assassination. Judis does point out the MLK was strongly opposed by Alinsky, showing the latter's conscious role as a wrecker and saboteur. See John Judis, "The Creation Myth: What Barack Obama Won't Tell You About his Community Organizing Past," *New Republic*, September 10, 2008.

[16] http://spot.acorn.net/jfkplace/09/fp.back_issues/16th_Issue/vs2.html

[17] http://www.aliciapatterson.org/APF1303/Jacoby/Jacoby.html

[18] http://falsani.blogspot.com/2008/04/barack-Obama-2004-god-factor-interview.html.

[19] The line is supposedly borrowed from Malcolm X after the Kennedy assassination; Kennedy was assassinated by the CIA operations directorate, as Joan Mellen has shown in her *Farewell to Justice*. Malcolm X's remark was therefore a piece of arrant stupidity and gullibility.

[20] See Webster Griffin Tarpley, *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA* (Joshua Tree CA: Progressive press, 2005ff.).
[21] *Hyde Park Herald*, September 19, 2008, cited by Ryan Lizza, "Making It," *New Yorker*, July 21, 2008, emphasis added.
[22] Incredibly enough, historian Herbert Parmet wrote of Richard Nixon that "It would do a great injustice to deny [Nixon's] intellectual and spiritual commitment to racial equality." As Michael Lind comments, "In fact, Nixon's purpose in reviving and implementing the Philadelphia Plan was to split the Democratic coalition by pitting white labor against the black civil rights movement." See Lind, *Up From Conservatism* (New York: The Free Press, 1996), p. 192.

[23] See my *Obama: The Postmodern Coup* (2008).
[24] According to a recent *Washington Post* account, 'A few years ago, executives at the prestigious University of Chicago Medical Center were concerned that an increasing number of patients were arriving at their emergency room with what the executives considered to be non-urgent complaints. The visits were costly to the hospital, and many of the patients, coming from the surrounding South Side neighborhood, were poor and uninsured. Michelle Obama, an executive at the medical center, launched an innovative program to steer the patients to existing neighborhood clinics to deal with their health needs. That effort, in time, inspired a broader program the hospital now calls its Urban Health Initiative. To ensure community support, Michelle Obama and others in late 2006 recommended that the hospital hire the firm of David Axelrod, who a few months later became the chief strategist for Barack Obama's presidential campaign. … Axelrod's firm warned hospital executives in its May 2007 presentation that, although many people welcomed the initiative, primary-care doctors opposed it as a break with the center's commitment to the community. Opinion research showed that a small but passionate group of people already considered the hospital to be elitist, arrogant and lacking in "cultural empathy" for the surrounding economically depressed South Side neighborhood, according to a draft report obtained by The Washington Post. Some doctors in focus groups dismissed local health clinics as "wholly inadequate." Quentin Young, a local physician whose five-doctor medical office lists Barack Obama among its patients, said that in past decades the South Side often viewed the institution as a "citadel of exclusion," more interested in research than the well-being of its neighbors. …The hospital told state regulators it spent $10 million on charity care for the poor in fiscal 2007 -- 1.3 percent of its total hospital expenses, according to an analysis performed for *The Washington Post* by the bipartisan, nonprofit Center for Tax and Budget Accountability. That is below the 2.1 percent average for nonprofit hospitals in Cook County. As a nonprofit, the University of Chicago Medical Center receives annual tax breaks worth nearly five times as much as it spends on charity care, the analysis found. Still, Quentin Young, the South Side physician, described the medical center's level of charity spending as "ludicrous." Young, known in Chicago for having been the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr.'s personal physician, is chairman of the Health and Medicine Policy Research Group, a Chicago-based nonprofit that advocates health-care reform. Young considered himself an ally of Barack Obama while he was a state legislator. "That's shameful," Young said of the percentages. "They are arguably, if not defrauding, then at least taking advantage of a public subsidy. We would like to see them give more than the minimum. The need is there." [A] hospital report quotes Michelle Obama as saying, "The world is seeping in, and our salvation will be the success of our partners" at local clinics…. Edward Novak, president of Chicago's Sacred Heart Hospital, declined to discuss the center's initiative in particular but dismissed as "bull" attempts to justify such programs as good for patients. "What they're really saying is, 'Don't use our emergency room because it will cost us money, and we don't want the public-aid population,' " Novak said. An April 2007 draft report from the medical center's polling firm, Peter D. Hart Research Associates, said focus groups suggested that "enough latent suspicion toward the hospital and university as elitist exists to ensure that a political attack against the Urban Health Initiative as deceptive and self-serving would find fertile ground." While most of those surveyed expressed favorable views of the center and its program, critics complained of arrogance and a lack of empathy, the report said. "More than a few staff members -- particularly medical staff -- express strongly worded concern or disappointment with UCMC in its commitment to the community," the report said. … "This new health initiative is not really about helping the

residents of the South Side of Chicago. It is simply a way for the University of Chicago Medical Center to save money and reduce costs by serving fewer poor people without health insurance." "I've had some complaints from my constituents," said Alderman Toni Preckwinkle, a former teacher who represents Chicago's 4th Ward and who will be an Obama delegate at the Democratic National Convention. "It's hard to know whether this is motivated by the interests of the patients or by the financial interests of the medical center."… Jeffrey Schaider, chairman of emergency medicine at nearby John H. Stroger Jr. Hospital of Cook County, also is skeptical. Schaider said his emergency room welcomes all patients, whether or not their maladies ultimately prove urgent. Lower-income workers also often find it difficult to visit clinics, which have limited hours, he said.' (Joe Stephens, "Obama Camp Has Many Ties to Wife's Employer," *Washington Post*, August 22, 2008)

[25] *Washington Post*, August 12, 2007.

[26] http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0208/8642.html

[27] http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0208/8642.html

[28] http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=MmEyN2RkNzcwYzgyZDY2MDBiY2U5MjJlZGMwNDM2ODg=

[29] Concerning Michelle's extensive foundation connections, Stanley Kurtz of the *National Review* writes: 'Michelle… had been executive director of Public Allies Chicago since 1991. Public Allies Chicago currently partners with the Asset-Based Community Development Institute at Northwestern University, led by noted community organizers John McKnight and Jody Kretzman. Michelle and Barack both have close links to Public Allies, to the Asset-Based Community Development Institute, to McKnight and to Kretzman. The Asset-Based Community Development Institute and its leaders are closely tied to the Gamaliel Foundation. Barack himself worked directly with the co-founder and Executive Director of the Gamaliel Foundation, Gregory Galluzzo…. the Gamaliel Foundation is guided by an extreme, anti-American ideology, much like Revered Wright's. In other words, Both Michelle and Barack Obama were part of a tightly knit network of Gamaliel Foundation organizers, and the guiding ideology of Gamaliel is deeply radical and anti-American.' (Stanley Kurtz, *National Review Online*, "The Corner," August 22, 2008) As for Barky, he was a founding member of the board of directors of Public Allies in 1992, resigning before Michelle became the founding executive director of Public Allies Chicago in early 1993…. Obama also served on the board of directors of the Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the Center for Neighborhood Technology, and the Lugenia Burns Hope Center, which dealt with 1,100 people thrown off welfare. He also served on the board of directors of the Chicago Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, the Center for Neighborhood Technology, and the Lugenia Burns Hope Center. The Lugenia Burns Hope Center, another povertician operation, specialized in moving former welfare recipients to low-wage jobs after Aid to Mothers With Dependent Children, a part of the FDR Social Security Act of 1935, had been abolished by Clinton. The Lugenia Burns is a foundation-funded operation evidently tasked with preventing a broad-based political rebellion against the abolition of Social Security; the Lugenia Burns has received grants from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and other foundations controlled by the ruling elite.

[30] http://www.opednews.com/author/author58.html

[31] 'On October 1, 2006, Mayor Richard Daley appointed Martin Nesbitt as Chairperson of the Chicago Housing Authority succeeding Sharon Gist Gilliam. Gist Gilliam assumed the role of interim CEO upon the resignation of Terry Peterson on Sept. 30, 2006. Mr. Nesbitt was appointed as a Commissioner of the Authority on July 9, 2003. He served as Vice Chairperson of the Board since January 17, 2006. Mr. Nesbitt is president of PRG Parking Management, also known as the Parking Spot, and manages the strategic and operating services of the off-airport parking facilities. Mr. Nesbitt is also vice president of the Pritzker Realty Group, L.P. where he procures new real estate investment opportunities, retail investments and developments for the Pritzker Group.' http://www.thecha.org/aboutus/martin_nesbitt.html

[32] Ben Smith, "Ax On Ayers," *Politico*, February 26, 2008.

[33] http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=3FC289D8-3048-5C12-009AD5180C22FF0B

[34] http://kimallen.sheepdogdesign.net/cinnamon/2007/06/thomas-g-ayers-1915-2007.html

[35] Ayers and Oughton had founded the Jesse James Gang out of the University of Michigan SDS chapter, with the help of a suspected agent provocateur named Jim Mellen. 'Bill and Diana… became more active in the Ann Arbor chapter of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). Ayers had been a member of the SDS radical education project for several years at a time when SDS was still a loosely-organized group of students who believed in experimental schools and community projects as vehicles for change. In June, 1968, they attended an SDS convention in East Lansing where a sharp split was emerging between the Progressive Labor Party (PL) and the cultural revolutionaries who naturally attracted Bill and Diana. … After the convention Diana and Bill spent part of the summer in Chicago working in the SDS national office where they had intense political discussion with Mike Klonsky, an SDS national officer, and Bernardine Dohrn, a later leader of the Weathermen. Diana and Bill became convinced that direct action rather than education and peaceful reform were the way to change society. Diana was deeply affected by the demonstrations at the Democratic Party convention that August and what she and the SDS and eventually the Walker Commission felt was a "police riot." At the peak of the violence, she called her sister, Carol, in Chicago for $150 to help bail Tom Hayden, one of the founders of SDS in 1962, out of jail. A day or two later she called again and said she and Bill were leaving the city because "it's getting too rough." It was also during that summer that Bill and Diana turned full-scale toward the cultural revolution. They developed a taste for "acid" rock at ear-shattering volume. They cut off their hair and began to wear hippy headbands and wire-rimmed glasses. They took LSD, sometimes with another couple. On one occasion one of the group ran out into the street naked but was coaxed back inside before the police came. They returned to Ann Arbor that fall in an activist mood. At the first meeting of the Ann Arbor SDS on Sept. 24, 1968, a sharp division in the group was apparent. Diana and Bill along with some 40 other radicals banded together against the moderates and formed a faction which they called "The Jesse James Gang." The gang declared themselves revolutionary gangsters. They held peaceful methods of reform in contempt. They urged direct action instead of talk, individual violent confrontations instead of big peace marches. Contained in their still half-formed ideas about the role of America in the world and white radicals in America, was the germ of the Weatherman analysis which would later call for violence. The gang disrupted SDS meetings and made vicious personal attacks on their opponents. The meetings frequently degenerated into brawls. The gang shouted and heckled and even threw eggs and tomatoes at moderate speakers. They often let it be known that their opponents were running the risk of physical beatings. Bill Ayers, Diana at his side, spoke against the failure of education to change people and described the gang as "the arms of liberation inside the monster." "We are tired of tiptoeing up to society and asking for reform. We're ready to kick it," he told one opponent. The behind-the-scenes leader of the Jesse James Gang was a mysterious, 31-year-old man named Jim Mellen who appeared out of nowhere in Ann Arbor that Fall. No one knew where he had gone to school or why he had come to the University of Michigan. Although he was the major intellectual force behind the gang, Mellen carefully avoided any position of formal authority. **A rumor began circulating among his critics that Mellen was an agent provocateur sent by the Central Intelligence Agency to destroy SDS and the radical movement in Michigan.** Ten months later, after helping to write the Weatherman manifesto and playing a part in the June, 1969, SDS convention which destroyed the organization, Mellen faded from the Ann Arbor radical scene as mysteriously as he had arrived. Within a period of a few weeks the Jesse James Gang triumphed within the SDS chapter at Ann Arbor. Early in October, 1968, the moderates decided they had had enough and walked out to form their own group. Through psychological warfare and vague threats of violence, the gang had captured the single most important SDS chapter in Michigan, which automatically gave them a powerful voice in the national organization. … Ayers rose to a position of strength with the gang because of his ability to dominate groups through a combination of charm and the volume of his voice. Handsome and brash, he was a notorious lady's man who did not hide his promiscuity from Diana. Diana told friends that although she was hurt by Bill's infidelity, it made her redouble her efforts to be a true revolutionary. Stung by frequent jibes that she could afford to be one because her daddy was rich, Diana struggled to make her own mark in the movement. (Lucinda Franks and Thomas Powers, "Story of Diana--The Making of a Terrorist--III--Angry, She Returns to US," United Press International 1970, emphasis added)

[36] Kathy Boudin was born in 1943 to a Jewish family with a long left-wing history, and was raised in Greenwich Village, New York City. Her great-uncle was Louis Boudonovitch Boudin, a Marxist theorist. She was the niece of I.F. Stone, the leftist Washington reporter and critic of Plato. Her father, attorney Leonard Boudin, had represented such controversial clients as Fidel Castro, Paul Robeson, and Daniel Ellsberg of the RAND Corporation. Leonard Boudin was an active member of the National Lawyers Guild. Kathy's older brother, Michael Boudin, joined the establishment law firm of Covington and Burling, where Dean Acheson and William P. Bundy had been partners. Michael Boudin is currently the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Boston. Kathy Boudin was convicted of one count of felony murder and armed robbery, and was sentenced to twenty years to life under a plea bargain for her role in the 1981 Brinks Robbery near New York City in which the Weathermen killed two policemen and an armed guard. Boudin was released in September 2003 amid the protests of the families of her victims. (Wikipedia)

[37] Cited as Carter and the PIT.

[38] Abby Rockefeller, the sister of David, Nelson, John D. III, Laurance, and Winthrop, reportedly joined SDS for a time in the early 1960s. (*Carter and the PIT*, 25) In the winter of 2007, there were isolated signs of an ongoing salon frequented by SDS nostalgics and members of the extended Rockefeller family in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[39] After the Days of Rage, federal indictments were handed down against most of the publicly identified Weathermen. As a result, the project moved into an "underground" phase characterized by heavy drug use, institutionalization of polymorphous perversion ("sexual liberation"), and intensive use of attack group methods of self-brainwashing (Maoist "criticism and self-criticism"), all staged in the "programmed paranoia" of a police round-up threatened at any minute. The Spring 1970 escalation of the war in Cambodia provided the pretext for Weatherman controllers to escalate the group's activities to terrorist bombings: the University of Washington ROTC building, the New York police headquarters, the Washington DC capitol building, etc. (*Carter and the PIT*, 121) These are the people that Obama finds congenial.

[40] Bob Black, "Up Sand Creek Without A Paddle," http://www.pirateballerina.com/images/bobblack.html, also posted at Discoverthenetworks.org, http://www.discoverthenetworks.org/Articles/Up%20Sand%20Creek%20Without%20a%20Paddle2.html. Some internet sources attempt to attack the reliability of Bob Black, but he is taken seriously by Sherrie Gosset, the associate editor of the neocon site Accuracy in Media, who reports: 'American anarchist Bob Black also skewered Churchill's credibility in a detailed essay, "Up Sand Creek Without a Paddle." He assails Churchill's "bigoted and bogus" 'scholarship', and asks how this "hustler" has been able to pass off his "racist fantasies as scholarship" and gain tenure at UC. He has no PhD and reportedly can't get published in even the most mediocre academic journals, so he sticks with leftist or racialist nationalist periodicals. Churchill "gets flown all over the country to address audiences of white leftists who pay him to guilt-trip them. How sweet the pain!" writes Black. Professor Brown explains that "In Indian activist circles, prestige and legitimacy often accrue to those who most successfully express an oppositional identity." Which reminds us, the University of Colorado media relations people did not return our phone call yet asking whether it's true the university investigated Churchill's Indian identity claims ten years ago. He's a "New Left/New Age ersatz Indian," who might have a dream catcher hanging over his bed, but is just a "well-funded pale face" who is a "Red racist" but not a "red man" Black says. Indeed, this 'injun of profit' has parlayed his "Indian-ness" into a gig raking in close to $100,000 working for the same evil capitalist American government he condemned 9/11 victims for supporting.' (See Sherrie Gosset, "Churchill: Ward of the State," campusreportonline.net, February 15, 2005)

[41] http://carcopy.blogspot.com/2005/02/denver-post-january-18-1987.html

[42] http://www.satyamag.com/apr04/churchill.html

[43] "Prof: 'I Want US Off the Planet.' Embattled Terror-Condoning Academic Says He Wants America 'Out of Existence,'" World Net Daily, February 7, 2005.

[44] Another Weatherman who is sometimes left out of the list of leading members is Bo Burlingham. The neocon web site Militant Islam Monitor.org cites 'an excerpt from the proceedings of the House Judiciary

Committee, on 22 September, 1976, in which Congressman Larry McDonald (D-GA) is giving this rundown of the TNI [Trans National Institute]: Robert "Bo" Burlingham, a prominent functionary of IPS's Cambridge [Massachusetts] subsidiary, was indicted in a bombing conspiracy in 1972, but charges were dropped when his Weathermen co-defendants could not be apprehended. Burlingham said in 1974: "I don't think an equitable, fair, free democratic world order is going to happen any other way than through violence."' See http://www.militantislammonitor.org/article/id/2296. Burlingham may have hosted Obama's friend Bernardine Dohrn during her trip to Europe to meet the deserters' movement, which was heavily penetrated by the CIA, in 1968; see http://laroucheplanet.info/pmwiki/pmwiki.php?n=Library.UnityNow3.

[45] Ayers and Dohrn are also close to other Democratic Party bigwigs besides Obama. They are friends of Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont, the head of the Senate Judiciary Committee. As Larry Johnson reports, '…actor and activist Peter Coyote talking on the 1996 Democratic Convention in Chicago on his website mentions a couple of times about having to inform his wife "Martha that I'm dragging her to the apartment of old friends, ex-Weathermen, Bernardine Dohrn and Bill Ayers, hosting a party for Senator Leahy. Perhaps Edward Said will be there. I urge her to come by promising that the event will push the edges of the envelope of her centrist politics."' Edward Said was a member of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation networks of British intelligence, serviced by the late Italian left socialist Lelio Basso, Ken Coates, and the Yugoslav dissident Vladimir Dedijier, with all of whom Said appeared at a conference in Linz, Austria, in September 1972. http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/05/29/ayers-Obama-philanthropy-corruption-what-big-media-refuses-to-disclose-about-Obamas-checkered-past-in-chicago-machine-politics/

[46] http://www.schwarzreport.org/Newsletters/1970/february1,70.htm

[47] According to U.S. Labor Party, *Carter and the Party of International Terrorism* (New York, 1976), Bernardine Dohrn attended the University of Chicago Law School and graduated in 1965; here she worked together with Dean Edward H. Levi, who later became Attorney General for Ford in March 1975. The USLP writers regard Levi as a Rockefeller family operative who was involved with Marcus Raskin and the Black P. Stone street gang of Chicago. From 1967-1970, Dohrn worked for the National Lawyers Guild, a group which had been accused by J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI of being a communist front in the 1950s and may well have been implicated in cold war intelligence activities. At the same time, Dohrn was then involved with the American Deserters Committee, a group that was active in the US and Europe" (*Carter and the PIT*, 120)

[48] http://www.schwarzreport.org/Newsletters/1970/february1,70.htm.

[49] http://www.schwarzreport.org/Newsletters/1970/february1,70.htm

[50] http://rezkowatch.blogspot.com/2008/06/repost-obamas-ultra-leftist-backers.html

[51] http://weblogs.baltimoresun.com/news/politics/blog/2008/02/clinton_campaign_obama_must_an.html

[52] http://www.markrudd.com/historical-writing/the-death-of-sds/

[53] As of 2008, the board of the Woods Fund is listed as: Laura S. Washington, Board Chair, Ida B. Wells-Barnett University Professor and Fellow of the DePaul Humanities Center; Jesus G. Garcia, Vice Chair, Executive Director, Little Village Community Development Corporation; William C. Ayers, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago.

[54] http://billayers.wordpress.com/category/articles/

[55] http://www.city-journal.org/2008/eon0423ss.html

[56] http://globallabor.blogspot.com/2008/04/who-sent-obama.html

[57] http://pundita.blogspot.com/2008/05/william-ayers-plan-to-turn-americas_20.html

[58] In mid-August 2008, the University of Illinois attempted to prevent researchers from gaining access to the archives of the Annenberg Chicago Challenge, which constituted some 70 linear feet of documents now housed at the Richard J. Daley Library at the Chicago Circle Campus. This is also where the Weatherman terrorist bomber Bill Ayers enjoys the fruits of his tenured professorship. After this high-handed outrage by a public institution became known, President White of the University of Illinois was bombarded by emails of protest demanding that the papers be made available. The University of Illinois announced as this book is going to press that the papers would be opened to the public on August 26, 2008. We hope to include this material in future editions of this book. The papers are likely to show that Ayers and Obama were no mere

acquaintances, but rather constituted a mutual admiration and career assistance society, spending hundreds of hours together in meetings and collaborating in innumerable ways. (Stanley Kurtz, "Chicago Annenberg Challenge Shutdown? A cover-up in the making?" *National Review Online*, August 18, 2008).
[59] http://globallabor.blogspot.com/2008/05/does-obama-support-reparations.html
[60] *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, July 28, 2008, http://starbulletin.com/2008/07/28/news/story05.html
[61] http://www.newsmax.com/limbaugh/Trinity_Church_Obama/2008/06/03/101086.html
[62] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/05/23/the-monster-in-the-room-does-obama-support-reparations/
[63] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/05/23/the-monster-in-the-room-does-obama-support-reparations/
[64] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mayhill-fowler/Obama-no-surprise-that-ha_b_96188.html
[65] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Hofstadter
[66] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emile_Durkheim
[67] http://www.hydeparkhistory.org/herald/1313HiddenHistory.pdf
[68] http://archive.rockefeller.edu/publications/conferences/saunier.pdf, emphasis added.
[69] http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/launder/regions/2002/0201elf.htm
[70] Another of Obama's super-rich Middle East friends is a certain Khalid al Mansour, who has served as moneybags for Barky. Former Manhattan Borough President Percy Sutton has reported: '"I was introduced to him by a friend who was raising money for him and the friends name was Dr. Khalid al Mansour from Texas. He is the principle adviser to one of the world's richest men. He told me about Obama**.** He wrote to me about him and his introduction was 'there is a young man that has applied to Harvard and I know that you have a few friends left there because you used to go up there to speak, would you please write a letter in support of him?'…I wrote a letter in support of him to my friends at Harvard saying to them I thought there was a genius that was going to be available and I sure hoped they would treat him kindly." Dr. Khalid Abdullah Tario Al-Mansour is an advisor to Heads of State and business leaders in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and North America. He has been actively involved in structuring investments and joint ventures worldwide for over 35 years. Dr. Al-Mansour was also responsible for the Africa investment activities of Kingdom Holdings, Saudi Prince Al-Waleed bin Talal's investment company. During his career, Dr. Al-Mansour has been a guest lecturer at Harvard University, Bombay University, Columbia University, UCLA, University of Kenya, London School of Economics and the University of Ghana.' This profile is redolent of intelligence community connections. See Texasdarlin, September 1, 2008.
[71] Jerome Corsi, *Obama Nation* (New York: Simon and Shuster, 2008), p. 173.
[72] (http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601070&sid=aMzI3I6BAo_U&refer=politics)
[74] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/27/recently-unsealed-documents-reveal-Obama-deeply-embroiled-in-rezko-case/#more-3276
[75] http://www.taylormarsh.com/archives_view.php?id=27939
[76] 'Ever since the Obama camp announced Patti Solis-Doyle would be joining their team as the Chief of Staff for the yet-to-be-chosen Vice Presidential candidate, I've been wondering if she was always a part of their team. After all, Taylor Marsh informs us, and others confirm that Solis-Doyle has a 20 year relationship with David Axelrod, Obama's puppet master. Further, over at No Quarter, Larry Johnson reveals that Solis-Doyle used to work for Richard Daley and her brother is a Chicago alderman. Clearly, the Solis-Doyle, Axelrod ties run deep. In addition, Steve Clemons, over at the Washington Note reported back in March: "Patti Solis Doyle allegedly bred a lot of ill will inside the campaign among staffers. Many Clinton aides talked about how she had a wall erected between herself and the rest of the campaign staff in Iowa. Others who had been around for Hillary Clinton's Senate campaign talked about how Patti Solis Doyle had shut down the campaign office for two full days in order to watch the collected DVD set of "Grey's Anatomy." I'm not kidding. On top of those clear failures, she also horribly mismanaged the Clinton campaign financially. One Clinton backer said what everyone was thinking: "Who can blame Obama for rewarding Patti? He would never be the nominee without her," one person who has worked for both Clintons and remains close to them said. The question isn't whether she helped him, it's whether she did it knowingly. Had Hillary won Iowa, the outcome would probably be very different today. Patti Solis-Doyle was ultimately the architect of Hillary's Iowa defeat

(Obama and Edward's tactics excluded). In my estimation, Patti Solis-Doyle was a mole.' (http://donedems.com/2008/06/17/patti-solis-doyle-obama-mole/)

[77] John Fund, "Obama Should Come Clean on Ayers, Rezko, and the Iraqi Billionaire," Wall Street Journal, August 30, 2008, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122005063234084813.html?mod=rss_opinion_main)

[78] *Washington Times*, February 29, 2008; http://www.gertzfile.com/gertzfile/ring022908.html, accessed Sept. 9, 2008.

[79] Andrew Walden, "Iraqi Billionaire Threatens Reporters Investigating Rezko Affair," *Accuracy in Media*, August 24, 2008.

[80] See http://www.gop.com/Print/?Guid=21066cde-d75a-48c9-a05c-69f32e30015a&pg=news

[81] (http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601070&sid=aMzI3I6BAo_U&refer=politics)

[82] Obama hired fellow Harvard Law alumnus and election law expert Thomas Johnson to challenge the nominating petitions of the four other candidates, thus getting them thrown off the ballot.

[83] (John Kass, "In the spirit of the great Second City, I give you a new musical "Obama's Lot," *Chicago Tribune*, January 30, 2008)

[84] http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=3FC289D8-3048-5C12-009AD5180C22FF0B

[85] Ayers also got some great reviews over the years from the Chicago leftist chronicler Studs Terkel. Terkel commented that this book showed that "William Ayers is as sensitive and gifted a chronicler as he is a teacher. His odyssey - for it is far more than just a tour - through the juvenile court is Dickensian in its tragic, maddening detail and dimension; and yet it is strangely hopeful." For Ayers' *Teaching Towards Freedom* Terkel wrote: "William Ayers is as sensitive and gifted a chronicler as he is a teacher." For *Fugitive Days*, it was "A memoir that is, in effect, a deeply moving elegy to all those young dreamers who tried to live decently in an indecent world. Ayers provides a tribute to those better angels of ourselves." This insane delirium goes to show that Studs went soft on terrorism in his old age.

[86] The reality of this speech is the object of much skepticism: "Obama's ad on anti-war speech is staged. The speech was given at an anti-war rally on Oct. 2, 2002…..Jessie Jackson was the main speaker. Obama's speech went mainly unnoticed. He had not yet announced his run for the Senate, although now he claims he risked his political career. Of course we know that there was NO risk in running against Alan Keyes, all Obama had to do was breathe. Gonyea says….."In an age of YouTube there is no video of the speech and only a snippet of audio. The Obama campaign has reenacted the speech in a campaign ad they are now running." If there is no video available it would seem the entire Obama anti-war speech on which he is basing his Ad campaign may be faked. In fact the entire speech could be distorted."
http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/03/26/the-fake-iraq-war-speech-more-creative-embellishments/

[87] But compare the report of former *Chicago Tribune* journalist Bill Glauber, who covered the October 2, 2002 rally and reports there were only 1,000 people, mostly older sixties radical types. The main speaker was not Obama, but Jessie Jackson. Glauber vaguely remembers hearing Obama, but did not mention him in the article he wrote that day. "I'm the guy who didn't quote Barack Obama," says Glauber.
http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=88988093

[88] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/James_Crown

[89] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/07/02/chicago-billionaire-industrialist-on-board-of-obamas-mortgage-provider/#more-3393

[90] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/02/20/machinists-union-tells-it-like-it-is/

[91] Feb 01, 2008 (*Chicago Tribune* - McClatchy-Tribune Information Services via COMTEX), **"Obama's fundraising, rhetoric collide: Union says senator did little to save jobs."**

[92] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/07/05/obamas-acorn/#more-3429

[93] http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=13491

[94] http://www.blackagendareport.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=529&Itemid=1

[95]http://www.blackagendareport.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=529&Itemid=1

[96] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blair_Hull#_note-fast#_note-fast

[97] http://jta.org/cgi-bin/iowa/breaking/107170.html

[98] http://www.claremont.org/publications/pubid.339/pub_detail.asp
[99] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blair_Hull
[100] Ben Wallace-Wells, "Obama's Narrator," *New York Times* April 1, 2007.
[101] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jack_Ryan_%282004_U.S._Senate_candidate%29
[102] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jack_Ryan_%28Senate_candidate%29#_note-nyt1#_note-nyt1
[103] http://www.thesmokinggun.com/archive/0622041ryans1.html
[104] http://www.dailypress.com/chi-0406220247jun22,0,6933700,full.story
[105] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jack_Ryan_%28Senate_candidate%29#_note-nyt1#_note-nyt1
[106] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Senate_career_of_Barack_Obama
[107] 'In 2004, a national environmentalist entity created and managed by the Rockefeller family endorsed Barack Obama, then an Illinois state senator with little national reputation, in his race against other Democrats in his Democratic primary race for United States senator. The League for Conservation Voters announced they would "launch a new TV spot, titled 'Rising Star,'" which would run regularly "through Election Day in the Chicago media market. The League's press release boasted that the promotion was expensive: "the ad buy is a significant, six-figure purchase." In the 2003-2004 campaign season (according to the Center for Public Integrity), the League also paid $297,867 to the political consulting firm of David Axelrod, which was managing Obama's campaign. Axelrod and his firm AKP Message and Media shaped Obama's political image and today manage the Obama Presidential campaign top-down. The League of Conservation Voters was founded by Laurance S. Rockefeller and his close associates. Among the current directors of the League are Larry Rockefeller, son of Laurance (who died the year of the Obama Senate campaign); Wade Greene, counselor to the Rockefeller family; Donald K. Ross, strategist for the Rockefeller family's environ mental and foundation activities; and Theodore Roosevelt, IV, partner of Felix Rohatyn at Lehman Brothers. Roosevelt is the League's honorary chairman and a longtime leader of the group. The League of Conservation Voters works in tandem with the Partnership for New York City, in setting the agenda for New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg. The Partnership was founded by Laurance's brother David Rockefeller. League of Conservation Voters' national board member Marcia Bystryn, who is executive director of the New York State branch of the League, is also president of "Plan NYC-2030, Mayor Michael Bloomberg's planning initiative. (http://www.larouchepac.com/news/2008/04/23/rockefellers-mid-wifed-birth-obamamania.html)
[108] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Barack_Obama
[109] http://www.salon.com/opinion/conason/2007/12/21/right_and_Obama/
[110] (http://www.freedomsenemies.com/_Obama/ObamaAfrica.htm)
[111] http://eakenya.org/newsevents/article.htm?id=8
[112] (http://www.freedomsenemies.com/_Obama/ObamaAfrica.htm)
[113] (http://www.therudenews.com/archives/416)
[114] http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/07/us/politics/07Obama.html?pagewanted=print
[115] http://www.counterpunch.org/gonzalez02292008.html
[116]
[117] http://dealbook.blogs.nytimes.com/2007/01/27/george-soros-backs-Obama-but-hedges-his-bets/
[118] http://sweetness-light.com/archive/shocker-sorosmoveon-endorse-b-hussein-Obama
[119]
[120] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/10/AR2008041004045_pf.html
[121] http://www.g2mil.com/Bradley.htm
[122] http://www.globalsecurity.org/org/news/2003/030906-stryker01.htm
[123] http://www.foxnews.com/wires/2007May13/0,4670,IraqStrykersStruggle,00.html
[124] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/10/AR2008041004045_pf.html
[125] http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0703/04/le.02.html
[126] See William Strauss and Neil Howe, *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069.* (New York: Perennial, 1992).
[127] http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/story/19106551/a_new_hope

[128] http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2008/01/31/volcker-i-endorse-Obama/
[129] http://www.timesfreepress.com/news/2008/jun/04/tennessee-carter-endorses-Obama-others-superdelega/
[130] http://thehill.com/leading-the-news/sen.-rockefeller-endorses-Obama-2008-02-29.html
[131] Mel Levine was a U.S. congressman, 1983-93. He is currently a partner in the law firm of Gibson, Dunne and Krutcher. For some years he served as co-president of Builders for Peace, which sought to assist the Middle East peace process. He represents yet another figure close to the left wing of the US intelligence community.
[132] http://www.observer.com/2008/Brzezinski-power-shouldnt-have-resigned
[133] http://www.zmag.org/znet/viewArticle/15558
[134]
[135] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/09/AR2008070901933.html
[136] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/26/breaking-news-Obama-bombs/
[137] http://thehill.com/campaign-2008/Obama-could-raise-100-million-in-june-fundraisers-say-2008-06-09.html
[138] http://paeditorsblog.blogspot.com/2008_03_16_archive.html
[139] http://www.rabble.ca/babble/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic&f=39&t=000113&p=
[140] Glenn Greenwald, http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/27/keith-olbermanns-bo-problem/#more-3290
[141] http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1972093/posts
[142] http://www.miamiherald.com/campaign08/v-print/story/405156.html
[143] The right-wing commentator who posted these remarks added, 'I mean, at this rate, why not run on the campaign slogan, "Immanentize the Eschaton"? (Jim Geraghty, March 5, 2008) We will return to this question shortly.
[144] http://www.miamiherald.com/campaign08/v-print/story/405156.html
[145] http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/articleview/927/1/32/
[146] http://www.politicalaffairs.net/article/articleview/927/1/32/
[147] http://www.cla.wayne.edu/polisci/kdk/Comparative/SOURCES/fascism.htm
[148] http://www.discriminations.us/2007/07/framing_redux_redux.html
[149] http://www.hippy.com/php/article-333.html
[150] http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/04/28/wright.transcript/
[151] 'At the NAACP meeting, Wright proudly propounded the racist contention that blacks have inherently different "learning styles," correctly citing as authority for this view Janice Hale of Wayne State University.' Wright 'praised the work of Geneva Smitherman of Michigan State University, who has called for the selective incorporation of Ebonics into the curriculum in order to validate the black experience. Wright gave another shout-out to the late Asa Hilliard of Georgia State University, who told us, Wright said, "how to fix the schools." Like Hale, Hilliard argued that disrupting the classroom through "impulsive interrupting and loud talking" is inherently black."' (Heather MacDonald, 'Poisonous "Authenticity" — Jeremiah Wright draws on a long line of Afrocentric charlatans,' *City Journal*, 29 April 2008)
[152] http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/04/28/wright.transcript/
[153]"Race, Genes and Justice: A Call to Reform the Presentation of Forensic DNA Evidence in Criminal Trials," Prof. Jonathan Kahn,
http://works.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=jonathan_kahn
[154] *I Corinthians* Ch. 13 (KJV).
[155] http://www.newsmax.com/morris/mccain_obama_polls/2008/07/27/116718.html
[156] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/erica-jong/patriarchy1000-hillary_b_86408.html
[157] http://video1.washingtontimes.com/debose/2008/03/Obama_troubles_hillary_boon.html
[158] http://www.foxnews.com/story/0%2C2933%2C312153%2C00.html
[159] http://obamaprincetonthesis.wordpress.com/
[160] http://www.mytowntalks.com/politics/michelle-Obama-whitey-transcript.php

[161] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/01/breaking-news-on-whitey-tape-from-fox-news-a-tv-network-has-the-tape/
[162] From Hill Buzz; http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/04/breaking-news-from-hillbuzz/
[163] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/02/thread-2-booman-blows-the-Obama-disinformation-campaign/
[164] http://hughhewitt.townhall.com/blog/default.aspx?mode=post&g=4468b2c5-a5aa-468d-8944-56a8108cc31a&trackbacks=true#commentAnchor
[165] http://www.politico.com/blogs/bensmith/0608/Obama_denies_a_rumor_and_questions_the_question.html; noquarterusa.net
[166] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/06/05/barack-punts-on-denial-of-michelle-tape/
[167] http://theobamafile.com/ObamaCampaign.htm
[168] See Tarpley et al., *Obama -The Postmodern Coup: The Making of a Manchurian Candidate* (Joshua Tree CA: Progressive Press, 2008).
[169] (New York: Basic Books, 2007), pp. 198-199.
[170] http://online.wsj.com/public/article_print/SB120579535818243439.html
[171] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shelby_Steele
[172] http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/05/04/texas-caucus-fraud/
[173] http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=56405
[174] http://www.infowars.com/articles/nwo/globalists_love_global_warming.htm
[175] http://www.infowars.com/articles/nwo/globalists_love_global_warming.htm
[176] *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*: Fourth Edition, 2000.
[177] http://graniteidealism.com/2007/12/05/obama-to-issue-call-to-serve-vow-to-make-national-service-important-cause-of-his-presidency/
[178] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJsdHoAy4aM
[179] There was one candidate for the vice-presidential nomination who was not shy about pleading his own cause: this was the rapper Ludacris, with whom Obama had discussed the welfare of American youth in Chicago in late November 2007. In late July 2008, Ludacris launched his bid with this lyric:

I'm back on it like I just signed my record deal
Yeah the best is here, the Bentley Coup paint is dripping wet, it got sex appeal
Never should have hated
You never should've doubted him
With a slot in the president's iPod Obama shattered 'em

Said I handled his biz and I'm one of his favorite rappers
Well give Luda a special pardon if I'm ever in the slammer
Better yet put him in office, make me your vice president
Hillary hated on you, so that bitch is irrelevant

Jesse talking slick and apologizing for what?
If you said it then you meant it how you want it have a gut!
And all you other politicians trying to hate on my man,
watch us win a majority vote in every state on my man

You can't stop what's bout to happen, we bout to make history
The first black president is destined and it's meant to be
The threats ain't fazing us, the nooses or the jokes
So get off your ass, black people, it's time to get out and vote!

Paint the White House black and I'm sure that's got 'em terrified
McCain don't belong in any chair unless he's paralyzed
Yeah I said it cause Bush is mentally handicapped
Ball up all of his speeches and I throw 'em like candy wrap

'cause what you talking I hear nothing even relevant
and you the worst of all 43 presidents

Get out and vote or the end will be near
The world is ready for change because Obama is here!
'cause Obama is here
The world is ready for change because Obama is here!

Obama's campaign attempted to distance itself from Obama's friend Ludacris by issuing a statement, while Barky himself said nothing. Experienced observers were watching for a statement beginning, "This is not the Ludacris I knew."

(http://www.swamppolitics.com/news/politics/blog/2008/07/obama_ludacris_bff.html)

[180] http://www.progressive.org/?q=mag_reed0508&disqus_reply=488404#comment-488404
[181] http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/laland/2008/02/the-bailout-ban.html
[182] The wall of silence in the national media was all the more grotesque since the Chicago media had not been able to ignore the three deaths: 'CHICAGO (CBS) — Activists fear gay African-Americans are being targeted for murder. Two openly gay men were killed recently on the South Side, as CBS 2's Mike Parker reports. African-American gay and lesbian groups are talking about the murders of two openly gay Black men in the past month. On November 17, 24-year-old Larry Bland was shot to death in his Englewood home. Bland, a security guard at Northwestern Hospital was shot more than once after struggling with a man who had entered the house through an unlocked basement door. Then on December 23, 47-year-old Donald Young, the choir director at Trinity United Church of Christ, was shot multiple times in his South Side apartment. His roommate found his body. "We're calling on the police department to let the community know what's going on," said Marc Loveless of the Coalition for Justice and Respect. "Are we under attack? Is this a serial killer?" Chicago Police Department Acting Sept. Dana Starks said, "I understand the concerns of any group, any community when it comes to homicide. As of right now, I cannot say whether there is a connection." The media services director of the church where Donald Young taught and led the choir, said, "Young did live an openly gay lifestyle; that was his choice." But she went on to call the Loveless statement, "self-serving." She also said the police are doing everything they can. The brother of victim Larry Bland says if the murder was a hate crime, he would not be surprised. "Englewood? Come on. That's why a lot of gay guys won't come out, because they fear for something like this to happen," said Bland's brother, Lynn. Starks says that "at this time" there is no evidence the murders were hate crimes. But he told CBS 2, the investigations are still underway.(Mike Parker, "African-American Gay Community Scared Over Deaths," CBS2 Chicago, Dec 27, 2007)
[183] "Margins of Error: Obama's Shrinking Map,"
http://noquarterusa.net/blog/2008/07/08/obama%e2%80%99s-flawed-race-strategy-why-the-black-vote-won%e2%80%99t-be-enough/
[184] http://www.rockymountainnews.com/news/2008/jun/25/partial-transcript-ralph-naders-comments/
[185] http://michellemalkin.com/2008/05/21/barack-obama-gaffe-machine/
[186] http://www.theamericanmind.com/2008/05/24/too-much-sunshine-or-was-that-sunrise/
[187] http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=65449
[188] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/23/AR2008072302903.html
[189] http://money.cnn.com/2008/06/18/magazines/fortune/easton_obama.fortune/index.htm?postversion=2008061810
[190] Clinton needed to say something like this: "I represent a clear majority of the Democratic Party primary voters. This majority must rule, and will rule, despite what a discredited gaggle of unelected and unaccountable party bosses and machine hacks may decree. The infamy and moral insanity of today's meeting of the Rules Committee shows that the Democratic National Committee has been seized by an illegitimate insurgent group intent on carrying out a coup d'état. The Democratic National Committee has

been hijacked by Wall Street interests whose unspoken agenda is alien to the needs of the American people. I call on Democrats to fight back. This is your party, and not the party of Howard Dean. My campaign is the real Democratic Party. I call on my supporters to seize control of the party apparatus in every state, and to make sure that my name will be on the ballot in November, so as to guarantee the American people the choice of at least one candidate who is actually qualified to be president in this crisis. In the midst of war and economic depression, we cannot permit another failed presidency on the part of yet another feckless and incompetent demagogue who has come out of nowhere to contravene the clear will of the voters in his quest for the highest office. Our national survival is once again at stake. Democrats, rally to me! Because of who I am and because of the grave responsibilities which I face, I call upon you to support me, whatever may happen. The Democratic Party is not the plaything of wealthy elitists. We are the New Deal Democrats, the party of Franklin D. Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, and with your help we will secure the future." Perhaps one day she will deliver a speech like this.

[191] http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/28/us/politics/28web-nagourney.html?_r=1&adxnnl=1&oref=slogin&adxnnlx=1217283784-twg0i3ZZqdSzDNW4Zh4KMw

[192] http://www.taylormarsh.com/archives_view.php?id=28116

[193] The website of this entity presents it in the following terms: 'At a moment of critical global transitions, the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, with support from the Ford Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, and a generous gift from Mr. David Rubenstein, has launched a multi-year, bipartisan initiative to develop a sustainable and effective national security strategy for the United States of America. Under the stewardship of honorary co-chairs George Shultz and Anthony Lake, the Princeton Project brings together leading thinkers on national security from government, academe, business, and the non-profit sector to analyze key issues and develop innovative responses to a range of national security threats.' (http://www.princeton.edu/~ppns/)

[194] See my *Obama – The Postmodern Coup* for a discussion of the massive CFR 1980s Project.

[195] See Webster G. Tarpley, "Lady Astor, Cliveden, and British Critics of Appeasement, 1936-1940," (2001).

[196] Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), 581.

[197] Carroll Quigley, *The Anglo-American Establishment* (New York: Books in Focus, 1981), 275.

[198]In January, *The Times* had asked: "Why should it be necessary to recoil from the system of 'Labor Service' [*Arbeitsdienst*] instituted in Germany, merely because in that country it is immediately precedent in time and openly preparatory to compulsory service in the Army?" (*Daily Worker*, June 6, 1938)

[199]A.J.P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War* (New York: Athenaeum, 1983), 189. Taylor claims that "every newspaper in the country applauded the Munich settlement with the exception of *Reynolds' News*." (Taylor 1983, xxvii).

[200]Gaetano Salvemini, *Prelude to World II* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1953), 509, 510.

[201]Frederick L. Schuman, *Europe on the Eve: The Crises of Diplomacy, 1933-39* (New York: Knopf, 1939), 335-6.

[202] Clement Leibovitz and Alvin Finkel, *In Our Time: The Chamberlain-Hitler Collusion* (New York: Monthly Review, 1998), 21-2, 32.

[203] http://www.cfr.org/publication/14004/democratic_debate_transcript_chicago.html

[204] http://www.cnn.com/2007/POLITICS/08/07/Obama.pakistan/index.html

[205] http://www.cfr.org/publication/14004/democratic_debate_transcript_chicago.html

[206] http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/Story?id=3434573&page=1

[207] http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/27/AR2008032700007_2.html?sid=ST2008032700935

[208] http://www.outsidethebeltway.com/archives/2008/06/us_airstrikes_kill_pakistani_troops/

[209] http://www.thefrontierpost.com/News.aspx?ncat=ar&nid=194&ad=16-06-2008

[210] http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,24000236-2703,00.html

[211] http://www.usnews.com/usnews/politics/bulletin/bulletin_080703.htm

[212] http://www.nydailynews.com/news/us_world/2008/07/02/2008-07-02_dont_bomb_iran_bush_warns_israel-1.html
[213] http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1215330891157&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull
[214] http://edition.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/meast/07/04/iran.threat/index.html
[215] http://wiredispatch.com/news/?id=245597
[216] http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2008/07/25/Brzezinski-warns-against_n_114999.html
[217] Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism, 1914-1945* (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1995), 298.
[218] Equally useless and misleading are the 10 steps to close down an open society offered by the left liberal gatekeeper and feminist Naomi Wolf in her recent book *End of America: Letter of Warning to a Young Patriot*. Wolf, who once advised Al Gore on earth tones, has served on the board of the Woodhull Institute. Here she totally ignores the central issue, which is the indispensable role of the fascist mass movement as a way of making society impose fascism on itself. Here there are no storm troopers in the street, no march on Rome; everything is top down. Wolf's steps all assume that fascism (identified with Bush) is already in power. Her ten steps: "1. Invoke a terrifying internal and external enemy; 2. Create a gulag; 3. Develop a thug caste; 4. Set up an internal surveillance system; 5. Harass citizens' groups; 6. Engage in arbitrary detention and release; 7. Target key individuals; 8. Control the press; 9. Dissent equals treason; 10. Suspend the rule of law." The stubborn refusal to address the fascist mass movement, which contains fervently idealistic students, militant workers, and veterans as well as goons, blinds left liberals of this type to the way that fascism really emerges. Wolf also still believes that the Reichstag was not arson by the Nazis, and her faith in the official 9/11 myth is still 100%.
[219] See my *9/11 Synthetic Terror*.
[220] Emilio Gentile is Professor of Political Science at the University of Rome La Sapienza and Principal Lecturer in History at the Rome Campus. He is a historian of fascism, best known for his interpretation of fascism as a "political religion." He is the author of several books, including *The Sacralization of Politics in Fascist Italy* (Harvard University Press), *The Struggle for Modernity: Nationalism, Futurism, and Fascism* (Praeger), *The Origins of Fascist Ideology, 1918-1925* (Enigma), and *Storia del partito fascista, 1919-1922: movimento e milizia* (Laterza).
[221] http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200809/fallows-debates/6
[222] For the following account, see Anthony Birley, *Septimius Severus* (London: Routledge, 1999), Tenney Frank, *An Economic History of Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1927). And Sir Paul Harvey, *The Oxford Companion to Classical Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).