

OCCASION FOR THOUGHT

Number 4.4.1

(2008)



REPORT ON
OBAMA
PART THREE, SECTION TWO

TOWARD DEEP WATERS

PART TWO OF AN ESSAY ON
WEBSTER G. TARPLEY'S

*BARACK H. OBAMA: THE
UNAUTHORIZED BIOGRAPHY*

1

Well, at least *that* part is over. Now we wait for the inauguration, on or after which who knows what might happen. I'm fully aware that hundreds of millions are oblivious to it, but I venture it safe to say that our nation, along with we the people huddled in it, have not often in our history been in any *greater* danger than we are now: I mean that we're in an intensely heightened state of very great hazard, and I mean that we're going to be kept in it until—at the *very* least—the end of January or February 2009.

Beyond that, who can say. It could be survivable. It could be even worse.

Anyone who's been following things knows the time is ripe. Like the dollar, the economy itself is reeling, about to expire. The stage is set with a masterly and unprecedentedly elaborate perfection. *Set*, you ask? For *what*?

Well, set for *change*, my darlings. But it's unlikely to be the kind, I'm afraid, that will make your feel hopeful and warm and fuzzy just by *believing* in it.

There's a chance that by February we'll be spending—if we *have* any, and if they're *worth* anything—Ameros instead of dollars. And there's a chance that the United States won't be a sovereign republic any longer but instead the middle part of the “North American Union,” a huge body made up of Mexico, the U.S., and Canada—all using Ameros. *If* they've got any of them, that is, and *if* they're worth anything.

I'm not claiming that any such thing is *going* to happen. I'm saying that there's a good chance of it.

We mustn't forget—excepting the millions who never *did* admit it—that we're dealing with “leaders” sufficiently monstrous, greedy, and criminal to have carefully and cold-bloodedly planned and executed 9/11 from A to Z. Why'd they do it? Because they wanted war in order to make a hegemonic grab for the world's oil and gas—and because they wanted a way to terrorize the American people badly enough that said people would give up their Constitutional rights and freedoms without the least whimper or complaint, in fact *eagerly*, all the better for the imposition of a police state if that were to prove useful in the fulfillment of the Napoleonic sweeping crimes that the murders, torturers, and traitors were in the process of committing. The [concentration camps](#) are ready. [Northcom](#) is in place to surveil and control us all, and the [weaponry to be used on us](#) is at the ready. On the “diplomatic” side, there have been, since 2005, five summit meetings of the Mexican, American, and Canadian heads of state to discuss and arrange details for creating the North American Union (a bit like the European Union except just *imposed*—get it?), and the [Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America](#) has been brought into existence to smooth the way.

On the other hand, the usurpation of U.S. sovereignty by the bloodless criminals who've been in charge for the last fifteen or twenty years *could* begin in some other way than through the sudden imposition of the North American Union. It *could*, say, take the form of a nuclear attack on a well-chosen American city or two, or three—since that's [all planned out, too](#)—with martial law to be declared afterward as an expedient way to bring order out of the resulting panic and mayhem. *Or* the usurpation of national sovereignty could be brought about by the deliberate collapsing of the entire American economy, something that, as the past few months have proven, the American people overwhelmingly support—they having done absolutely nothing since at least 2000 to prevent it or to bar their “leaders” from *doing* it. Even the new Nobelist, Paul Krugman, *still* insists upon continuing to talk about “incompetence” in the handling of the nation's—and now the world's—“economy.” May I be pardoned for saying to the new prize-winner, or I should say for *asking* of him, “*Duh*”?

If you'd like to read a very small handful of letters—one of them very, very brilliant indeed—on the subject of “incompetence” versus “planned destruction,” [click here](#)—but be sure to come right back.

I can be pretty certain that readers of this present essay are likely to fall into two fairly distinct camps. One camp, on the small side, will be made up of those who *already agree with me* that we are now at an unprecedentedly and massively dangerous moment

in our history. The other camp, a far, far larger one, will be made up of those who—well, those who will simply think me mad.

I'm not heartened by this fact, but neither am I surprised.

The purpose of this essay is to review and discuss Webster G. Tarpley's new book, [Barack H. Obama: The Unauthorized Biography](#), as was the purpose of the essay [preceding this one](#). But that subject is enormous, and let's hold things up a moment for some very, very helpful background.

Any of those who think I'm mad should be certain to read Daniel Estulin's notable book from 2007, [The True Story of the Bilderberg Group](#). (Everyone should read it, I dare say, but it's likely to be particularly useful and informative for those who still think I'm crazy for saying the things I'm saying.)

If the subject is new to you, it may be helpful to read up a little bit on what [the Bilderberg Group](#) is. When you come back, here's where we'll pick up:

Estulin takes his readers back to the time of President Richard Nixon and the Watergate affair. Certainly, we're not going to analyze *that* all over again. But Estulin shows exactly how it works: that is, exactly how it is that the "overworld," to use [Peter Dale Scott's](#) term for it (or the "invisible government," to use [Webster Tarpley's](#)) controls its puppet-presidents—and how it has been practicing doing so since it moved JFK out of the way by means of assassination.

The story is familiar enough that I doubt many will be lost even if we cut in to Estulin's pages at what may seem an abrupt point:

James McCord's confession of perjury to Judge John Sirica should have warned Nixon that he was being set up for a downfall. But, the confused and emotionally paralysed Nixon followed, to the letter, the [Tavistock](#) profiling of how a person's morale can be broken through a strategy of terror.

Kissinger was responsible for brainwashing and confusing President Nixon, while, in effect, it was Haig who ran the U.S. government during this "orientation period" of the President.

Coleman¹ writes that "on the insistence of the RIIA, Haig virtually took over the management of the Government of the United States after the April 1973 coup d'état." (p. 58)

Much changed, and it changed quickly. We pick up the story a page later:

At that stage, Nixon's Atomic Energy Commission was dismantled, so Chairman James Schlesinger could then be drafted to serve as the government's

¹ This is John Coleman, author of "[The Tavistock Institute: Sinister and Deadly](#), the ground-breaking book on the sinister plans of the world's foremost brainwashing institute. . ." (p. 57)

Secretary of Defense. It would be Schlesinger's task to require all military commanders to refuse orders from the White House prior to top Republicans' threatening to impeach the President. Instead, Nixon voluntarily resigned August 8, 1974.

Was the humiliation of Nixon a lesson and a warning to future Presidents of the United States not to imagine they could defy the direction of manipulation of the Shadow World Government and win?

More specifically, the collapse of Nixon's presidency led to the reduction of the armed services after U.S. withdrawal from Viet Nam and the de-industrializing of the United States with the signing of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which Nixon vehemently opposed—two results that directly fulfilled the Post Industrial-Zero-Growth Strategies of the Bilderberg Group. (p. 59, emphasis in original)

Does any of this make even the *least* tiny bit of conceivable sense? I mean, why in the name of god and all the devils above would the powers-that-be, or the overpower, or the secret government want to destroy Nixon in order to shove through GATT and thereby *begin pushing the U.S. into a stage of relative weakness, hastening it into a post-industrial age?*

Incompetence? They were simply pretty dumb and just *didn't know what they were doing?*

But no. Not so. *Never*. In fact, for sheer emphasis, let's repeat "never" several times, maybe even the same number as poor King Lear said it, grieving over the fact that Cordelia would never come back to life: "Never, never, never, never, never."

And yet even now, even today, even *three decades and four years later*, people—regular people, intellectuals, professors, Nobel *Prize* winners—are still plucking stupidly on that damned broken harp-string, "incompetence." The truth is—since otherwise *none of it makes any sense*—that no more back in 1974 was it *incompetence* that set into play the deliberate weakening of the U.S. than it is now, today, *incompetence* that is doing all it can to bring about the destruction (or, in Dennis Kucinich's recent phrase, to bring about the "[hollowing out](#)") of the U.S.

No. For those elements of the "overworld" who marionetted Nixon, then Carter, then Bush One, then Clinton, then the Chimpanzee, and who now are attaching the final strings on Obama—those elements are not and never have been in favor of aiding or helping the United States, but, traitors high crimners to a one, they are interested only in maligning, exploiting, even destroying the United States in order to serve their *own* financial interests or to enhance and consolidate their *own* power.

Explains Daniel Estulin:

Michael Thomas, a Wall Street investment banker who has won wide acclaim as an author, and is regarded by many as the Reagan-Bush era's most

incisive commentator, said in *SCH News*, May 28, 1999, “If the Bilderbergers seem more publicity-shy than ever, that is, among other reasons, because their proposals, implemented by subservient agencies such as the IMF and the World Bank have caused more mass devastation in recent years than World War II ever did.” (p. 62)

And:

“The unhappy result,” as ex-BBC journalist Tony Gosling reports at his Web site, www.bilderberg.org, is a picture of Western democracy subverted, with decision makers getting together not for reasons important to ordinary people—social justice, common interest, and quality of life—but to strengthen economic austerity and bring even more private gain for the world’s political and corporate elite.” (p. 62)

With that cheery bit, let’s bring this first part of the second section of the third installment of “Report on Obama” to a close. And let’s do it with one more passage from Daniel Estulin—a passage asking the question, How and why *can it be* that people just don’t get it—that people *just don’t understand what’s being done to them?*

What perplexes me most is that other people don’t see the dangers. Is it because knowledge brings responsibility and clamors for a decisive response? If we acknowledge that, in fact, there does exist a power far greater than the elected office of the President, a “moral” authority far more powerful than the Christian Pope, an invisible power that controls the world’s military apparatus and intelligence systems, controls the international banking system, controls the most effective propaganda system in history, we might be then forced to conclude that democracy is, at best, an illusion, and at worst, a prelude to a dictatorship that will become known as the [New World Order](#).

And a great, great question it is. Those genuinely interested in it should be sure to read Webster Tarpley’s [9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA](#) and Peter Dale Scott’s [The Road to 9/11: Wealth, Empire, and the Future of America](#)—and to pick one title after another [from there](#). I myself have been reading about the subject pretty much steadily since June 2003. And Daniel Estulin has been intensely involved in—and *reporting on*—it for decades. Read [his book](#) if you doubt me. And also poke around [his web site](#).

The “overworld,” in other words, has had *plenty* of time for the setting of the scene. Is it really so absurd to consider, its time come round at last, that the moment for the grim curtain to go up may be now?

2

After reading Webster Tarpley’s [Barack H. Obama: The Unauthorized Biography](#), I finally understood exactly why it was that in or around the early 1990s—or before—my own life as a writer changed dramatically—for the worse—and nearly came to an end altogether. *Me? Me*, a middle class white male, and on top of it, judging by the way I felt, a *dead one? Me* get published any more? Fat chance. It was all I could do to

defend keeping *Hamlet* in the required core literature courses, let alone getting my second novel reviewed, or my third novel even into *print*, say nothing of my fourth.

In my naiveté, I thought back then that my own academic colleagues and my own fellow writers had just simply lost their minds and had thereby brought the intellectual and literary world I'd been living in for my entire adult life tumbling suddenly down around my ears. All I could figure out or imagine was that they'd gone berserk, had drunk one kind of television-distilled Kool-Aid or another and, as a mass, had set out—as the Athenians accused Socrates of doing—to “make the weaker argument the stronger,” to abandon aesthetic judgment altogether, to blind themselves to literature and all it was and had ever been—and to fragment and destroy themselves, me, the publishing market, and publishing itself by judging the merit, value, and worth of *all things* according solely to the four prison bars of “race, class, ethnicity, and gender.”

Bad enough, but the idiot-narrowing went on and on, until each prison bar was sub-divided—or made to procreate—into several others, with the result that “Hispanic” was a slur as opposed to, say, “Chicano,” itself in turn a slur if the proper term happened to be “Chicana,” and, as for sex—pardon me, gender—there came to be way more prison bars than you could ever have imagined, all the way to the point where are now actual academic programs in what I once called “light bulb.”

I know it's indecorous, but I'm going to quote from one of my own books, in this case from the third chapter of *A Nation Gone Blind*, “Consumerism, Victimology, and the Disappearance of the Meaningful Self.” At this particular point, the subject is “gender studies.”

One must tread delicately here, for the piety and righteousness surrounding these issues are nothing if not powerful and rigid. Humor, too, is quite, quite absent in and from any and all such considerations. A healthy and useful sense of humor, in fact, was one of the earliest victims of the Age of Simplification, and one of the most deeply to be mourned. Even some small bit of it could be of enormous help in cleaning the intellectual stables and getting rid of confused thinking—which is doubtless the real reason for humor's carefully, even grimly, maintained suppression. Let's allow for a brief digression on the subject. What normal and intelligent person, for example, if still firing on all eight intellectual cylinders, wouldn't laugh at the acronym “CLAGS” for the Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies in the City University of New York? If “clags” doesn't sound funny—for a number of reasons, which you won't find here—what does? Or, in the same academic center, how about something referred to as “LGTBQ,” needing to be spelled out, I presume, since it *appears* to be unpronounceable, though I suppose it could be pronounced “light bulb,” or perhaps “light-book.” What it—obviously?—stands for is “Lesbian /Gay / Transgender / Bisexual / Queer,” as in the following passage, itself of interest:

“LGTBQ Studies has grown tremendously since Martin Duberman hatched the idea for CLAGS,” she [Alisa Solomon] adds. “The Center is proud to have been a part of shaping and expanding the field. In today's conservative and

economically difficult times, we face tough challenges—which makes our work more important than ever.”² (p. 237)

Thanks to Tarpley, I now understand that the balkanizing and diminutizing of minds followed by general intellectual collapse wasn’t initially the fault of my peers—albeit there remains the fact that not every *single* colleague or fellow writer was wholly self-reliant and a defensive genius. But I understand *very* clearly that the poison drunk by all—by *almost* all—was formulated, packaged, bottled, priced, sold, served, and set out to do its reductive, debilitating, and catastrophic work by *others*, and from *elsewhere*.

Some of the poison got its start in the laboratory of affirmative action—a program that it’s *still* a grave and very risky sin to be critical of if you’re within earshot of “liberals.” Tarpley, however, is not one to be deterred. “Most left liberals,” he writes,

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. (p. 101)

Now, if *that’s* not interesting, what *is*? The argument that Tarpley himself adheres to throughout is that any kind of “affirmation action” that’s determined or allocated by race, ethnicity, even gender, etc., is necessarily inferior to any such program that’s based solely and only on class, on socio-economic placement, situation, and need. That kind of approach would be unifying. Any approach based on differences, on the other hand, will both by definition and by logic, be *dis*-unifying.

Nixon saw and understood this fact very early, as did the U.S. “financial elite.” Tarpley:

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

² *CUNY Matters*, Summer 2003, p. 11. *CUNY Matters* is published by the Office of University Relations, The City University of New York, 535 East 80th St., New York, NY 10021.

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) (Tarpley, p. 101, emphases added)

In other words, the "financial elite" can spend far less money by *isolating* one minority from another for the receiving of grant-and-support donations than they ever could by actually *being* benevolent across the board, by socio-economic class, as would be the case in any real kind of economic Marshall Plan. In the meantime, the elites can still maintain the *appearance* of near-limitless benevolence and generosity, being the givers of manna to one eagerly-waiting group after another—while the non-recipient will grow to resent and perhaps even despise the recipient.

At the same time, party politicians like Nixon and Shultz—he of the "Princeton tiger tattooed on his posterior"—can make out like gangbusters by doing in effect the very same thing. Shultz's "Philadelphia Plan," as Tarpley points out, imposed racial quotas on the construction trades in order to create hostility between working class whites and opportunity-minded blacks, thereby successfully breaking up a bloc that would ordinarily, or otherwise, have been politically united.

What quickly developed in the years after Watergate was an extraordinary plan, widespread, omnipresent, and effective, whose intent was in large part to fragment and thereby neutralize any true, large-scale, political bloc that would in fact allow political power of, from, and by the people (the middle-class and the poor) to emerge, remain intact, and exert influence. With *that* enormous political bloc shattered into pieces

through the financial elites' strategy of divide and conquer, and then *kept* impotent both by that same strategy and by others, the elites would be free to consolidate their *own* ultra-conservative political power with increasing ease—always with the salient aim of removing both wealth *and* well-being *from* the people and transferring them in ever-greater amounts and at ever-greater rates of speed *to* the elites themselves.

In *The Unauthorized Biography*, Tarpley identifies mainly, but not only, the Trilateral Commission, the Ford Foundation, and the “foundation-funded Left CIA” as the vital sources of the putatively benevolent but in fact crippling divisive donations and energies that over the past twenty-five years have marked, weakened, balkanized, and all but destroyed any intact leftist or progressive-leftist social or intellectual fabric that may have remained in the entire U.S. And Obama is mixed in with it all, tight as a tick. As I mentioned [last time](#), Tarpley writes that in a certain passage in his memoir, *Dreams from My Father*, Obama 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” (p. 44).

The tentacles of such institutions reach far and probe deep. I myself have seen this and lived through it in a thirty-year academic hitch, a story I told in *A Nation Gone Blind*, when I knew vividly and despised heartily the political-intellectual ruins all around me, even though then I didn't entirely understand either their root causes *or* the studied, concerted, massive, and orchestrated political evil that those root causes represented.

In his own book, itself in many ways a history of the wildly destructive and anti-United States plot that we may soon find ourselves facing openly and head-on, Tarpley goes back even earlier than 1974 and shows how the divide-and-conquer warfare of rich against poor was at work even in the New York City teachers' strike of 1968. The particular relevance of that old history to our new administration-elect has to do with the centrality of the Ford Foundation's intrusive and destructive role in the strike—the same Ford Foundation that Obama's mother worked for that that Michelle Obama was later to join.

Under the heading “Ford Operatives Provoke the Teachers To Strike,” Tarpley writes, and cites, as follows:

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) (Tarpley, p. 75)

Tarpley spares no one's feelings or fears in pointing out the connections, real and potential, between then and now: "Every institution in the city," he writes,

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. (p. 75)

Frightening words. And yet there does remain for any seriously thinking person a question as to which of the two phrases is actually the *more* frightening or even, perhaps, the *more* destructive—"foundation methods of social engineering" or "civil war."

"The events round the New York City teachers' strike of 1968," Tarpley continues,

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. (p. 76)

He adds:

In other words, Lindsay was [unjustly caused to be] 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. (p. 77)

3

I can imagine readers, if any have stayed with me this long, finding themselves alarmed at the extremist tone audible in some of these passages from Tarpley, with their "civil war" and "Obama regime" and the like. Admittedly, back at the start of this piece, I myself was sufficiently alarmist for anyone's taste. But now, as we come toward a close, I think it's my responsibility to make perfectly clear that real urgency—even a sense of *emergency*—undeniably does permeate Tarpley's book. That very urgency is what has impelled him to write it—in effect, has impelled him to set out to warn any who will listen.

I've been reading Tarpley and writing about him for a few years now, and like any other conscientious descriptive or analytic writer on the subject of other peoples' books, I feel mainly a sense of inadequacy—of what I *can't* do to convey a book's full wealth. *This* one, I say now for the record, is a true powerhouse, rich both in breadth and in depth, in its clear sense of extremity, urgency, and importance, also in its remarkable thoroughness *and*, odd though this may sound, in its impartiality. Americans are seldom, almost never, told the truth. And it's *because* this book tells the truth that it seems shocking. That it *is* shocking. But it's impartial. Truth always is.

I urge that anyone who doubts my words will do the only adult, intelligent, responsible thing that remains to *be* done in such a case. Forget about me *immediately*. Get hold of the book. Read Tarpley. Decide for yourself.



It's strong stuff. But decades of cultivated ignorance have given Americans timid stomachs for the truth. Worse, those same decades of cultivated ignorance—steady diet of lies—have set Americans up as the willing patsies who now may be forced to witness the raising of the great curtain on a sight most, most ruinous and lamentable.

Let's follow Tarpley just for a moment longer on the subject of the New York teachers' strike. Under the heading "A Classic Patrician-Plebeian Alliance to Crush the Middle Class," he writes—and then again cites—the following:

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,³ 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.

³ For much of the character and many of the achievements of Vincent J. Salandria, see the extraordinary volume by E. Martin Schotz, [*History Will Not Absolve Us: Orwellian Control, Public Denial, & the Murder of President Kennedy*](#) (Brookline, 1996)

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.") (Tarpley, pp. 77-78)

And so we move from the New York City teachers' strike of 1968, a result of foundation-backed social engineering—i.e. dividing and conquering—on to Chicago and the figures familiar to everyone who used their eyes and ears during the recent campaign, Bernardine Dohrn and Bill Ayers.

There's an enormous amount of material here, but there's no way to avoid it. We're about to hear some stronger stuff than ever, and if the historian-biographer is to be given his due—which he *must* be, so far as I'm concerned—then we've got to follow the case he makes both as to its foreground and its background, not to mention, throughout, as to its fairness, transparency, and logic.

That said, we return to Tarpley. Under the less-than-mincing head, "Poverty Pimps for the Foundations," we read the following:

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. (pp. 67-68)

Information of this sort—that is, the truth about the widely revered but in fact ruinous, retrograde, profiling, conscienceless, powerfully controlling, oligarchic foundations—goes a long way in helping explain dreadful phenomena ranging from the collapse of university literary studies as described in *A Nation Gone Blind* all the way to [the cover-up of 9/11 truth](#) and the candidacy of Barack Obama.

Under the heading, “Obama’s Big Break: Ayers and the Chicago Annenberg Challenge,” Tarpley refers to writer and blogger Steve Diamond (“[Who ‘sent’ Obama?](#)” April 22, 2008) in beginning to unfold the story of Obama and Bill Ayers:

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. (p. 158)

Whether wafted there or not by “the fine Trilateral hand,” Diamond and Tarpley agree that “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.” (Tarpley, p. 158)

“Diamond’s suspicions [about who “sent” Obama and when they did so],” Tarpley writes,

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 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. (p. 160, emphasis added)

The truth is grotesquely painful, and the ugly truth that Tarpley gradually reveals—or at least the powerful *case* for this truth that he gradually reveals—is purely and simply that the Obama candidacy, campaign, and election are not only the greatest con job ever perpetrated on our nation and people, but that the real and actual *purpose* of that candidacy, campaign, and election may very well actually be to bring about once and for all the destruction of the U.S., “*the reduction of [it] into serfdom*,” the transfer of its wealth—as we are seeing already in the “bailouts” that are occurring, *without popular resistance*—into the pockets of the elites as the serfs are pressed further into misery.

The [foundation-and-corporation-controlled media](#) had no trouble euphemizing—lying about—the significance of Bill Ayers to Obama, emphasizing that Obama was [only “8 years old](#) when the Weathermen were bombing the U.S. Capitol and Pentagon and killing police officers.” Thanks to Tarpley, and to Steve Diamond, we’ve seen the fact of Obama’s, indeed, having once been eight years old to be quite irrelevant to his actual, and later, interest in Ayers.

Again, Tarpley’s facts are many and his treatment detailed:

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 prolabor 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 [sic] 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. (p. 79, emphases added)

And those, as learned from the foundations, and as dictated to *by* them, were to divide and conquer.

“The crowning achievement of McGeorge Bundy's career,” writes Tarpley, 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 [sic] 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) (Tarpley, p. 80)

Tarpley’s outrage at the monstrous coup staged during the Bakke period is unusual—not because he alone feels it, but because he, very nearly alone, has the courage to express it openly and with eloquent fervor. Thanks in greatest part to the foundations’ extraordinary work, particularly over the past thirty years, in fracturing, fragmenting, diminutizing, false-focusing, pietizing, indoctrinating, blinding, and numbing the minds of America’s liberal intellectuals, it quickly became a forbidden thing to put Tarpley’s logical, empirically evident, fact-based argument into words.

A nation gone blind was a nation ready—even willing—to be misled.

For Tarpley, the Obama candidacy, campaign, and election *could not have occurred* if it weren’t for the pre-existence of this massive Kool-Aid lie, *and* if it weren’t for the fact of this massive Kool-Aid lie having been willingly drunk by almost every “liberal” person in America, every one of them undoubtedly idealistic and undoubtedly nothing if not well-intended, including the young, whom we saw again and again in near-ecstasy at the mere sight of Obama, at the mere hoping and wishing *for* him.

And yet these people—*all* of them—were undereducated, kept sufficiently ignorant to be easily conned, misled, manipulated, and lied to. *Anyone* in America who has both a heart *and* a sufficiently informed mind to see what was happening all along and to see now what *has* happened—such a person can only weep in pity and sorrow merely at the thought that possibly we could have had a *real* candidate, an *actual* progressive, not a neocon dressed up as something he isn’t.

These words—*my* words—in our society of foundation-ism, anti-education, and pietistic false-focusing, will doubtless be taken as words indicating that I’m against Obama and that therefore I’m against blacks. My words, in short, will be taken as indicating that I am a racist. I am not. Neither am I blind.

Tarpley anticipates the same charge of racism, and, early in his book,⁴ he dismisses it deftly, thoroughly, conscientiously, and well. If I were to defend myself, here, against the same false charge, my defense would parallel his.

⁴ 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. 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

But it's unlikely that common sense will prevail in the matter of loosely-flung charges of racism any more than it will prevail in overwhelmingly immense questions that are very soon going to determine the very future of our nation, along with the question of whether that future will be tolerable and free, or, plainly put, intolerable, vicious, mean, criminal, horrible, and appalling.

What's happened so far, over the past two years, is no indication that the signs are favorable, no matter how much they may appear so to the celebrating millions in the weeks following the election.

Tarpley:

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 [i.e., Tarpley's view] 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

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. (pp. 10-11)

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. (pp. 80-81, emphases added)

4

So just what *will* the powers-that-be do with their puppet, now that, at long last, after almost thirty years of preparation, they've found, chosen, gotten, indoctrinated, and caught him to keep as long as they like? Tarpley fears civil war brought about by calculated racial injustice, incendiarism, unfairness, and fraud. So do I. Equally, he fears fascism. So do I. In his previous book, [*Obama—The Postmodern Coup: The Making of a Manchurian Candidate*](#), says Tarpley, “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.” (p. 305) In [part one](#) of this essay, we looked at some of the results of this whole-ownership, and Tarpley argued that it served for one thing to

[reveal] 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. (pp. 305-306)

Perhaps. In all likelihood, in contrast with the ham-handed methods of Bush/Cheney, it will *all* “be done under left cover”—but not an atom of it will be any the

less tyrannic and ruthless for that. Perhaps the “war on terror” slogans *will* be dumped, but for the time being terrorism itself is being practiced upon us the people like there were no tomorrow. Even before the election, Biden was [guaranteeing another 9/11](#) or worse, then came “Barack Obama is warned to beware of a [‘huge threat’ from al-Qaeda](#)” via the *London Times*, and this happy Thanksgiving morning, as I write, the bombings in Mumbai please the editors of the *New York Times* well enough to widen their headline to four columns—for a bombing that’s [fake throughout, getting us “ready” for Obama’s “necessary” war on Pakistan](#).

And to judge by the cabinet Obama is currently assembling, it seems possible that his owners aren’t even going to bother with the business of “left cover”—as in the decision, for example, to keep Robert Gates for Defense Secretary, a man whom Ray McGovern describes first-hand as one who would choose—no, *did* choose—cold-blooded mass murder over having a rung in his career ladder taken away ([“Robert Gates: As Bad as Rumsfeld?”](#)).

Conceivably, any prediction or evaluation is already too late. It’s absolutely possible that the fix is in, and that, for all his effort, all his depth, all his knowledge, all his care in looking beneath the surface, all his unflagging efforts to warn, to warn, to warn—that maybe even Webster Tarpley is too late. Maybe the nation has simply been so blind for so long that there’s no longer any supply of popular wisdom or political perception or natural strength left whatsoever to be drawn upon in any effort to right the nation.

I suspect Tarpley would agree with most of Chris Hedges’ crushingly depressing recent article about dumbing down. Entitled [“America the Illiterate,”](#) it explains in its first paragraph that

We live in two Americas. One America, now the minority, functions in a print-based, literate world. It can cope with complexity and has the intellectual tools to separate illusion from truth. The other America, which constitutes the majority, exists in a non-reality-based belief system. This America, dependent on skillfully manipulated images for information, has severed itself from the literate, print-based culture. It cannot differentiate between lies and truth. It is informed by simplistic, childish narratives and clichés. It is thrown into confusion by ambiguity, nuance and self-reflection. This divide, more than race, class or gender, more than rural or urban, believer or nonbeliever, red state or blue state, has split the country into radically distinct, unbridgeable and antagonistic entities.

The phrases “more than race, class or gender, more than rural or urban, believer or nonbeliever, red state or blue state” are a clear echo of Tarpley’s repeated plea that race is a false index of need, while *poverty* is a real one—which is precisely why it will continue to be ignored. At the same time, Hedges’ paragraph tells us exactly who it was that elected Obama—except that there are more cross-overs between the two populations than Hedges knows. There’s nothing scientific about it, but a reading of *A Nation Gone Blind* will show that there are plenty of *literate* people, along with the sea of illiterates, who “cannot differentiate between lies and truth.” *They’re* the ones who elected Obama, who

apparently can't even remember, or never noticed, that the Bill of Rights has been destroyed. Mickey Z. has a word or two for those electors in "[A Song for Obama](#)"—and for us all—worth citing:

Yeah, I guess there'll be absolutely no reason for Ed Hamell to write a new protest song when Lord Obama maintains the death penalty, the PATRIOT Act, the fence on the US-Mexican border, and the subsidizing of Israeli war crimes. Gays can't marry, single-payer is doomed, and the third term of the Clinton administration looms. . .but Hamell and his militant ilk can "stop bitching" now. For posers like them, all this doesn't seem to include the reality that blacks make up roughly 12% of the American population but constitute 40% of the death row population. It doesn't include an obscene military budget, corporate personhood, structural adjustment programs, and NAFTA.

The Obamatrons are not pushing their hero to end any of the following either: the bogus war on a tactic, corporate welfare, homelessness, sweatshops, factory farming, strip mining, deforestation, or giving away control of public airwaves, public land, and public pensions. Ninety percent of the ocean's large fish are gone but somehow these are "jubilant" times for those deluded denizens of the Left ready to "stop bitching."

They'd rather bask in the toxic glow of fantasy—choosing to believe their work is done because a mainstream politician who raised \$640 million is gonna turn "all this" around. These folks have tainted the very concept of radical activism and deserve nothing but our contempt.

In a nation gone blind, where Chris Hedges' "minority" of those who can tell true from false is a *far* smaller minority than he might think, in a nation whose [most celebrated profs and scholars](#) don't even make the cut into that minority—in a nation like ours, you can search long and hard for any *good* news.

Here's one of the handy synoptic paragraphs that Tarpley generously provides readers with in his book—read it carefully, because there'll be a quiz question afterward asking you to pinpoint the *good* news:

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. (pp.354-355)

And so he did, except the Republican was named Biden-the-Terror-Monger.

Just how bad is it going to be, our "future"? Academia is a shambles, intellectuals can't think, the general population (intellectuals included) is "dependent on skillfully manipulated images for information" and can't "differentiate between lies and truth"—how much better suited could any nation conceivably *be* for the arrival not of a savior but of a demagogue?

For *decades* the ground has been softened up, and ditto with the brains of the American "intellectual class." Just take a look—through Tarpley's plainest of words—at what the "left" has allowed—no, what the left has swallowed hook, line, and sinker, what the "left" has *encouraged*—over the past thirty years:

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,*⁵ which cannot escape the fact that the hopes of

⁵ "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.'

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. (p. 102, emphases added)

That dead hand—along “with its policing and proselytizing arm, the mass media,”—has successfully transformed the arts and academia into impotent collaborators, the “people” have been made by all appearances catatonic, the intelligentsia for the far greatest part ditto. Tarpley is a magnificent exception, as are certain others, for example the absolutely extraordinary Dr. Judy Wood, along with her [revolutionary scientific work showing what really happened to the World Trade Center buildings on 9/11](#)—revelatory work that, as far as I can see, is being malignly and traitorously marginalized (click [here](#) if you wonder what I mean). And, yes, there *are* other examples like Tarpley and Wood—but too few, too tired, too late. Almost the whole of the American intellectual class, along with *all* of the American mainstream media, are already complicit in the crimes of the *present* tyranny under Cheney/Bush. What conceivable reason could or would there ever be for them to change under the *approaching* one?

Don’t forget the economy—what’s been done to it so far, by whom it’s been done, who is going to suffer as a result, and who is going to benefit—majorly. Another reading of [Daniel Estulin](#) is a requirement—before class on Monday—for *anyone* who’s not up and alert on every single one of those four preceding economic “questions.”

Back a ways, we saw Tarpley predicting “savage austerity, brutal economic sacrifice, and a massive further reduction in the standard of living of the depleted and exhausted US population” under an Obama administration. Let’s look at what he says a paragraph later:

Obama has thus [by a candid remark on the campaign trail—see [Part One](#) of this review] 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. (p. 306)

Grotesque and horrible talk. Grotesque and horrible thoughts. But just think of today’s [bombings in Mumbai](#) as you read Tarpley’s words—and if you find *no*

(Heather Mac Donald”) (Tarpley, p. 81) Read [A Nation Gone Blind](#) for description of the equivalent death of the *literary* arts. EL

connection between the two, or *no* connection between Mumbai and our future under Obama and his helpers, *then* your assignment is not just to read [Estulin](#) by Monday, but to read [Tarpley also](#) by Monday.

Everyone in America should read Tarpley in any case. I repeat the word: *Everyone*, skeptical or not. And there *are* some things here and there to be skeptical *about*—Tarpley is odd on global warming—but in *The Unauthorized Biography* we have an extraordinarily important book, a book right now every bit as important as any other I know of or can think of—and a book, also, legacy of our gravely endangered Constitutional freedoms, that's available to be read freely by anyone who *will*.

Those who elect *not* to read the book, it seems to me, though with all the usual understandable exceptions, must be either blind on the one hand or suicidal on the other.

When I think of America now, all I can think of is lemmings.

Happy Thanksgiving.

—Eric Larsen

—November 27, 2008