



Written by [Staff](#) on April 4, 2011

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 27, No. 07

Inside Track

NPR: Not Politically Responsible

If you want to know what's wrong with taxpayer subsidies for National Public Radio, conservative investigator James O'Keefe and his Project Veritas have provided the answer.

In two secretly made recordings, undercover operatives working for O'Keefe made top NPR executives look like liberal fools.

The trouble for NPR began when Project Veritas operatives, posing as Muslim philanthropists working for the "Muslin Education Action Trust," ate lunch on February 22 with NPR execs Ron Schiller and Betsy Liley. Schiller was the NPR foundation president and vice president for development; Liley is director of institutional giving.

At the lunch, Schiller said that Tea Party members are stupid racists. And Liley laughed and approved when the Muslim men said they call NPR "National Palestinian Radio" because its coverage of the Middle East is biased against Israel. The Muslim philanthropists confessed their group is essentially a front for the infamous Muslim Brotherhood, which seeks to unify Islam in a transnational political Caliphate, and discussed giving NPR \$5 million.

When the tape went viral, it not only pushed Ron Schiller out the door but also ended the NPR career of CEO Vivian Schiller. She landed in hot water in October for saying that veteran NPR man Juan Williams, a liberal, needed a psychiatrist after he confessed that seeing Muslims on a plane make him nervous.

After that first explosion, Project Veritas posted an audio of Liley speaking to one of the two Muslims with whom she ate lunch. In that conversation, she promised to hide Muslin Education Action Trust as the donor of the \$5 million donation from auditors, and said legal counsel was drafting an agreement for the gift.

The problem was that, after the first tape appeared, NPR heatedly denied it had considered accepting the donation. The second tape belied that claim. NPR planned to take the money and hide the source. And CEO Vivian Schiller, the tape shows, knew about it.

The irony of the situation is that a prominent public radio executive, three days after the lunch but before it was exposed, told NPR board members at a meeting that the leftist network made a mistake cultivating an audience of rich, white liberals. Appealing to 11 percent of the population had been successful, Susan Schardt said, but the conservative criticism of NPR — that it is a liberal network aimed at a liberal audience — is largely correct. Schardt appealed to the board to broaden NPR's audience.

Meanwhile, Project Veritas plans to release even more damning evidence of NPR's leftist politics.

Government Payouts Are a Third of U.S. "Income"

If it sometimes feels like almost everyone is on the government dole except you, there may be a reason for that sensation: According to a recent study, one-third of all income in the United States comes in various forms of "social welfare benefits."

The trend toward a growing proportion of the population relying on government programs instead of



Written by [Staff](#) on April 4, 2011

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 27, No. 07

labor for its income has been an observable phenomena since at least the days when President Johnson's "Great Society" programs were initiated in the mid-1960s. Now, however, federal and state budget deficits are metastasizing as politicians whose reelection depends on giving away "other people's money" find themselves running out of working citizens to tax.

As reported by CNBC, the study by TrimTabs Investment Research revealed that "Government payouts — including Social Security, Medicare and unemployment insurance — make up more than a third of total wages and salaries of the U.S. population, a record figure that will only increase if action isn't taken before the majority of Baby Boomers enter retirement."

The amount of "income" dependent on government largesse is ballooning at an almost unimaginable rate. In the words of the CNBC story:

In order to get welfare back to its pre-recession ratio of 26 percent of pay, "either wages and salaries would have to increase \$2.3 trillion, or 35 percent, to \$8.8 trillion, or social welfare benefits would have to decline \$500 billion, or 23 percent, to \$1.7 trillion," she said.

The first is an economic impossibility, the second a political improbability. Given the intersection of difficult economic and political choices — and a political class which has learned that avoiding such choices is usually the best way to guarantee reelection — it remains to be seen whether the American people will keep the pressure on their Representatives to stop spending before the economy spirals down to a level far worse than has been experienced the past several years.

CFR: Tea Party Dangerous, Obstructive

When the internationalist-minded Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) decided it was time to take a hard look at the growing influence of the Tea Party movement in America, it selected "one of the country's leading students of American foreign policy," Walter Russell Mead, to do the study. His article in the March/April 2011 issue of *Foreign Affairs* is entitled "The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy: What Populism Means for Globalism."

He gets the first part right: "The rise of the Tea Party movement has been the most controversial and dramatic development in U.S. politics for many years. Supporters have hailed it as a return to core American values; opponents have seen it as a racist, reactionary, and ultimately futile protest against the emerging reality of a multicultural, multiracial United States and a new era of government activism."

He then complains that this battle of ideologies is going to be impossible to resolve, especially since the Tea Party has no leadership, and includes "affluent suburban libertarians, rural fundamentalists, ambitious pundits, unreconstructed racists, and fiscally conservative housewives." He was distressed to learn that about 115 million of them exist (or at least sympathize with the movement) according to a recent poll.

Mead recognizes the danger represented by the Tea Party to the socialist/internationalist agenda. If resistance to the schemes and plans of the insiders to turn the United States into just another European socialist country in a new world order continues to grow, there could be real trouble for the elites.

Writes Mead:

Sometimes those elites are right, and sometimes they are wrong, but their ability to win



Written by [Staff](#) on April 4, 2011

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 27, No. 07

voter approval for policies that seem counterintuitive is a critical factor in the American political system. In times like the present, when a surge of populist political energy coincides with a significant loss of popular confidence in establishment institutions — ranging from the mainstream media and the foreign policy and intellectual establishments to the financial and corporate leadership and the government itself — *Jacksonian sentiment [Tea Party sentiment] diminishes the ability of elite institutions and their members to shape national debates and policy.* [Emphasis added.] The rejection of the scientific consensus on climate change is [just] one of many examples of populist revolt against expert consensus in the United States.

Let's unpack what Mead has just said here. The elites have an agenda, right or wrong. But under what is left of the Constitution, voter approval is still necessary to obtain approval and funding for their agenda. But with their increasing loss of credibility, and the awakening of members and supporters of the Tea Party to the decades-long scam, the elitists are finding it increasingly difficult to accomplish their objectives. And the mainstream media, losing credibility daily as it continues to reflect the elites' positions that are no longer tenable, are having less and less influence in the real conversation about freedom. The Internet is taking its place.

Mead tries to put a happy face on this unnerving opposition to the establishment's plans for America: "Even though it is by no means likely that the new Jacksonians will gain full control of the government anytime soon (or perhaps ever), the influence of the populist revolt against mainstream politics has become so significant that students of U.S. foreign policy must consider the consequences." In other words, the Tea Party represents only a temporary speed bump on the way to the new world order, but it could get out of hand if the elites aren't careful.

He's right about that. Many Tea Partiers have little interest in nation-building, or in "making the world safe for democracy." They think countries should mind their own business. All of which makes accomplishment of the elite's "liberal world order" all the more questionable. Mead states the obvious: "Today's Jacksonians are ready and willing to do whatever it takes to defend the United States, but they do not believe that U.S. interests are best served by the creation of a liberal and cosmopolitan [read: internationalist] world order."

Mead does draw some hope from the apparent division relating to foreign adventures that appears to be forming in the Tea Party. The "Paulites" (represented by Ron Paul) represent, he says, "an inward-looking, neo-isolationist approach to foreign policy." The "Palinites" (represented by Sarah Palin) are much more to the elite's liking, wanting instead a "vigorous, proactive approach to the problem of terrorism in the Middle East, one that rests on a close alliance between the United States and Israel."

In stating his nervousness about the potential for the Tea Party to delay the internationalists' plans to sew up the "liberal world order" promptly, Mead also provides a warning to those calling themselves Tea Partiers who are investing themselves in the freedom fight. He says,

Americans [insider-elites] should rejoice that in many ways the Tea Party movement, warts and all, is a significantly more capable and reliable partner for the United States' world-order-building tasks than were the isolationists of 60 years ago.



Written by [Staff](#) on April 4, 2011

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 27, No. 07

Restating the obvious, Mead allows that if the “Palinites” succeed in controlling the direction of the Tea Party on international affairs, then the elites’ march to their liberal world order should continue without difficulty.

As the Tea Party movement grows, the problems that it creates for CFR insiders should continue to mount — but only if the Tea Party movement moves in the direction of the noninterventionist foreign policy advocated by Ron Paul, as opposed to the interventionist foreign policy advocated by Sarah Palin.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.