



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

Trump vs. the Establishment

Hedge fund billionaires, Wall Street mega-bankers, Hollywood movie moguls, RINOs (Republicans In Name Only), ultra-Left “Progressive” Democrats, and Big Media journalists have all ganged up on one man. Together with an AstroTurf army of neocon pundits, radical academics, student activists, and street agitators funded by the Big Foundations and Big Government, they have united to stop that one man: Donald J. Trump.



George Soros, David Rockefeller, Bill Gates, Warren Buffett, Michael Bloomberg, Steven Spielberg, Jeff Bezos, and a bevy of other uber-rich titans have teamed up with *National Review*, the *Weekly Standard*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, CNN, MSNBC, CBS, ABC, NPR, et al., to ensure that “The Donald” never makes it into the White House. Some of these plutocrats — Soros, Buffett, and Spielberg — have taken the full “I’m With Her” Hillary Rodham Clinton loyalty pledge. Many of the anti-Trump “Republican” and “conservative” poseurs, on the other hand, have not formally taken the Hillary plunge, but their implacable “Never Trump” stance amounts to the same thing.

Not since 1964 has the political and financial establishment gone into such full-tilt mode against a presidential candidate. In fact, the establishment elites are shamelessly recycling the same vicious propaganda tactics against Donald Trump that they employed against Republican U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, then the rising star of the conservative/anti-communist movement.

Piling On the Propaganda

Goldwater, the establishment media choir relentlessly chimed, was an “extremist” and a “racist,” and was responsible for the “climate of hate” that was somehow responsible for the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the race riots that were then rocking many American cities. Sound familiar? Moreover, voters were repeatedly told, the Arizona solon did not have the “temperament” to be the man with his finger on the nuclear trigger: His “extremism” and “warmongering” could lead to atomic war and global incineration. The anti-Goldwater character assassination campaign culminated with the infamous “daisy ad,” the television commercial in which a winsome young girl counting daisy petals disappears in a mushroom cloud.

A remake of the “daisy ad” aimed at Trump is rumored to be in the offing. Back in May, *Politico* interviewed the admen who created “Daisy” and other notorious hit pieces for President Johnson’s venomous 1964 TV campaign that revolutionized political commercials.

In the *Politico* interview (“LBJ’s Ad Men: Here’s How Clinton Can Beat Trump”), two of the still-living members of Johnson’s ad team explained how the successful formula they used to smear Goldwater could be used to undermine Trump. Sid Myers, former art director at Doyle Dane Bernbach, the LBJ campaign’s advertising firm, and Lloyd Wright, the Democratic National Committee’s media coordinator at the time, detailed how some of their dirty tricks that were so effective in 1964 could also work well



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

today.

Actually, some of those tricks were already under way against Trump before the *Politico* article appeared. One of the 1964 slime attacks employed the favorite libel of liberals, that conservatives and Republicans are racist KKKers. (The inconvenient reality is that, historically, it has been the Democratic Party and Democratic politicians that have been most closely associated with the Ku Klux Klan.) Myers and Wright led the team that filmed LBJ's commercial featuring a KKK cross-burning with voice-over endorsements of Goldwater. Over the past several months, Big Media reporters and commentators have been churning and rechurning a contrived non-story: that Donald Trump received a KKK endorsement that he did not "immediately" disavow. Why is that a contrived non-story? Well, for several reasons. First of all, there's good reason to believe that this is a "political stunt," which is to say that it is very likely that the whole "endorsement" was a set-up by Trump's opposition to create precisely that slime effect it is having — or that they hope it is having.

The Myers-Wright LBJ hitmen parlayed the KKK smear into another infamous ad known as "Confessions of a Republican," a four-minute monologue in which actor William Bogert, posing as a lifelong Republican coming from a long family history of Republicans, worriedly explained that Goldwater "scares me." "When the head of the Ku Klux Klan, when all these weird groups, come out in favor of the candidate of my party — either they're not Republicans, or I'm not," Bogert said.

Truth be told, Bogert was/is a Republican In Name Only (a RINO), as his most recent performances confirm. The 80-year-old actor has been trotted out by Team Hillary and her media allies over the past several months to reprise his anti-Goldwater "Confessions" against the current Republican presidential nominee. As the Republican National Convention was getting under way in Cleveland this past July, the Clinton campaign released a new ad featuring Bogert replaying his 1964 role and explaining why Trump "scares me." However, before the Clinton/Bogert spot was actually run as a commercial, Bogert was featured in friendly interviews with CNN's Don Lemon and MSNBC's Rachel Maddow, and in articles for *Time*, *U.S. News & World Report*, and other similar organs, where he has invariably been presented as a "moderate" Republican, the same as in 1964.

But how "moderate" is a Republican who can support left-wing "Progressive" Democrat Lyndon Johnson in 1964 and left-wing "Progressive" Democrat Hillary Clinton in 2016? Rather, Bogert, like other (real or alleged) Republicans jumping on the anti-Trump/pro-Clinton bandwagon, may be best described as a "Rockefeller Republican." That was a much-used and well-understood political term in the 1960s and 1970s, and still is a very relevant label today describing the pro-Big Government, liberal-left, globalist, one-world GOP operatives that masquerade as "moderates." Specifically, it referred to the elitist wing of the GOP led by Nelson Rockefeller (governor of New York, 1959-1973, and vice president, 1974-1977). Nelson, the scion of the ultra-rich Rockefeller banking dynasty and a perennial presidential wannabe, was ignominiously defeated by Goldwater in the 1964 primaries. But for those in the know, "Rockefeller Republican" more accurately described (and still describes) the GOP leaders and agents associated with the "Eastern Establishment" presided over by Nelson's brother David, then chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, as well as chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the "brain trust" of the Eastern Establishment.

The Rockefeller Republicans of the Eastern Establishment represented the moneyed Wall Street interests that were allied to the Big Government, internationalist agenda of the New Deal/New Frontier Democrats. Like the Democrats, they favored more government spending, more federal regulation and



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

intervention, foreign aid, the United Nations, entangling treaties, judicial activism, abortion, etc. The Rockefeller Republicans were/are a mere echo of the Democrats, thus Goldwater's pledge to offer "a choice, not an echo" to the American people.

But the idea of offering a real choice of political leaders to the American people is actually anathema to the establishment that has captured both the Democrat and Republican parties, and held them under tight control for decades. The reality of American politics was described this way in 1966 by the late Professor Carroll Quigley in his famous book *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*: "The argument that the two parties should represent opposed ideals and policies, one, perhaps of the Right and the other of the Left, is a foolish idea acceptable only to the doctrinaire and academic thinkers. Instead the two parties should be almost identical, so that the American people can 'throw the rascals out' at any election without leading to any profound or extensive shifts in policy."

Quigley's description above is important not because it represents his own views (although that may also be the case), but because, according to him, it represents the views and operational plans of the ruling elite, the Eastern Establishment, that, de facto, has usurped control over America's financial and political system. Even more importantly, the results of one election cycle after another, over the past 50-60 years, have clearly demonstrated that the change of party does not bring "any profound or extensive shifts in policy."

Dominant Political Desires

Dr. Quigley, a professor of history at Princeton, Harvard, and Georgetown Universities, and a mentor of Bill Clinton, was one of the rare academics who was privileged to study the "secret records" of the Council on Foreign Relations and the "network of power" of which it is a key component.

"There does exist," wrote Quigley, "and has existed for a generation, an international Anglophile network which operates, to some extent, in the way the radical Right believes the Communists act. In fact, this network, which we may identify as the Round Table Groups, has no aversion to cooperating with the Communists, or any other groups, and frequently does so." The chief Round Table Groups to which he refers are the CFR (in the United States) and the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA, also known as Chatham House, in Britain). "I know of the operations of this network," Quigley explained, "because I have studied it for twenty years and was permitted for two years, in the early 1960's, to examine its papers and secret records." "I have no aversion to it or to most of its aims and have, for much of my life, been close to it and to many of its instruments," he continued. "I have objected, both in the past and recently, to a few of its policies ... but in general my chief difference of opinion is that it wishes to remain unknown, and I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

Indeed, now more than ever, the role of this secretive power network "is significant enough to be known." But, unfortunately, far too few are courageous enough to truly "speak truth to power" and expose the increasing stranglehold it exercises over our entire nation, and much of the planet.

Hillary Rodham Clinton's close ties to the globalist establishment, particularly as embodied in its chief operations arm, the CFR, explains why the world government lobby — both Republicans and Democrats — has rushed to her aid and is viciously attacking Trump. By both word and deed, she has proven herself to be a thoroughgoing internationalist, an anti-national sovereignty one-worlder. Although she is



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

not herself a CFR member, her daughter, Chelsea, and husband, Bill, are both members. However, official membership is a mere formality that she, undoubtedly, is forgoing for the time being to avoid needless controversy. Like Bill, she is certain to become an official member when it is expedient. In the meantime, she has left no doubts as to where she stands, having infamously lauded the CFR for guiding the U.S. State Department in “what we should be doing and how we should think,” and having referred to Pratt House, the CFR headquarters in New York City, as “the mother ship.”

Those paeans of praise came from Hillary Clinton during a July 2009 speech she delivered at the CFR’s new Washington, D.C., headquarters, while she was still serving as President Obama’s secretary of state. She was introduced by her “good friend,” CFR President Richard Haass, who leads the organization’s calls for “global governance” and regularly supports ceding U.S. national sovereignty to international bodies. (Naturally, he is also harshly critical of Trump.)

Following her introduction by Haass, Secretary Clinton made this remarkable admission:

Thank you very much, Richard, and I am delighted to be here in these new headquarters. I have been often to, I guess, the mother ship in New York City, but it’s good to have an outpost of the Council right here down the street from the State Department. We get a lot of advice from the Council, so this will mean I won’t have as far to go to be told what we should be doing and how we should think about the future.

As U.S. senator for New York and secretary of state, Hillary Rodham Clinton has reliably promoted the CFR “mother ship’s” agenda: the UN’s International Criminal Court, the UN’s Small Arms Treaty, the UN’s Convention on the Rights of the Child, the UN’s Law of the Sea Treaty, the UN’s population control and sexual perversion agenda, the World Trade Organization, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, and much more. She has also pushed many of these same (and related) programs through the Bill and Hillary Clinton Foundation, while also enriching herself under the guise of philanthropy.

Clinton’s words and deeds more than confirm the severe critique of the organization by the late Admiral Chester Ward, who was himself a CFR member for nearly two decades. Admiral Ward, writing in 1977 on the powerful control the private and secretive CFR exercises over official U.S. policy, noted:

Once the ruling members of CFR have decided that the U.S. Government should adopt a particular policy, the very substantial research facilities of CFR are put to work to develop arguments, intellectual and emotional, to support the new policy, and to confound and discredit, intellectually and politically, any opposition. The most articulate theoreticians and ideologists prepare related articles, aided by the research, to sell the new policy and to make it appear inevitable and irresistible. By following the evolution of this propaganda in the most prestigious scholarly journal in the world, *Foreign Affairs*, anyone can determine years in advance what the future defense and foreign policies of the United States will be. If a certain proposition is repeated often enough in that journal, then the U.S. Administration in power — be it Republican or Democratic — begins to act as if that proposition or assumption were an established fact.

Admiral Ward, a former judge advocate general of the U.S. Navy and a CFR member from 1959-1977, became one of the organization’s chief critics. According to Ward, the goal of the CFR is the “submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national independence into an all-powerful one-world government.” He charged that “this lust to surrender the sovereignty and independence of the United



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

States is pervasive throughout most of the membership.” The CFR elite and their allied globalists in the RIIA, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderberg Group, the Brookings Institution, the Aspen Institute, the Ford Foundation, and other internationalist centers, have for decades referred to their world government plans as the New World Order.

The roadblock of national sovereignty, and specifically the U.S. Constitution with its structural checks and balances, is standing in the way of this grand scheme. This is why, Admiral Ward noted, “In the entire CFR lexicon, there is no term of revulsion carrying a meaning so deep as ‘America First.’”

Trying to Tame Trump

It was Goldwater’s “America First” philosophy that caused the CFR establishment to unleash the hellish hordes of Mordor against him, and it is Trump’s “America First” comments that have, likewise, sent the orchestrated waves of revulsion crashing upon him from the globalist chorus.

Let’s briefly examine the very carefully choreographed outpouring of outrage from the Rockefeller Republicans and the Clinton Democrats. Although scripted to appear spontaneous and uncoordinated, the critically time-released statements by high-profile politicians and the stories and op-eds by their media allies are about as spontaneous as a Super Bowl halftime show.

One of the most recent anti-Trump hit pieces by the CFR’s “Republocrats” came in the form of a letter to the *New York Times* (for nearly a century the CFR’s prime propaganda transmission belt) on August 8, from, as the *Times* put it, “Fifty of the nation’s most senior Republican national security officials.”

The letter, signed by former officials of the National Security Council and the Departments of State, Defense, and Homeland Security, accuses Donald Trump of lacking the “character, values, and experience” to be president, and charge that he would “put at risk our country’s national security and well-being.”

“We know the personal qualities required of a President of the United States,” the letter states, and continues: “None of us will vote for Donald Trump.” The letter by ostensible Republicans reads like a rip-and-read press statement from Team Hillary, utilizing all the Clintonian buzzwords about Trump’s “temperament” and “ignorance,” and his “dangerous” and “reckless” tendencies. The list of signatories to the letter is a veritable Who’s Who of Rockefeller Republicans from the past several GOP administrations. Among the prominent CFR members who signed on are John B. Bellinger III, Robert Blackwill, Eliot A. Cohen, Richard Fontaine, Jendayi Frazer, Aaron Friedberg, Brian Gunderson, Michael Hayden, Carla A. Hills, John Negroponte, Nicholas Rostow, Shirin R. Tahir-Kheli, William H. Taft IV, Dov Zakheim, Philip Zelikow, and Robert Zoellick.

Trump responded to the attack, charging that the letter’s signers are “the ones the American people should look to for answers on why the world is a mess, and we thank them for coming forward so everyone in the country knows who to blame for making the world such a dangerous place.” These supposedly important critics, he said, are “nothing more than the failed Washington elite looking to hold onto their power.” It is difficult to dispute Trump on this key point, which is why the CFR-aligned media focus instead on trumped up stories, such as the “crying baby fiasco,” and his supposed “Second Amendment threat” against Hillary.

Another member of the “failed Washington elite,” Maine Senator Susan M. Collins (CFR), penned a similar anti-Trump letter for the *Washington Post* (another longtime CFR transmission belt) on the same



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

day, August 8, entitled “Why I Cannot Support Donald Trump.” Senator Collins, who has an abysmal 40 percent rating on this magazine’s Freedom Index, says in her letter that she is “a lifelong Republican.” “But Donald Trump,” she insists, “does not reflect historical Republican values nor the inclusive approach to governing that is critical to healing the divisions in our country.” Apparently, in Collins’ view, “historical Republican values” include supporting bigger government, more taxes, more debt, more regulation (except when it comes to auditing the unaccountable Federal Reserve, a common-sense proposal she opposes), more undeclared wars, and more surveillance-state measures, as well as support for the militant pro-abortion and LGBTQ agendas.

Also on August 8, much of the CFR-aligned blogosphere and Big Media universe celebrated the announcement by Republican Evan McMullin (CFR) that he is entering the presidential race as an “independent” #NeverTrump candidate. McMullin, who recently left his job as the chief policy director for Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives, claims to be a conservative, but is more likely a neoconservative of the Susan Collins/Paul Ryan/John McCain/Mitch McConnell stripe. Besides being a CFR member, he is ex-CIA (favorite intel-disinformation apparatus of the CFR), and ex-Goldman Sachs (favorite Wall Street firm of Hillary).

A couple of weeks earlier, in a July 24 column for the left-wing Daily Beast, liberal-left Democrat “journalist” Eleanor Clift (the veteran commentator for PBS and MSNBC) reported, with apparent glee, “Some of the GOP’s best brains” are now going for Hillary. Among the supposed Republican brainiacs that are joining the Clinton camp, says Clift, are Robert Kagan (CFR), a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a co-founder of the all-war-all-the-time Project for the New American Century; Brent Scowcroft (CFR), an advisor to four GOP presidents; Henry Paulson, Jr. (CFR), former treasury secretary under President George W. Bush and former chairman and CEO of Goldman Sachs; Kori Schake (CFR), former George W. Bush National Security official; Max Boot, a CFR senior fellow and former advisor to John McCain, Mitt Romney, and Marco Rubio; retired Army Colonel Peter Mansoor (CFR), former top aide to General David Petraeus (CFR); and Larry Pressler (CFR), former U.S. senator for South Dakota.

It’s easy to see why a “progressive” such as Eleanor Clift would consider these Rockefeller RINOs to be the GOP’s “best brains,” but most thinking Republicans with any constitutional conviction would say “good riddance,” and would urge these longtime globalists to stay in the party of Bernie, Barack, and Hillary, where they belong. There are too many like Larry Pressler posing as “moderate Republicans” as long as it is politically expedient. But this is not the first time he has jumped ship: He also voted and campaigned for Obama in 2012.

Many more of the CFR Republican elite can be expected to make highly public defections in the coming days and weeks. Maybe not all the way over to an endorsement of Hillary, but certainly condemning Trump and warning voters of the grave “dangers” he would pose if he occupied the White House. Between now and November 8, we can be sure there will be coordinated waves of RINO Rockefeller Republicans attacking Trump and embracing Clinton, all in a scripted effort to cripple and defeat the Republican nominee.

The Team Hillary message is, “See, Trump is so toxic and unpresidential that even all these famous Republicans are fleeing him.” That message will work — and is working — with ill-informed voters. For truly informed voters, however, the RINO exodus is a good thing to cheer, and one of the best endorsements for Donald Trump. Yes, from a solid, constitutionalist perspective, he has many faults,



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on September 5, 2016

Published in the issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 32, No. 17

warts, and deficiencies. However, it should be clear from the unprecedented magnitude and ferocity of the attacks leveled against him that Trump represents an existential threat to the CFR insiders' grand schemes for a New World Order. And it should be equally clear that Hillary Clinton is viewed by these same globalists as the chosen one to further extend their subversive schemes. Whatever his faults, Trump is seen by the globalists as their adversary, because they see in him a nationalist, a patriot, who will stand athwart their schemes for global empire. Moreover, due to his independent wealth, he is uniquely positioned to challenge and monkey-wrench their schemes. And for these reasons, between now and election day, their attacks on him will be relentless and ever more vicious.

* * *

Hillary's Wall Street Fat Cats and Billionaire Boys' Club

Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren, and other Democrats lambasted Hillary Clinton for her scandalously enormous campaign donations from Wall Street's biggest banks and hedge funds. Her response has been to double down and take still more campaign lucre, while feigning outrage that anyone would think that any amount of money, no matter how large, could ever corrupt a paragon of virtue such as herself. "Anybody who knows me, who thinks they can influence me, name anything they've influenced me on. Just name one thing," Clinton defiantly charged at a February 3, 2016, televised CNN forum in New Hampshire. "I'm out here every day saying, 'I'm going to shut them down; I'm going after them.'" At an earlier campaign stop in Iowa on January 24, she declared, "I believe strongly that we need to make sure that Wall Street never wrecks Main Street again.... No bank is too big to fail, and no executive is too powerful to jail."

In an internal memo on August 8, Hillary Clinton's campaign manager Robby Mook crowed that the campaign had hauled in \$90 million in July, and "we are very proud of the more than \$469 million our campaign has raised so far." It is certain to hit well over a half billion dollars before Election Day. And here are some of the principal Lords of Mammon who are providing it: George Soros, hedge fund investor, \$9 million to pro-Clinton SuperPACs; Alex Soros, son of George Soros, \$1 million to pro-Clinton groups; Steven Spielberg, Hollywood producer/director, \$1 million to pro-Clinton SuperPACs; Donald Sussman, Paloma Partners hedge fund, \$8.1 million to pro-Clinton SuperPACs; James Simons, Renaissance Technologies investment firm, \$9.5 million to pro-Clinton groups; Bernard L. Schwartz, investment banker, \$1 million to pro-Clinton groups; Herbert M. Sandler, banker, \$3 million to pro-Clinton SuperPACs; Jay Robert and Mary Katherine Pritzker, investors, \$6.5 million to pro-Clinton groups.

Additional "Billionaire Club" Hillary supporters include Warren Buffett, the world's second-wealthiest billionaire (according to a July 2016 *Forbes* rating); Jeff Bezos, Amazon.com founder, owner of the *Washington Post*, the world's third-wealthiest billionaire (*Forbes*); Michael Bloomberg, former New York City mayor, Bloomberg News CEO, gun control/global-warming activist; Elon Musk, tech magnate (PayPal, Tesla Motors, SpaceX); Oprah Winfrey, entertainer; Jeffrey Katzenberg, Hollywood movie mogul; Lloyd Blankfein, Goldman Sachs CEO; Meg Whitman, Hewlett Packard CEO; Sheryl Sandberg, Facebook COO; Mark Cuban, Dallas Mavericks owner, reality TV show star; Mortimer Zuckerman, owner/publisher of the *New York Daily News* and *U.S. News & World Report*; Tom Steyer, hedge fund manager/environmental activist; Barry Diller, media and entertainment mogul; and Eric Schmidt, former Google CEO.



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.