



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

War on Police From Above and Below

It is not surprising that leftist radicals who loot, destroy property, and set fires would not like the local police. After all, there are laws against such criminal activity, and local police often arrest the radicals. What is not as well known is that these street radicals are supported financially by some of our country's wealthiest elites.



AP Images

AP Images

This may appear odd at first glance. Why would men and women who live in mansions support attacks upon the local police — the very people who protect the property of the wealthy tycoons?

Before examining *why* these elitists support violent street mobs, let us first establish that many do support them, both directly and indirectly.

For example, a liberal donor club, the Democracy Alliance, urges its donors to write big checks to groups that are financially supporting Black Lives Matter, the Marxist organization that has been leading many of the riots across America.

Democracy Alliance was created in 2005 by a small group of wealthy leftists, such as George Soros and Rob McKay, the heir to the Taco Bell fortune. According to *Politico*, the purpose was to “build a permanent infrastructure to advance liberal ideas and causes.” Donors pledged to give at least \$200,000 per year to recommended groups. Donations total over a half a billion dollars.

Democracy Alliance member Leah Hunt-Hendrix, the granddaughter of Texas oil billionaire H.L. Hunt (who was in contrast a conservative patriot), is a leader in a group calling itself *Solidaire*, which has given hundreds of thousands of dollars to Black Lives Matter and other progressive social movements. Among *Solidaire*'s activities is bailing out rioters arrested during “protests.” Hunt-Hendrix was also active in the Occupy Wall Street movement.

Support for violent groups has been going on for years. Susan Sandler, a board member of Democracy Alliance, helped finance the Organization for Black Struggle. The Organization for Black Struggle organized protests that quickly became violent in the aftermath of the Ferguson, Missouri, incident in which a black teenager, Michael Brown, attacked a police officer, causing the officer to defend himself and shoot and kill Brown (a recitation of events that was verified by the Obama administration).

As early as 1968, wealthy individuals and corporations were already at it. James Simon Kunen was a leader of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which, in 1968, almost shut down Columbia University in New York City by occupying buildings and disrupting classes. Kunen later wrote a book about his experiences with SDS, entitled *The Strawberry Statement*.

In the book, Kunen wrote, “Also at the [SDS] convention [held during the unrest at Columbia], men from Business International Round Tables — the meetings sponsored by Business International for their client groups and heads of government — tried to buy up a few radicals. These men are the world's



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

leading industrialists and they convene to decide how our lives are going to go. These are the guys who wrote the Alliance for Progress. They're the left wing of the ruling class."

Kunen added, "They offered to finance our demonstrations in Chicago." The "demonstrations" in Chicago were similar to today's "protests," which were actually violent riots in which the police were portrayed by the media of that day as being the instigators of the violence.

"We were also offered Esso (Rockefeller) money," Kunen wrote. "They want us to make a lot of radical commotion so they can look more in the center as they move to the Left."

This illustrates how money is filtered through various groups, which enables wealthy leftists to finance radicalism. This is why so many of these supposedly grass-roots groups appear as if from nowhere — they are funded by billionaire leftists, buying up radicals.

Radical Transformation of America

Such donations are not done haphazardly, nor done to really fix any racial injustices. They are targeted to the most radical groups in order to cause the most possible disruption within our culture.

A commonality behind this funding of radical groups is that the financiers are usually closely affiliated with, or members of, globalist organizations such as the Council on Foreign Relations or the Bilderbergers, groups that wish to upend American society so that Americans accept the call to cede power to a global government. (Since Americans are so well off in this country, globalists work to create angst among societal groups, exploit jealousies, and undo the common belief in American exceptionalism, to prompt Americans to believe that dictatorial globalism is a better alternative.)

Perhaps no organization better typifies the ruling establishment of the United States than the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). When Hillary Clinton was secretary of state, she welcomed the opening of a new branch of the CFR in Washington, D.C., saying, "It's good to have an outpost of the Council down the street from the State Department. We get a lot of advice from the Council, and this means I won't have as far to go to be told what we should be doing and how we should think about the future."

And who can forget that then-Vice President Joe Biden used the occasion of a meeting with the CFR to brag that he had gotten a state prosecutor in Ukraine fired, threatening to withhold a \$1-billion U.S. loan guarantee if the firing didn't happen. Of course, Biden did not add that his son Hunter was on the board of a company that was at that time being investigated by that very state prosecutor.

The CFR was formed in the aftermath of President Woodrow Wilson's failure to get the U.S. Senate to ratify the Treaty of Versailles in order to join the League of Nations. Opponents in the Senate rightly feared the league would become a world government and destroy America's national sovereignty. After this failure, the CFR was formed by powerful elitists to promote the concept of internationalism, now usually called globalism.

One of the tools the CFR uses to promote what it sometimes euphemistically calls "global governance" is its magazine, *Foreign Affairs*. *Foreign Affairs'* articles are supposedly nonpartisan, but almost every issue since Donald Trump was elected president has included *multiple* articles attacking him, particularly his use of the phrase *America First*. Its articles can also be expected to promote various progressive causes, including gun control, but especially the idea of globally controlled "free trade" and



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

other ideas that tend to advance its globalist ideology.

For example, in its September/October 2020 issue, *Foreign Affairs* included an article by Laurence Ralph, a left-wing professor at Princeton who is the director of the Center on Transnational Policing. Ralph received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He is strongly anti-police. In his book *Renegade Dreams: Living Through Injury in Gangland Chicago*, he discusses gunshot violence, advocating much stricter gun control.

Ralph's article, entitled "To Protect and to Serve: Global Lessons in Police Reform," is a call for the "radical transformation" of the United States, particularly with "sweeping national law enforcement reforms." He claims that modern local police departments have been "shaped by the legacies of slavery and Jim Crow" and that they evolved from the "slave patrols" that controlled "enslaved people before emancipation." (This is historically inaccurate, as the first three police departments were in Boston (1838), New York City (1844), and Philadelphia (1854), all non-slave states.)

Ralph twists statistics to advance the notion that local police departments exist largely to systematically oppress black people. He cleverly notes that white officers are responsible for 68 percent of the police killings of people of color, but considering that white officers are a large majority of police departments (because a majority of Americans are of a white European ancestry) this is not surprising. This also logically means that a third of the police officers who kill people of color are not white. Ralph's statistics also do not consider whether the officers were being attacked by the person of color.

While Ralph, who is an African-American, assumes that racism is systemic in America's local police departments, that is only a pretext to the message of his article, which fits nicely with the CFR's goal of "global governance," which is that control of local police needs to be transferred to the national level (which, I would suspect, is part of an eventual plan of globalists to have *global* law enforcement). Ralph praises Denmark and Iceland for having "instituted mechanisms for police oversight at the national level."

He added, "Compared with law enforcement infrastructures in countries that have lower levels of police violence, the U.S. law enforcement infrastructure is extremely decentralized. There are nearly 18,000 police agencies in the United States."

The solution, then, according to Ralph, is more control at the national level. He praises consent decrees, for example, in which a local government is bullied by the U.S. Department of Justice into allowing the monitoring of its activities and the implementation of federal-directed "reforms." He offers Japan as a model for the United States because there "police departments are coordinated and trained by the National Police Agency." (It might be noted that General Douglas MacArthur, who took control of Japan when the country surrendered in WWII, expressed hope in his autobiography that Japan would emphasize local, rather than national, law enforcement.) Ralph insists that such nationalization of police makes "deadly violence [by the police] far less likely."

In his *Foreign Affairs* article, Ralph suggests that part of the problem is "the prevalence of guns in the United States, which is comparable in this regard to no other country on earth. Faced with a heavily armed populace, U.S. law-enforcement agencies often argue that they must have military-grade weapons and the right to use deadly force." He cites an article in *The Atlantic*, which asserted, "Where guns are abundant, civilians are more likely to kill civilians and cops, and cops are, in turn, more likely to kill civilians." *The Atlantic* article added that "police violence" (as they called it) in the United States



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

“can be sufficiently addressed only through legislation that reduces the availability of firearms.” Of course, such claims are specious: The places in the United States with greatest prevalence of guns, mainly rural areas, see little violence perpetrated with guns, and many U.S. cities and other countries with very strict gun control, such as Chicago and Mexico, are practically war zones.

It is important to note that despite the assertion that the CFR and *Foreign Affairs* are nonpartisan, they are clearly favorable to multiple progressive causes such as gun control and a welfare state. For example, Ralph’s article in *Foreign Affairs* calls for more social welfare as part of the solution to what he sees as the problem of local control of the police.

But mainly, Ralph clearly sees nationalization and even globalization as desirable, favorably citing the reduction of police forces in the European Union countries. Not surprisingly, he supports the national movement to “defund” the police as the first step toward abolition of locally controlled police and re-directing the money toward social programs. In this regard, he approvingly cites Nita Tennyson, the 20-year-old organizer of a “die-in” protest in Chicago. Tennyson explained why she organized the die-in: “In my neighborhood, there are no grocery stores. We live in a food desert. There are a bunch of schools getting shut own. The mental health facilities are shut down, too. And that just leaves people with nothing to do. They become a danger to themselves and their community. But if we had those resources [instead of the money going to local police], we wouldn’t even need the police.”

Summing it up, Ralph called for shifting the “billions” that go to local police departments toward “health care, housing, education, and employment.” However, since the 1960s, trillions of dollars have been spent in these areas, and violence continues, so that is not the answer. In fact, it is irrefutably true that a main reason there often aren’t adequate health services, grocery stores, and jobs in inner cities is *because of the high crime there*.

As ludicrous as Ralph’s polemic is, it was given space in *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, an organization made up of some of the most powerful people in the country.

But the CFR is not the only example of what could be described as “pressure from above” joining with “pressure from below” in the effort to transfer the responsibility for law enforcement from the state and local governments to the federal government, and possibly even a world government, eventually.

Why Do Elites Support Radicals?

Which brings us to the question of *why*. Why would men and women of great wealth want to finance radicals in the streets, who rail against the super-rich, and those who call for the centralization of law enforcement in the United States?

Bluntly put, socialism and centralization of law enforcement both mean *control* of the population. Some individuals are motivated by money, others by fame, and still others find fulfillment in other things such as their spending time with their families. But for some, *power* is the greatest motivation. The average person probably cannot understand this desire, but we know from history that such power-hungry individuals do exist.

George Orwell touched on this question in his classic dystopian novel *1984*. In the book, O’Brien — a member of the socialist oligarchy that controlled that fictional future society — tells Winston Smith (the central character who had defied the ruling class), *why* the oligarchy wanted power over other human beings. “The Party seeks power for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

interested solely in power.... One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship.... The object of power is power.”

We cannot be sure what motivates all of these super-rich elites to finance street radicals, or why so many in academia, politics, entertainment, and the media support them, or why there are those who want to rule others. Perhaps many are just paternalistic, but whatever their motivation in seeking power, to them it is crucial to control law enforcement in order to have that power. Leaving the control of the police in the hands of the state and local governments leaves much control out of elites' hands.

It is obvious that the elites cannot simply publicly announce that they want to terminate local control of the police because they want more power over us. Instead, they offer altruistic reasons, as Laurence Ralph did in his *Foreign Affairs* article. As an academic, Ralph might very well be sincere in thinking that nationalization, or even globalization, of the police forces would be a good idea. But for those who love liberty (and can recognize the logical flaws in narratives such as Ralph's), it is a bad idea.

There are real cases of police misconduct, because police officers are human beings. What is not the answer to rooting out the tiny minority of rogue cops is to abolish local control of police. The attempt to defund and even abolish local police is simply a prelude to nationalization and eventual globalization of police.

Those seeking to nationalize the police offer interim policy changes, such as eliminating laws that protect the police, and creating a database of police use-of-force incidents, or letting Congress (or perhaps federal bureaucrats) develop training requirements for local police. Regardless of what those training requirements would turn out to be, the regulation of police powers should not be federalized. Living inside the Washington Beltway does not make one smarter or more moral than those of us who live in the rest of the country.

It should also be emphasized that the creation of local civilian review boards will only weaken local control of law enforcement. These boards would likely be dominated by local anti-police activists who would predictably focus on real or supposed examples of local police misconduct, simply adding to the outcry for a federal takeover local police functions.

There are tens of millions of interactions that occur each year between local police and members of the public — of all ethnicities — and tens of millions of times these interactions end peacefully. Confrontations that end in death or serious injury are rare. There is simply no evidence that there exists systemic racism in America's local police forces. The average cop does not seek out individuals to mistreat.

Turning control of policing over to the federal government would not result in the elimination of every single bad cop. On the contrary, we could cite multiple examples of *federal* law enforcement, from actions of the DEA, the FBI, the ATF, and others, in which innocent American citizens have been mistreated. In National Socialist Germany, Adolf Hitler took control of law enforcement away from the German states and local government, and turned it over to the Gestapo, who proceeded to beat, kidnap, torture, and kill perceived opponents. While some will argue that the United States is not Nazi Germany, we should understand that human nature is no different in our country than in totalitarian regimes such as Hitler's or others such as that of Joseph Stalin.

This is why the Founders wisely placed checks on the power of the federal government when they created the Constitution of the United States. This is why they left most criminal law issues, and



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

policing, in the hands of the states and local governments. It is often said that one can't fight city hall, but actually, one has a much better chance of fighting city hall than of fighting a federal police force — or a global police force.

Powerful forces, such as those that run the Council on Foreign Relations or those that create organizations that fund street radicals, hate local control of law enforcement, because if it is controlled locally, that means they do not control it. And they want to control it, because they want to control you.

Photo credit: AP Images



Written by [Steve Byas](#) on September 19, 2020

Published in the October 5, 2020 issue of [the New American](#) magazine. Vol. 36, No. 19

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.