

Part-I <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/01/12/virgil-trumps-nationalist-vision-vs-gospel-globalism/>
Part-II <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2017/01/13/virgil-deep-state-strikes-back-permanent-campaign-donald-trump/>
Part-III <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/01/15/virgil-making-america-great-again-or-not-the-establishment-targets-trumps-top-strategist/>
Bannon <http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/21/politics/steve-bannon-donald-trump-nationalist/>
Part-0 <http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2017/01/09/virgil-arguments-from-bad-authority-how-the-mainstream-media-tries-to-trick-you/>

Virgil: Trump's Nationalist Vision vs. the Gospel of Globalism



AP, Getty, BNN Edit

by [Virgil](#) 12 Jan 2017 3,782

First of Three Parts...

1. The Trump Nationalist Vision, Ascendant

It's an obvious fact: Donald Trump hasn't even been sworn in as the 45th President, and yet, already, he's setting the national agenda. Through Twitter, other social media, and the occasional public appearance, he's still doing what he did throughout the presidential campaign—dominating. Only now, as he says, he's doing it not for himself, but for the American people.

In recent weeks, Trump has struck job-saving deals with [Carrier](#) and [Ford](#). Hence this revealing January 3 headline: “[Chided by Trump, Ford scraps Mexico factory, adds Michigan jobs.](#)” He’s also announced a \$50 billion, 50,000 jobs deal with Japanese investor [Masayoshi Son](#) and has just touted a new job-creating plan from [Fiat Chrysler](#).

Yet at the same time, Trump is using sticks, as well as carrots. He has made it clear that any company that takes jobs out the country will be lambasted for doing so. As he said in his [January 11 press conference](#),

The word is now out, that when you want to move your plant to Mexico or some other place, and you want to fire all of your workers from Michigan and Ohio . . . it’s not going to happen that way anymore.

And in that same press conference, he went after the pharmaceutical companies for charging too much. And he had a market-oriented solution: “What we have to do is create new bidding procedures for the drug industry, because they’re getting away with murder.”

And of course, he has chastised defense contractors [Boeing](#) and [Lockheed](#), which he believes have been asking too much from the taxpayers.

The result of this “tweet therapy” has been an overhaul of thinking in Corporate America. Surveying Trump’s new style of presidential bully pulpiteering, [Reuters](#) concludes, “Corporate leaders . . . can no longer focus only on maximizing shareholder value; they must now also weigh national interest.” Yes, that’s correct: **American business executives are now getting a crash course in economic patriotism; they can no longer act as if they aren’t citizens of this country—or that other US citizens don’t matter.** Because of Trump, they must now take into account the overall strength and well-being of the nation in which they reside.

And here’s the interesting thing: Trump’s pro-worker, pro-taxpayer activism is also proving to be pro-business. It’s a win for all three sectors; call it a national win-win-win. And it only makes sense: If there are more American workers with big paychecks buying things and paying their fair share of taxes, that’s good both for American business and for Uncle Sam’s budget.

Indeed, according to the National Federation of Independent Business, [small business optimism has “skyrocketed,”](#) and [consumer confidence](#) is also up; meanwhile, the dollar is up, and the Dow Jones Industrial Average has gained 2000 points since the election. So **it’s fully evident that the American economy is responding positively to Trump as dealmaker-in-chief.** And President Trump will be joined in his administration, of course, by a slew of other successful dealmakers.

Yes, it’s interesting to think back on the old ways of the federal government, the pre-Trump ways. That is, the feds have been interventionist on so many matters for so long, and yet they were almost entirely hands-off when it came to good jobs and wages; corporations were free to come and go—mostly, go. The message to employers was, in effect, *Do whatever you want to your rank-and-file workers, but you must, at all costs, protect wetlands, spotted owls, and the feelings of “protected victims” and their free choice of bathrooms.*

Thankfully, that strange and unfair policy choice by Uncle Sam—to ignore the interests of the broad middle class while catering to ever more avant-garde sub-categories—seems to be coming to an end.

So it’s possible, perhaps even likely, that **under President Trump we will once again become a nation for all Americans—even Middle Americans.** We could yet be the “city on a hill” that Ronald Reagan so eloquent described. That is, a true center-right “Team America,” united in its determination to work hard and do well, with US citizens coming first.

As Trump said in his press conference on Wednesday, his victory was “a movement like the world has never seen before . . . that was a beautiful thing on November 8.”

2. The Old Globalist Vision, Descendant

Of course, not everyone thinks that what happened on Election Day 2016 was a beautiful thing, because they have been living their lives according to a vision much different than Trump's economic nationalism.

Let's get specific. We can start with Barack Obama; for the last eight years, as we know, Obama never worried much about the middle class, or, for that matter, about America. Instead, his eyes were on a different prize: the vision of a relentlessly globalized world, in which the US would fit in . . . somewhere.

Here's how the 44th president expressed himself in his [first inaugural address](#), back in 2009:

As the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself; and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace.

That might be a nice thought to have in some academic ivory tower, but in the real world, there's precious little evidence that the polyglot peoples of the planet agree on much of anything, let alone how to usher in a new era of peace. Heck, even Obama, having received a Nobel Peace Prize for making nice speeches, immediately escalated that forlorn war in Afghanistan. Yet still, in his dogmatically ideological mind, he was determined to shrink American power so that it would "play its role" in this new global order.

And so **in April 2009, the president** was at pains to deny that "American exceptionalism" was anything worth taking note of, let alone being proud of. Instead, he **snarked that "American exceptionalism" was an illusion**, because all countries see themselves as exceptional. Obama's dismissiveness inspired [one reporter to observe](#),

If all countries are "exceptional," then none are, and to claim otherwise robs the word, and the idea of American exceptionalism, of any meaning.

And yet again, Obama's comments made perfect sense, if we see that his goal was to cubbyhole the United States as just another country on the world stage, somewhere between Uganda and Uzbekistan.

So of course, Obama devoted his first few months in office to a worldwide "[apology tour](#)," although many say that it lasted, really, for his entire eight years in the White House.

John Fonte, a conservative critic of globalism at the Hudson Institute, calls this ideology "[transnational progressivism](#)," and it certainly defines the progressive worldview.

Indeed, if we dig deeper, we can see that globalism is, in fact, a kind of religion. Everyone has heard, whether they wanted to or not, that 1971 John Lennon song, "Imagine," including these gloppy-lefty lyrics:

Imagine there's no countries
It isn't hard to do
Nothing to kill or die for
And no religion, too.

This "Lennonism," to be sure, is shared by many around the world. Thus it's little wonder that Obama made common cause with other globalists, including former British prime minister David Cameron, German chancellor Angela Merkel, and European Union chief Jean-Claude Juncker.

These are the people who presided over the creation, or the elevation, of various murky transnational enterprises, including the United Nations, the European Union, the [Paris Climate Change Agreement](#), and the [Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action](#), aka, the Iran nuclear deal.

The common thread running through all these bureaucratic contraptions is the so-called “democracy deficit.” That is, in the mind of the elite, the fewer real people, including in the US, who get to vote on, or otherwise scrutinize, the doings of these bureaucracies, the better.

Indeed, it’s also best, the elite thinks, if people never even learn the truth about what’s being done in their name. We can cite, for example, the issue of refugees. To globalists, it’s a point of honor to accept refugees, even with the prospect of subsidizing forever, in unassimilated dependency. So we can readily see that Germany’s Merkel is, in the globalist virtue-signaling hierarchy, the most “honorable.”

Yet, as we know, the Obama administration has done its best to keep up. And if these refugee-influx programs aren’t popular with the public, well, the standard elite instinct is to mislead and deceive. In the mind of these deceivers, it’s all for the greater good because the ideal of the sacred “global village” is never better off if the “deplorables” get to decide anything.

It’s been well documented that [the US government has been hiding the truth about the crimes of refugees, the health of refugees, and even the actual number of refugees](#). Is anyone in the Obama administration the least bit apologetic for these dishonest abuses? Of course not.

And yet, of course, in light of the recent election results, in which Obama-type globalism was decisively rejected, we have to ask: *Did the elite really think that they would get away with it? Did they really think that people wouldn’t notice what has been happening to their communities and neighborhoods?*

The answer seems to be, “Yes”—[the Obamans truly believed that they could get away with it. They thought that Trump would be buried by a blue demographic wave in 2016, and that Hillary Clinton would be continuing their favored globalist policies in 2017.](#)

To which we can say: Perhaps the elite aren’t as smart as they think they are. And yet, of course, even after being booted out of power, the Obama globalists will enjoy a soft landing: Many of them will soon be working for some George Soros-funded think tank, or pressure group. And from those cushy perches, they will be able to keep up their “[resistance](#)” to Trump (more on this in the next two installments).

Now we cite a second sacred item on the globalist agenda: international free trade.

And here we see, once again, that elite thinking on globalism has a way of turning a theory into a transcendently moral first principle. And it’s been this way for a long time.

Back in 1846, the leading British free trader [Richard Cobden](#) declared, flat-out, that free trade would save the world:

I see in the Free-trade principle that which shall act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation in the universe—drawing men together, thrusting aside the antagonism of race, and creed, and language, and uniting us in the bonds of eternal peace.

Cobden was a capitalist, and capitalists are often cold-eyed, but, as we can see, there’s a dreamy, even giddy, utopianism in Cobden’s thinking. And amazingly, it won the battle of public opinion in 19th-century Britain.

Interestingly, one contemporary of Cobden’s—who was much colder-eyed and decidedly *not* a capitalist—nevertheless endorsed the same idea. That would be Karl Marx, the founder of communism. As a theoretical prognosticator, [Marx may have had a mistaken view of what communism would become in the future](#), and yet, nevertheless, he was a shrewd observer of current events.

Marx could see that unchecked and unbalanced *laissez-faire* capitalism would quickly pulverize cultures, traditions, even whole nations in an endless gale of creative destruction. That is, individuals might be better off in some material ways, but, as a community, they would be atomized and unhinged.

In the meantime, Marx continued, left to their own devices, untrammelled free markets would concentrate most of the wealth in the hands of speculators and other financialists. And so a result, Marx concluded, the masses, in their vexation, would be ready to experiment with socialism and then communism.

With that hoped-for Red scenario in mind, Marx declared in a famous 1848 speech, “[Gentlemen, I am in favor of free trade.](#)”

Yet today, the most ardent proponents of free trade aren't ironically-minded communists; they are neo-Cobdenite globalists, and they are achingly sincere. Some might be Democrats, some might be Republicans, some might think of themselves as liberal, some might identify as conservatives. Yet what unites them all is a vision of a borderless world, with minimal restrictions on exports and imports. (And, of course, minimal restrictions on the transit, also, of people.)

To be sure, some globalists, such as the EU's Jean-Claude Juncker, have turned globalism into a profitable ideology; for years now, Juncker has been in the middle of efforts by his home country, Luxembourg, to become [the world's most billionaire-friendly tax haven](#). So yes, there's plenty of self-interest in globalism. And yet at the same time, there's more than that—much more.

3. The Gospel of Globalism

Indeed, this globalist faith is so strong that one can fairly conclude that it's more than an ideology—it must be a kind of theology.

As writer [Fay Voshell](#) suggested last September in *American Thinker*, globalism, for many, is a kind of transmuted Christianity. That is, [globalism is a new kind of faith:](#)

Replacing the beatific vision of Christianity is a new universal . . . [an order in which human beings' allegiance is to a global City of Men ruled by elite priests who act as gods for the masses.](#) Preachers of the globalist vision present an ersatz kingdom . . . The religion of globalism sees an earthly, utopian world order in which all men pay allegiance to elite priests who rule over a World City without national borders. Sometimes the substitute beatific vision is expressed in terms of a “global village,” a mystical entity that takes the place of the family of God. The globalists' family of humanity is without distinction of country, tribe or creed.

Those last words, “without distinction of country, tribe or creed,” take us right back to where we started—with John Lennon's “Imagine.”

For the globalists, this vision is so powerful that it's easy to see how they would be inspired to do exactly what they have done: open their borders, impose political correctness on their people, and transform their societies through vast social-engineering schemes. Indeed, as we have seen, globalist political leaders are so committed to their beliefs that they are even willing to risk losing elections, sacrificing their careers on the altar of their faith.

And that's just what happened with the Brexit vote in June, which not only put Britain on a course to leave the European Union, but also cost David Cameron his high office at Number 10 Downing Street. And here in the US in November, the same thing happened to Hillary Clinton—and to Barack Obama's legacy.

Given the passionate depths of globalist sentiments, it's little wonder that the elites took those defeats with bitter dismay. In the United Kingdom, for example, the beginning of the angry globalist response was to put a permanent hex on the leader of Brexit, Nigel Farage.

And oh yes, you might have noticed: Here in the US, the elite is just as angry at Trump.

In the globalist mind, Farage and Trump aren't just enemies, they are heretics. Maybe even, in a post-Christian sense, they are anti-Christ.

So while Farage and Trump have won their respective political victories, the full fury of the elite has yet to be felt.

We'll take a look at the reaction in the US in the next installment.

Next: The Deep State Divebombs Trump.

Read More Stories About:

[Big Government](#), [barack obama](#), [Deep State](#), [Donald Trump](#), [Free Trade](#), [globalism](#), [karl marx](#), [Nationalism](#), [Richard Cobden](#), [Virgil](#)

<http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2017/01/13/virgil-deep-state-strikes-back-permanent-campaign-donald-trump/>

Virgil: The Deep State Strikes Back: The Permanent Campaign Against Donald Trump



by [Virgil](#) 13 Jan 2017 5,615

Second of Three Parts...

In the [first installment](#) of this series, we observed that globalism is an ideology, maybe even a theology. And so of course, globalism generates plenty of passionate support among the planetary elite. And yet passion must be translated into political power. And of course, the globalists have plenty of that, too. In this second installment, we will see how the globalists still seek to get their way, even after losing the 2016 elections. For them, Target #1, of course, is Donald Trump.

1. The Weaponization of Rumors

Every Breitbart reader is familiar with the general outlines of the Russia hack story: Beginning in June 2016, someone or something known as “Guccifer 2.0” was taking credit for hacking the computers of top Democrats and, working through Julian Assange’s Wikileaks, doling out juicy information.

The hacks were clearly damaging to the Democrats. And because the leaks proved to be true, they had significant repercussions. The revelations forced, for example, the chair of the Democratic National Committee, Rep. Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, to resign last July.

Soon, the Democrats developed their counter-strategy, which can be summed up as, *It’s Donald Trump’s fault*. That is, whoever and whatever Guccifer was, he or it was doing the hacking to help Trump. So again, *Blame Trump!*

By the fall, the Democrats had a further point to make: *The Russians were doing it*. So was it, in fact, the Russian spy agencies FSB, or GRU, that were behind the hacks? Virgil doesn’t know, but he does know this: The Democrats were accusing the Russians, at least at first, without any solid evidence.

Meanwhile, at around the same time, the Democrats decided that they themselves should play the Russia Innuendo Game.

So beginning in July, rumors began to circulate that an investigation had uncovered bombshell revelations about Trump and the Russians. Yet the evidence was flimsy, at best: it consisted of various statements, attributed to unnamed sources, accusing Trump of various things.

In other words, nothing was proven, and so even the Main Stream Media, hungry as it was for anti-Trump hammers, chose not to touch the allegations. The one exception was a vague October 31 item in the left-wing *Mother Jones*, which [reported](#)—perhaps one should say, “reported”—that a “former Western intelligence officer,” hired first by anti-Trump Republicans, and then by Democrats, had assembled a dossier suggesting that Trump had been “compromised” by Russian intelligence.

The *Mother Jones* report was carefully written, mindful that there was no proof and, in fact, no evidence, other than the say-so of one writer, who had been on the payroll of anti-Trump forces. Which is to say, it was nothing—just an opposition-research dump full of unknown unknowns. Indeed, the words could have been for a far-out novel or screenplay.

Yet the *Mother Jones* story did have one specific nugget: We learned that in a letter to FBI Director James Comey, dated October 30, Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid had attempted, yet again, to stir the anti-Trump pot. As Reid declared:

In my communications with you and other top officials in the national security community, it has become clear that you possess explosive information about close ties and coordination between Donald Trump, his top advisors, and the Russian government—a foreign interest openly hostile to the United States.

Yet despite Reid’s best efforts, the allegations still got no traction: Media outlets, no matter how pro-Hillary, were just not going to attach their credibility to a report that had no demonstrable basis in fact.

Moreover, it’s also possible that the Democrats didn’t push the anti-Trump story as hard as they could have—they were complacent. That is, [they thought Hillary Clinton was on her way to victory](#), and so why rock the boat by raising [allegations that might ricochet in some unforeseen direction?](#) [Against, maybe, Bill Clinton?](#) As Obama himself has said, [he and all his advisers were convinced that Hillary was going to win](#). And so after the election, Obama & Co. assumed, Clinton 45 could clean up whatever mess had been made.

Of course, all that smugness evaporated after Trump’s election on November 8.

2. The Deep State Makes Its Moves

Ever since Trump's triumph, the anti-Trump drumbeat has grown ever louder. And **it's not just Democrats**. We have since learned, for example, that in December, [Republican Sen. John McCain personally delivered anti-Trump allegations to the FBI](#). And of course, there could have been other political players—many others—involved in the anti-Trump effort.

In fact, it's accurate to say that the vast bulk of DC officialdom is anti-Trump. Here at Breitbart on [December 12](#), I took a look at this officialdom; it's been called the "Deep State." That is, the Deep State is the permanent political combine that runs Washington—or at least tries to. As I defined it a month ago:

The term "Deep State" refers to the complex of bureaucrats, technocrats, and plutocrats that likes things just the way they are and wants to keep them like that—elections be damned.

It's obvious that the last thing that the Deep State wants to see is the DC swamp being drained. To them, it's home!

Virgil wrote again about the Deep State vs. Trump on [December 19](#), noting that the Deep State will soon have its natural leader, Barack Obama:

The 44th president won't be going far. Come January, he'll be moving just a mile or so uptown, to the swanky Kalorama neighborhood, where, it's a safe bet, he'll hold court as if he were still president. So the Deep State will still have a rallying point as it plots its next move against the Dreaded Trump. Or should we say, it will have another rallying point, because, in fact, it already has plenty.

Virgil might note that this story was written three weeks before Politico revealed the soon-to-be ex-president's future plans. Here's [the headline from January 9](#): "Obama retools his political operation for another run: He will use his foundation and an updated Organizing for Action group to try to salvage his legacy and rebuild the Democratic Party." In other words, Obama will be a force to be reckoned with.

And so in that December 19 piece, Virgil closed with these words, which have proven to be prophetic:

The bitter election is over, dear reader, but **the real storm is still to come**.

Since then, the storm has come on many fronts. Aside from the usual anti-Trump media, Deep Staters are pursuing other angles; for example, the career staff at the US Department of Justice [is targeting FBI Director James Comey](#) for his pre-election handling of Hillary Clinton's e-mail case; it's a safe bet that these careerists, enjoying statutory autonomy within DOJ, will find Comey in violation of something.

Meanwhile, anti-Trump lawyers and other activists from across the country [are planning to descend on the Capitol for the Inauguration](#). And we just learned that [Deep Staters stationed in Israel have warned their Israeli counterparts not to trust Trump](#).

Yet **the Deep State is most active inside the DC Beltway**: For example, one energetic Deep State anti-Trumper is Walter Shaub, director of the Office of Government Ethics. Yes, he's a federal employee, but Shaub has turned his supposedly non-partisan office into a partisan machine, advancing his anti-Trump campaign including, even, on Twitter.

Interestingly, the research group [America's Rising](#) has observed that Shaub, a Democrat who donated to Obama's 2012 re-election campaign, has never seemed bothered by Hillary Clinton's multiple ethical transgressions. As the group puts it:

Shaub's history as a Democrat and the double standard he employed as head of the OGE, should give the media pause before taking Shaub's words seriously.

And yet of course, Shaub is still in the news all the time, **always flailing at Trump**. Here, for example, is a January 11 [headline in *The Hill*](#), describing Shaub's latest attack: "Federal ethics chief blasts 'meaningless' Trump business plan." And this, [from Politico](#): "Federal ethics czar delivers broadside against Trump conflicts plan."

Yet the biggest broadsides, of course, have been over the question of Russian influence in the US. Even if reporters stayed away from scurrilous rumors that couldn't be proven, they nevertheless pursued other angles, notably, that the Russians had a strategy for helping Trump defeat Hillary.

In this effort, of course, journos were greatly aided by Deep Staters.

For example, in mid-December, Politico Europe added the detail—make that the alleged, as opposed to proven, detail—that [Russian leader Vladimir Putin](#) "[personally directed](#)" the hacking effort, as part of his supposed "vendetta" against Hillary Clinton. Is that true? Who knows. But Politico got the story, it wrote, from "multiple senior intelligence officials."

3. The Battle of the Beltway

Then, last week, the story heated up even hotter. And the flashpoint was that dubious dossier—the one, as we have noted, that had been floating around for months.

Recently, the "Big Four" intel chiefs—that would be Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, FBI Director Comey, CIA Director John Brennan, and National Security Agency Director Admiral Mike Rogers—decided that the document was worth taking seriously after all. That is, the "Western" operative mentioned by *Mother Jones*—publicly identified recently as a Briton, [Christopher Steele](#), a former British MI-6 spy—was suddenly given a promotion; now, he and his info were deemed to be a credible source. So credible, in fact, that the Big Four needed to tell Trump all about it.

So last week, the President-elect was [briefed](#) on some of the allegations by senior US intelligence officials. And here's what's strange: Even though that quartet of Deep Staters is supposed to be good at keeping secrets, the news of that briefing immediately leaked.

As *The Washington Post* [reported](#) on January 10, one top official said that Trump was briefed on the allegations "because they were already circulating widely and it was 'mostly a courtesy' to let him know they were out there."

To which Virgil can say, that's some kind of "courtesy"! **In fact, it seems to have been more like a set-up.** Let's think about it: Scurrilous rumors about Trump have been floating around for months, rumbling below the level of newsworthiness, and yet the Intel Quartet says that, as a "courtesy," they will tell Trump about the rumors, and then blab about it to the press. That's not courtesy, that's *chutzpah*.

And so of course, components of the briefing, the saucy parts, became huge news. After all, the Intel Quartet, in telling Trump about the charges, had given them a kind of pseudo-truthiness—and had certainly made them newsworthy. So now, **for the MSM, it was open season on Trump.**

Politico, always the expert at stirring up the Beltway, blared its [January 10 headline](#), "Trump confronts firestorm of Russia allegations." The story quoted Adam Jentleson, a former top aide to Harry Reid, as tweeting out, in all-capital letters, "THIS IS WHAT HARRY REID WAS REFERRING TO." That is, referring back to Reid's October 30 letter to FBI Director Comey.

(We might pause to note that Jentleson is now [running a “war room” for the Center for American Progress](#), which is to say, his full time job is now sending out all-caps political blasts.)

CNN ran hard with the Trump story. It was “breaking news,” the channel declared, that “the nation’s top intelligence officials” had briefed both Trump (and, at other times, Obama and Joe Biden) on information that “compromised President-elect Trump.”

Meanwhile, Team Trump hotly denied all of it. On ABC News’ “Good Morning America,” Kellyanne Conway said:

Just to smear the president-elect of the United States, we now have intelligence officials divulging information that they are sworn not to divulge. I don’t even think this is fake news, I think this is just fake.

For his part, **Trump was wise to what the Deep State was doing to him**. Deriding his enemies as “sick people,” he tweeted:

Intelligence agencies should never have allowed this fake news to “leak” into the public. One last shot at me. Are we living in Nazi Germany?

As we have come to expect, that was some tough talk from Trump. And yet his obvious anger aside, the President-elect was also shrewdly firming up his base, which has long believed the worst about the MSM and the Deep State.

Indeed, in that January 11 press conference, Trump seized the opportunity to go on the offensive. He not only dismissed the accusations, but **he also labeled CNN as “fake news,”** no doubt provoking loud cheers all across Trump Nation.

And the President-elect recalled how he had been set up by the Intel Quartet: “Every time I meet [with the officials], people are reading about it.” He added that it’s “very unfair that it happened, very unfair to the American people.”

Thus Trump rallied his support; on January 12, Politico Playbook, an e-mail tipsheet for DC insiders and wannabe insiders, had to grudgingly [admit](#), “For most people who watched Trump yesterday, it was a pretty good performance.”

Yet of course, Trump’s harshest critics are, well, still harsh. So it’s fair to say that the forces on both sides of the battleline—pro-Trump and anti-Trump—have now redoubled their resolve.

Here we can pause to note that the intelligence officials apparently delivered only a dry [two-page summary](#) of the allegations; we can call that the Little Smear. Yet there was also a longer, 35-page heap of allegations, including sexual allegations; we can call that the Big Smear.

The leading player in the **Big Smear was BuzzFeed**, an online publication founded by one [Jonah Peretti](#), who had earlier learned his trade at The Huffington Post. **Yes, the website printed the full 35-page dossier, complete with its sexual salaciousness.** (Once again, we must immediately stipulate that **there’s zero proof that any of the charges are true.**)

Amazingly, at the same time that he published this slime, BuzzFeed editor Ben Smith tweeted out, “There is serious reason to doubt the allegations.”

Virgil's not a lawyer, but it sure seems to him that **Smith's admission meets the legal standard for defamation, including "reckless disregard for the truth."** As one [legal resource](#) puts it:

If the person defamed was a public figure, the person making the defamatory statement can only be held liable for defamation if he/she knew that the statement was false or if he/she acted **with reckless disregard as to the truth or falsity of the statement.** [emphasis added]

Hello, lawsuit?

Meanwhile, criticism from others in the media came cascading down on BuzzFeed. Speaking for the MSM, NBC News' [Chuck Todd](#) put it right in the face of BuzzFeed's Ben Smith:

You just published fake news. You made a knowing decision to put out an untruth.

Smith answered by saying, "I think this is a real story about a real document." To which we can say, yes, it is a real document, in the sense that it has words on a page. But that doesn't mean it's a **true** document. As in, every single word on every single page could be a lie—and BuzzFeed offered the reader no help in verifying anything.

Meanwhile, other MSM-ers weighed in. *The Wall Street Journal* [reported](#), in its mild way, "The *Journal* hasn't been able to verify the allegations." At the same time, two *Washington Post* media writers, [Margaret Sullivan](#) and [Erik Wemple](#), denounced BuzzFeed's decision. And on January 12, DC veteran Mike Allen—formerly at Politico, now at a new start-up, Axios—[dismissed the allegations](#):

Think about the half day of madness that started when BuzzFeed posted, in full, an unsubstantiated, one-source memo, funded by partisans, that claimed acts — **too disgusting to print** — by the man a week from the Oval Office.

That is, Allen was saying, nothing is going to come of this.

In the meantime, on the orthodox conservative right, *National Review*'s [David French](#), himself strongly anti-Trump, wrote of the BuzzFeed story:

This is ridiculous. How can "Americans make up their own minds" when they have no ability to fact-check the allegations? The public knows nothing about the sources, nothing about the underlying claims, and has no means of discovering the truth. . . . **This isn't transparency; it's malice.**

And conservative media watchdog [Brent Bozell](#) threw this punch:

BuzzFeed's story is clearly fake news. **Any media outlet that does not produce a news story that declares BuzzFeed's story fake news is giving aid and comfort to fake news and furthering its proliferation.** This fiasco is exactly why the media's ratings are in the toilet.

And here's Glenn Greenwald, writing for The Intercept, hard-hitting as always. Under the headline, "[The Deep State Goes to War with President-Elect, Using Unverified Claims, as Democrats Cheer](#)," Greenwald declared any publication of the material to be "an assault on journalism, democracy, and basic human rationality."

Greenwald's critique notwithstanding, the MSM is now having its cake and eating it too. That is, it can claim "clean hands" in not printing the allegations at first, and yet now that they're out, it can happily reprint the allegations; after all, someone else printed them first, thereby making them "news." Thus it is that casual references to the dossier are now finding their way into [MSM stories about the Trump administration](#), not just

stories about the Russia allegations. This is the MSM daisy-chain: a happy circle of anti-Trumpism. Americans might not like it, but MSM-ers sure do.

Meanwhile, another acute observer, Matt Drudge, wondered if the Russians were even involved at all. That is, perhaps it was the Deep State itself cranking out the allegations, while throwing the blame at Moscow:

Are corrupt US intel agencies blackmailing Trump with their own dirt cleverly tagged to “Russian” operatives?

Interestingly, amidst this backlash against the now-notorious bad briefing, one of the briefers, James Clapper, has chosen to distance himself from the others. Late in the evening of January 11, [he issued a statement](#) declaring that the intelligence agencies had “not made any judgment that the information in this document is reliable.” To which Virgil says: “Nice try, Mr. Clapper, but the time to speak up about your concerns was before the briefing, or during the briefing, not *after* the briefing—after the bleep hit the fan.”

Of course, Clapper’s retrospective regrets notwithstanding, the Deep State is full speed ahead, still seeking to torpedo Trump.

For example, former Clinton campaign manager [Robby Mook](#) compares the matter to Watergate. The implication is clear enough: Just as the Deep State succeeding in driving Richard Nixon out of office back in 1974, now today, the Deep State should seek the same fate for Trump.

Of course, Trump is not planning on going anywhere; in fact, it’s been reported that staffers are already working on his [2020 re-election campaign](#).

So the Battle of the Beltway will continue.

Next: The Deep State opens up another front against Trump.

Read More Stories About:

[Big Government](#), [Big Journalism](#), [Buzzfeed](#), [CNN](#), [Deep State](#), [Donald Trump](#), [Guccifer 2.0](#), [Russian hacking](#)

<http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2017/01/15/virgil-making-america-great-again-or-not-the-establishment-targets-trumps-top-strategist/>

Virgil: Making America Great Again—Or Not: The Establishment Targets Trump’s Top Strategist



AP, BNN Edit

by [Virgil](#) 15 Jan 2017 [3,786](#)

Part Three of a three-part series...

In [Part One](#) we saw how the gospel of globalism inspires its believers to disdain, even despise, middle-class nationalists—that is, the people who voted for Donald Trump.

And in [Part Two](#) we saw how the Deep State, one of the many weapons in the globalist arsenal, is now targeting Trump and his agenda for America. Here in Part Three, we will focus on how one well-placed Trump opponent is seeking to pick off a key member of the new presidential staff.

1. Fake News: “Bannon vs. Trump”

Attacks on Stephen K. Bannon, the former executive chairman of Breitbart, slated to become the top strategist in the Trump White House, are nothing new.

Just since the election, *Mother Jones* magazine has called him “[worse . . . than a racist](#),” Joy Behar labeled him “[a fascist](#),” and former Vermont governor Howard Dean insisted, against all evidence, that he is “[a Nazi](#).” You get the idea.

Okay, these head-on assaults haven’t gotten very far; they were tried, too, during the 2016 campaign, and Bannon’s standing within Trump world has never wavered.

And yet, of course, the assaults keep coming. And so to help keep track of them all, perhaps we should assign them into categories. For example, in an [earlier article](#), not part of this series, Virgil cited the ways in which “argument from authority”—*argumentum ad verecundiam*—can be used and, more often these days, misused.

This important earlier article is included here, as “Part-O” - found at the end.

So now we can add a second, slyer, category of media falsehood. We can call this one the “assertion of a false conflict,” *declaratio contra falsum*. This one is a version of the familiar attempt to stir the pot, whipping up hard feelings between people: *Hey, did you hear what he said about you?*

That’s what Virgil thinks was happening when *The New York Times*’ David Brooks headlined his January 10 column, headlined, “[Bannon vs. Trump](#).” That is, [he is simply trying to cause trouble; yet since it’s right there in the nation’s leading newspaper, some gullible readers might believe it.](#)

Brooks got right to his point: Within the Trump administration, he asserted, a future fight was brewing. On one side, “Republican regulars,” and on the other side, “populist ethno-nationalists.”

The *Timesman* made it perfectly clear whom he was rooting for in this alleged feud: The Republican regulars, he cheered, have based their thinking “upon the post-World War II international order—the American-led alliances, norms and organizations that bind democracies and preserve global peace.”

Meanwhile, on the other hand, in Brooks’ telling, there were those rotten populist ethno-nationalists, “the forces of perpetual chaos unleashed by Donald Trump’s attention span.” Yes, because Trump isn’t paying attention to his own administration, Brooks continued, the dreaded populist ethno-nationalists threaten to undermine the international status quo with their radical critique. According to Brooks, their critique “is simultaneously moral, religious, economic, political and racial”—and always, bad. And the essence of it, Brooks added, is to be found “in the remarks Steve Bannon made to a Vatican conference in 2014.”

And here’s Brooks’ description of the gist of Bannon’s speech:

Humane capitalism has been replaced by the savage capitalism that brought us the financial crisis. National democracy has been replaced by a crony-capitalist network of global elites. Traditional virtue has been replaced by abortion and gay marriage. Sovereign nation-states are being replaced by hapless multilateral organizations like the E.U. Decadent and enervated, the West lies vulnerable in the face of a confident and convicted Islamofascism, which is the cosmic threat of our time.

So that’s how Brooks characterizes Bannon’s beliefs. And Brooks is just warming up. He then goes on to compare Trump to Vladimir Putin, and Bannon to a conservative Russian political figure in Putin’s orbit, Alexander Dugin.

Yet after making these dark comparisons, Brooks offers his readers a ray of light: The dark ethno-nationalists, he predicts, will fail. Why? Because, Brooks chortles, Trump is such a lazy, egocentric, lightweight that he will lose interest in these Bannonite topics and so will drift over to the side of the globalists.

A question leaps immediately to mind: Did Brooks get some scoop as to Trump's thinking? Some revelatory interview? The answer, Brooks indicates, is "no." It's just his hunch:

I'm personally betting the foreign policy apparatus, including the secretaries of state and defense, will grind down the populists around Trump.

In other words, Brooks, having contrived a false conflict between Trump and Bannon, further admits that all of it is his own wishful thinking.

Okay, and so to another question: Why does Brooks keep using "ethno-nationalist"—four times, in fact—as a descriptor for Bannon, even though he has specifically, and repeatedly, rejected the term? Indeed, Bannon has been so emphatic on this point that even others in the MSM have had to acknowledge it; hence this CNN headline from November 21, 2016, "[Bannon rejects white nationalism: 'I'm an economic nationalist.'](#)" That story, and many others, are easily available to Brooks, but he doesn't seem to care; he is happy slinging around his slurs. And once this story is debunked, soon enough, no doubt, he'll be peddling still more fake news about Trump, Bannon—or someone else in the Trump administration.

This article on Bannon is also included after this one - 2nd from the end here

2. So Who Is David Brooks, Anyway?

[David Brooks](#) has enjoyed a good career in the MSM. Born in 1961, he's nominally a conservative, having worked variously at *National Review*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Weekly Standard*, and, since 2003, as an opinion columnist for *The New York Times*.

And along the way, he has expressed some interesting ideas; for example, in 2006, [he opined that Sens. John McCain and Joe Lieberman should form their own third party](#), based mostly on their shared neoconservatism and globalism. Needless to say, nothing ever came of Brooks' suggestion.

Over his career, Brooks has been notable for three things: first, a book published in 2000 that celebrated the [upper-class luxe lifestyle](#); second, [a fervent advocacy of the 2003 Iraq War](#); and third, [his journalistic love affair with Barack Obama](#).

In other words, he's the perfect sort of housebroken "conservative" for Washington, DC, just the sort of fellow who gets that long-term gig on the [PBS NewsHour](#).

Okay, so let's consider Brooks' track record on Donald Trump. We can sum it up with two points: First, he hates Trump; and second, he is not a good forecaster.

In March of last year, the headline of his column was "[No, Not Trump, Not Ever.](#)" In that piece he harumphed, "Donald Trump is epically unprepared to be president. He has no realistic policies, no advisers, no capacity to learn."

Then Brooks really got going:

Trump is perhaps the most dishonest person to run for high office in our lifetimes. All politicians stretch the truth, but Trump has a steady obliviousness to accuracy.

And since Trump was so terrible in Brooks' mind, it was hard for him to imagine that anyone else could like him. Thus in June 2016, [he predicted that in the November election to come, Hillary Clinton would beat Trump](#). As he put it, "People will be sick of Donald Trump, and they will go for her."

To cap it off, in a column published on November 4, four days before the 2016 general election, [Brooks doubled down on his endorsement of Clinton](#), describing her as "the bigger change agent." Then he went on to describe Trump as "solipsistic, impatient, combative, unsubtle and ignorant," all the while insisting that Clinton was "better suited to getting things done." Amusingly, among the things Clinton would get done, Brooks told his readers, was developing a plan to "secure the border."

Perfectly expressing the *Times*' view of the world, Brooks added, "Any sensible person can distinguish between an effective operating officer [Clinton] and a whirling disaster who is only about himself [Trump]."

Okay, so Brooks, along with 99.9 percent of the rest of the *Times*, liked Clinton and didn't like Trump. We get that.

Yet further details of that column are revealing—revealing, that is, about Brooks. Here's how the piece starts:

A few weeks ago I met a guy in Idaho who was absolutely certain that Donald Trump would win this election. He was wearing tattered, soiled overalls, missing a bunch of teeth and was unnaturally skinny. He was probably about 50, but his haggard face looked 70. He was getting by aimlessly as a handyman.

We might linger over some of those snobby word choices: "tattered, soiled overalls . . . missing a bunch of teeth." Virgil might pause to ask: [Since the 1972 movie *Deliverance*, has there ever been a more profoundly perfect stereotype of how a posh Easterner looks down his nose at the rubes in the rest of the country?](#)

In the piece, Brooks, himself blissfully confident that Hillary was going to prevail, then goes on to recount how he tried patiently to explain to the man that he was wrong in his thinking. And yet, Brooks writes with a sigh, "It was like telling him a sea gull could play billiards."

One might think that the actual election results, four days later, would have humbled Brooks a bit, but they haven't—not at all.

Since the election, he's been as strongly anti-Trump as ever. And, amazingly, he's still in the game of making predictions for *Times* readers, "[The guy will probably resign or be impeached within a year.](#)"

Yet [as we have seen, given Brooks' poor record as prophet, nobody on Team Trump should be worried.](#)

In the meantime, Trump has a country to run.

3. Trump's Vision, Bannon's Vision

Trump's vision for America is ambitious and complex, and yet even so, it can be summed up in the four words he made famous during the campaign: **"Make America Great Again."**

We can quickly note that this idea of American greatness is at the heart of our national history. For example, the Great Seal of the United States, created in 1782, includes the Latin words, *novus ordo seclorum*, "new order for the ages." That is, the Founders believed America should and would set the standard, a high bar, for the future. Yes, that's thinking big; that's the American Way. And so it's not surprising that the same Latin motto has been on the back of the US dollar bill since 1935.

And Trump has other other key phrases that Virgil expects to characterize the Trump presidency. As he said on August at the Cleveland Republican convention, “[Americanism, not globalism, will be our credo.](#)” And since the election, he has added that the Trump administration will pledge to follow “[two simple rules: Buy American and Hire American.](#)” No wonder the globalists hate Trump!

You might want to also see the video where Trump NAMES the Globalists:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ud4sHtwLPs>

Globalists React to Trump Victory

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eiwAu8J4Ml8>

What IS a Globalist?

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XumrD3ET3Sg>

As for Steve Bannon, he has views that can only be described as Trumpian, and he has held them for a long time. So of course the globalists hate him, too.

Since Bannon only rarely gives interviews, some might be curious to know more about his thinking—that is, looking beyond the nasty canards hurled at him by the likes of *Mother Jones*, Behar, and Dean.

In fact, Bannon has been articulating his vision for a long time; since 2004, he has produced no fewer than [16 documentaries](#).

Yet a more direct and personal window into Bannon’s thinking can be found in [his 2014 speech to the Vatican](#); that’s the one that Brooks ripped in his January 10 column. So, without Brooks’ “help,” let’s take a closer look:

Bannon begins by saying that he believes, strongly, that there’s “a crisis” in our time—that is, “a crisis of our faith, a crisis of the West, a crisis of capitalism.” And so he begins with the spiritual question; yes, many today are well off, but the question they should be asking themselves is deeper than money:

What is the purpose of whatever I’m doing with this wealth? **What is the purpose of what I’m doing with the ability that God has given us, that divine providence has given us to actually be a creator of jobs and a creator of wealth?**

He continues in this vein:

It really behooves all of us to really take a hard look and make sure that we are reinvesting that back into positive things.

Yes, **we should invest in positive things, things of faith and belief, which money can’t buy.** Thus the “crisis of faith.”

So now we come to Bannon’s “crisis of the West.” Here, we need only look to Angela Merkel’s Germany; it’s the richest country in Europe, and yet it is now in deadly danger of demographic dissolution—and threatens to take the whole continent down with it.

Indeed, Bannon’s words from 2014, before Merkel foolishly chose to open her borders while subsidizing permanent dependence, now look prescient. **He warned then that the threat from jihadi Islam is “going to come to Europe . . . it’s going to come to the United Kingdom.”** Moreover, in his talk he took note of a tweet that very day from ISIS, promising to turn the United States into a “river of blood.”

Yes, a crisis of the West, indeed.

Now let's turn to the "crisis of capitalism." Back in December, [a talented journalist named David Hawkins considered some of Bannon's points from a philosophical perspective.](#)

Hawkins summarized Bannon's Vatican speech, in which Bannon argued that in recent decades, capitalism seems to have come mostly in two forms, both at least somewhat pernicious:

First, there's the bailout-oriented "crony capitalism" that we saw in the scandalous 2008 bailouts; and

Second, there's the "Ayn Rand influenced . . . libertarian capitalism, which he sees as commoditizing people into mere producers and products."

This latter kind, Hawkins continued, weakens "our collective moral strength."

The answer, Hawkins concluded, is "enlightened capitalism"—that is, the capitalism in which capitalists think about the fate of their country, not just their bank account. As Hawkins put it:

It was this enlightened capitalism that gave the West—through wide asset ownership—its strong middle class and an aspirant and affluent working class which provided the moral and economic foundations for the West to defeat Nazism in 1945 and support Ronald Reagan in standing-up to and defeating the Soviet Union during the Cold War. And now this has been corrupted and in turn weakened the West itself and **Bannon believes the West now faces losing everything it has gained across more than 2000 years.** [emphasis added]

Hawkins ended his essay with these hopeful words:

With Bannon, Trump and "Trumpism" the US and the West has an opportunity for economic, moral and political renewal—a new enlightenment.

Okay, so Hawkins ably describes the problem, and outlines the ultimate desired outcome. And yet we might ask: How, exactly, does America get there? How do we get from the crisis of 2017 to a better place—as soon as possible?

For the answer, we might return to Bannon's 2014 talk, in which he called for aggressively building "a center-right populist movement," the heart of which should be:

. . . the middle class, the working men and women in the world who are just tired of being dictated to by what we call **the party of Davos.**

Interestingly, that seems to have happened in the last three years!

We can also pause to note that "Davos," of course, is shorthand for the [World Economic Forum](#), a conclave of billionaire globalists and their courtiers, meeting every year in Davos, Switzerland. And so Bannon's reference to "the party of Davos" speaks to the reality that global high finance seems to have conquered most of the politics, and most of the parties, of most of the world—and as a result, the America middle class, now sinking in the globalist broth, has been made worse off.

It might be worth noting that the next Davos meeting is just a few days away, on January 17 to 20. And since this is the first session since the November election, there's going to be some soul-searching—and a lot more attempted blame-shifting.

Here, for example, Hence a [headline](#) in *Bloomberg Business Week*: "Davos Wonders If It's Part of the Problem: Did the global elite's devotion to borderless capitalism sow the seeds of a populist backlash?" Many would say that the answer, of course, is "yes."

And yet **Davos Men, and Davos Women will not be giving up so easily.** For instance, one of the scheduled “chats” at Davos will be between Sheryl Sandberg of Facebook and Meg Whitman of HP together they will offer their jet-setting audience their focus-grouped thoughts on shaping “a positive narrative for the global community.” That is, a “global community” that’s safely profitable for Facebook and HP, wherever in the world they might choose to operate.

Will these efforts at spinning globalism succeed? Will the globalists be permitted to keep inflating their financial bubbles—and keep getting bailed out when they pop? The Davosians surely hope so, but it’s possible, after Trump (and before Trump, Brexit), that the jig is up.

But wait! There’s still hope for the globalists. The new American president might not think much of Davos, but the president of the People’s Republic of China, Xi Jinping, thinks differently. Indeed, he is scheduled to speak at Davos in a few days; it will be the first-ever appearance by a Chinese head of state.

We can assume, of course, that Xi, picking up the torch from, say, Barack Obama, will offer a full-throated defense of globalism; after all, globalism has been very, very good for his country.

4. Trump’s Moment

In the meantime, **the eyes of the world are on the soon-to-be 45th president.** As noted in [Part One](#), Trump’s energetic economic activism is already making itself felt: And the good news has continued to pour forth:

Just on January 12, [Amazon announced](#) that it would commit to creating 100,000 new jobs in the US.

Moreover, on January 13, Lockheed, which had earlier been chastised by Trump for price-gouging, announced that it would pledge not only lower costs for its F-35 fighter, but also an additional 1800 jobs in Texas.

As Virgil also noted earlier, **it’s astonishing that past presidents didn’t engage in this sort of pro-jobs, pro-profits, pro-American economic patriotism; perhaps they didn’t know how, or perhaps they didn’t care.**

In any case, Trump does know how, and he does care. And the American people are noticing.

According to a January 10 [Quinnipiac Poll](#),

47 percent of Americans believe that Trump’s economic policies will help the economy, while only 31 percent say they will hurt.

In other words, Trump has already built for himself a 16-point advantage on that question. And his presidency has not yet even begun.

To be sure, in the next few years, Trump, and his team, will be tested again and again. And while it’s impossible to predict the future, it would be foolish to bet against them.

By contrast, it *would* be smart to bet against David Brooks. Addled as he is by his hatred of Trump and his aide Bannon—and probably many other Trumpians that he hasn’t yet had time to attack—Brooks is always wrong.

Read More Stories About:

[Big Government](#), [Big Journalism](#), [David Brooks](#), [Davos Economic Forum](#), [Donald Trump](#), [Economic Populism](#), [globalism](#), [Nationalism](#), [Party of Davos](#), [Populism](#), [Stephen K. Bannon](#), [Steve Bannon](#)

Bannon rejects white nationalism: 'I'm an economic nationalist'



By [Eric Bradner](#), CNN Updated 6:39 PM ET, Mon November 21, 2016



Washington (CNN) Steve Bannon, Donald Trump's selection for White House chief strategist, says he's an "economic nationalist" but rejects racist and anti-Semitic elements of the nationalist alt-right movement.

In [an interview with the Wall Street Journal](#), Bannon, a former Breitbart News executive, cast himself as a strident opponent of "globalism" -- including free trade deals that Trump has bemoaned.

"I'm an economic nationalist. **I am an America first guy,**" Bannon said in the interview.

"And I have admired nationalist movements throughout the world, have said repeatedly strong nations make great neighbors. I've also said repeatedly that the ethno-nationalist movement, prominent in Europe, will change over time. I've never been a supporter of ethno-nationalism."

Bannon said that **"the black working and middle class and the Hispanic working and middle class, just like whites, have been severely hurt by the policies of globalism."**

He said he had urged Trump to reach out to minority communities on the campaign trail.

"I was the one who said we are going to Flint, Michigan, we are going to black churches in Cleveland, because the thrust of this movement is that **we are going to bring capitalism to the inner cities,**" Bannon told the newspaper.

Bannon has been a target of Democratic criticism since his selection by Trump. Many liberals have pointed to incendiary Breitbart headlines -- items that mock "trannies," labeled Weekly Standard editor Bill Kristol a "renegade Jew" and more -- in urging Trump to cut ties with Bannon.

He dismissed that criticism, casting it as disappointment from Democrats who expected Trump to lose.

"They were ready to coronate Hillary Clinton. That didn't happen, and I'm one of the reasons why. So, by the way, I wear these attacks as an emblem of pride," he said.

He also cast Breitbart as "edgy" but "vibrant," and said, **"Our definition of the alt-right is younger people who are anti-globalists, very nationalist, terribly anti-establishment."**

<http://www.breitbart.com/big-journalism/2017/01/09/virgil-arguments-from-bad-authority-how-the-mainstream-media-tries-to-trick-you/>

Virgil: Arguments from Bad Authority: How the Mainstream Media Tries to Trick You



AP, BNN Edit

by [Virgil9](#) Jan 2017 [2,668](#)

This article is a 'precursor', Part-0, to the above 3-Part article

In rhetoric, there's an ancient concept called "argument from authority." In Latin, it's called *argumentum ad verecundiam*. The idea is that the person making an argument invokes a big name, saying, in effect, "So-and-so agrees with me, so I must be right!"

Of course, an argument from authority can be false. One of the many possible fallacies is, most obviously, that **the cited authority might not be an authority on the subject at all**. So the fallacy could be the mixing of apples and oranges; the authority might simply not be relevant. As with any tool, **it can be used, or misused**.

And as we shall see, argument from authority is a particularly favored rhetorical tactic of the Mainstream Media: **The MSM introduces an authority figure, builds him or her up, and then, having created a giant, uses that giant to smack down its foes, usually, a Republican.**

And what if the exemplars of authority are fallacious?

In the minds of the MSM, of course, **the duty to oppose Donald Trump and the GOP is the prime imperative.** So to that end, in pursuit of this higher truth, **any rhetorical sleight-of-hand is not only allowed, but admired.**

We can cite three recent examples:

First, in the January 6 *Washington Post*, we were presented with a headline, "[I knew Gov. Schwarzenegger. Mr. Trump, you're no Gov. Schwarzenegger.](#)" We can immediately note that this wording, of course, is a play on the [famous jibe of Sen. Lloyd Bentsen \(D-TX\)](#)—"I knew Jack Kennedy . . ."—aimed at Dan Quayle during the 1988 presidential campaign. So that's an example of argument from authority, right there.

In the piece itself, writer Abby Lunardini, a former aide to Arnold Schwarzenegger when he was governor of California, seeks to contrast her former boss with Donald Trump. In Lunardini's telling, Schwarzenegger, now back in the news for his new role on NBC's *Celebrity Apprentice*, becomes the authority on executive leadership by which Trump should be judged. And, of course, this being the MSM, Trump is deemed to come up short.

Indeed, in making her argument, Lunardini describes virtues in Schwarzenegger that many observers had failed to notice. In office in Sacramento, he was, she assures us, "a dedicated student of policy and government," adding, "Schwarzenegger prided himself on being the best-briefed person in the room."

Having built up Schwarzenegger to Solomonic status, Lunardini now uses the august authority she has conferred on the onetime action-movie star to dump on Trump. In contrast to her ex-boss, she writes, Trump has a "legendarily short attention span," and a habit of "blowing-off of debate prep and intelligence briefings."

Having thus dismissed Trump, Lunardini recalls that Schwarzenegger himself had troubles early on in his governorship, and yet he solved them by changing course; he brought in a Democratic chief of staff who proceeded to "work with" (read: cave in to) the Democrats in the state legislature.

The implication is clear: In her mind, President Trump could save himself by similarly caving in to the Democrats in Washington.

As the author puts it:

Perhaps Trump, like Schwarzenegger, will turn out to be a pragmatic social moderate who uses his charm and business negotiation skills to forge consensus.

And yet, Lunardini sighs, that's not likely to happen. As she puts it, "That's more than we can reasonably expect from Trump."

Okay, so there we have one argument from authority, MSM-style: Judged by the standards of the Great Governor Schwarzenegger, President Trump is likely to be a failure.

Now let's take a second example, also from January 6. The headline in *Politico* reads, "[Bill Perry Is Terrified. Why Aren't You? How an 89-year-old cold warrior became America's nuclear conscience.](#)"

Perhaps William J. Perry is not a household name, although some time back, from 1994 to 1997, he was an important figure, serving as secretary of defense under President Clinton. And yet even then, he cut a relatively low profile; he hasn't really been heard from in decades.

Yet now, if *Politico* has anything to say about it, that will change—his stature will rise. According to this MSM outlet, Perry, now in his ninth decade, has reluctantly taken on the new role as “America’s nuclear conscience,” because he is worried. And what is he worried about? Why, Donald Trump, of course!

In the explanation of writers John Harris and Bryan Bender, Perry, supposedly a quiet sage all these years, has now been inspired to action by the president-elect’s supposedly careless talk about nuclear weapons and the nuclear arms race.

Perry had supported Hillary Clinton, and had assumed that she would win. And yet, in the *Politico* account:

Now comes Donald Trump with a long trail of statements effectively shrugging his shoulders about a world newly bristling with bombs and people with reasons to use them.

So that leaves Perry, according to *Politico*, with no choice but to speak up as the voice of “rationality”:

Donald Trump was not the voice he was looking for, to put it mildly, but he has responded to the Trump cyclone with modulated restraint. Perry said he assumes his most truculent rhetoric isn’t serious, the utterances of a man who assumed his words were for political effect only and had no real consequences.

Okay, got that? As far as *Politico* is concerned, Trump is a blowhard for sure, and probably menace to boot. And yet maybe, just maybe, he will heed the wise counsel of Perry. And what if Trump doesn’t? Well, then, in the MSM view, that’s just one more strike against Trump: He doesn’t heed the wisdom of good authority.

Now we can come to our third example, seen in this headline in the

December 31 *Politico*: [“What the ‘Godfather of Populism’ Thinks of Donald Trump: In the 1970s, Fred Harris invented the “new populism.” Now, with a so-called populist taking the White House, he’s aghast—and wants to reclaim the term.”](#)

By now, the reader is not surprised that the MSM has once again found an elder figure to elevate, thereby lowering the stature of Trump.

The wise man in this case is former Sen. Fred R. Harris (D-OK), here to tell us who is, and who isn’t, a proper populist. And so already we can figure it out: Trump will flunk the Harris test.

Harris was once a figure of some renown. Born in 1930 in Cotton County, OK, he became prominent when appointed to the US Senate in 1964. He was re-elected two years later and then, in the late 60s, became a media darling: While retaining his twangy country & western persona, he became a safe vote for every limousine-liberal cause of that era, even as he persisted in calling himself a “populist.” And for their part, East Coast leftists were happy to go along with Harris’ word-play; if he could be a reliable liberal vote in conservative Oklahoma, he was welcome to call himself whatever he wanted, if that’s what it took to give himself some political cover.

Yet Harris’ rhetorical ploys didn’t work out so well. He avoided seeking a third term in 1972, choosing instead to run for president; his national campaign fizzled. And in fact, at the time, it was thought that Harris couldn’t win re-election in Oklahoma, as he was too liberal for the state; he was, for example, pro-choice on abortion. Harris sought the presidency again in 1976, and, once more, his campaign went nowhere.

And for the last four decades, Harris has been a professor at the University of New Mexico, although he has continued to be a liberal Democrat in good standing. Now 86, he has been a delegate to every Democratic convention, a campaign co-chair for Barack Obama in 2008, and a strong supporter of Hillary Clinton last year.

In other words, while it certainly can be said that Harris' progressive credentials are in good order, it's harder to say the same of his populist credentials.

After all, populism is all about the rule of the people—their voice, their vision. And the people in Harris' home state aren't so liberal and they no longer vote for Democrats: In 2016, for example, Trump won 65 percent of the vote in the Sooner State, while Clinton won less than 29 percent

So again, it would seem that Harris is more of a leftist than a populist. And yet in this instance, it behooves *Politico* writer Richard Linnett to extoll Harris' populist credentials—he's the "Godfather of Populism," after all—because populism is the standard by which he seeks to judge, and convict, Trump.

As *Politico* puts it:

When Harris looks at Donald Trump's campaign, he sees a vision of populism fundamentally opposed to the way he saw the movement. In the 1970s, Harris aimed to build political clout by creating new coalitions across boundaries of race, gender and class, uniting people on the basis of their shared struggle.

As we have seen, Harris' vision of populism—in reality, liberalism, complete with sneering references to the purported "racism" of political foes—was rejected by the voters, both in Oklahoma and nationwide.

And yet because Trump has so much populist support, it's a clever MSM tactic to try to belittle his populist credibility. Here's more from *Politico*:

In electing Trump, Fred Harris believes the people voted against their own interests, choosing a man who will enrich himself and not them. He sees Trump as a leader who has built walls between groups and emphasized their differences in order to gain power—in fact, Harris isn't so sure that the president-elect's views can even be called populist.

So there we have it: The Godfather of Populism isn't so sure that the president-elect is at all a populist. Yes, it might seem cheeky that Harris, out of office for nearly half a century, presumes to explain why it is that Trump, who just won 63 million votes, carrying 30 states—including, of course, Oklahoma—is not actually populist. And yet, of course, the MSM eats it up.

Yes, argument from authority is a strong rhetorical tactic.

It can be used to reveal the truth, or it can be used to conceal the truth.

And, by their own words, MSMers have shown us which approach they prefer.

Read More Stories About:

[Big Journalism](#), [Media Bias](#), [Virgil](#)