Have Foreign Adversaries Infiltrated the Societal Fabric of America with Socialistic Ideology for the Purpose of Influencing the American Political Structure?

by

Susan Piscator
Henley-Putnam University

October 5, 2014

Dr. Harry Nimon, Committee Chair

Dr. Denise Greaves, Committee Member

Dr. Bruce Guggenberger, Committee Member

Mr. Ed Urie, Committee Member

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Counterterrorism
Abstract

The primary hypothesis of the thesis is the identification of deliberate foreign-influenced infiltration of socialistic ideologies into the American culture. This study examined the present American political and cultural milieus with respect to specific historical documents and literature on socialistic ideology. The doctrines of Karl Marx, Lavrentiy Beria, and Saul Alinsky were compared in two case studies involving current sensitive political situations for possible indications of infiltration.

The research question became not only whether our President over-steps his boundaries but also why and whether a foreign factor is influencing this shift. Are the drivers of current political and intelligence community policies simply the result of, as Dougherty describes, an “acceptance of all-embracing state authority [that] is largely due to fatigue and despair brought about by war or economic disorder” (Dougherty, 2010, p. 8)?
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Chapter 1
Introduction
Research Question

Socialism as defined by the Online Law Dictionary is “an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services” ("Defining Socialism," n.d., npn). A growing propensity toward socialistic ideologies is manifesting itself in this country, when according to Peter Schuck, emeritus professor of law at Yale, our “government bureaucracies respond to failures in social systems by demanding even more power” (Levin, 2014, p. 2.). John Nichols in his book, The “S” Word, states:

Polls tell us that democratic socialism is more popular today than at any time in recent American history. He [Nichols] cites polls that 20-25 percent of Americans view socialism positively, with the number at 43 percent among those ages 18-29. The polls also find that Americans are increasingly critical of the capitalist system that made America the envy and target of the rest of the world (Kincaid, 2011, p. 2).

Is socialistic creep the result of stagnation in our economy, frustration with capitalism as demonstrated with the Occupy Wall Street Movement, the schema of our educational system, a weariness of a prolonged military engagement in the Middle East, or the application of Saul Alinsky’s Rules for the Radicals? The following statement may summarize the recipe for this observation or structural reformation:

Attacks on basic American freedoms are occurring at such a frantic pace and in such
disparate arenas that it is easy to lose sight of the bigger picture. By replacing individual freedom with government control and direction, the president’s policies have produced the weakest recovery in over a century. Had our forefathers placed their faith in government instead of individuals, the U.S. today would be a third world nation. By moving to replace our precious individual freedoms with progressively more government control over the economy and markets, the president opts for policies that will continue to erode the living standards of most Americans (Genetski, 2014, p. 1).

The primary hypothesis of this thesis is the credentialing and analysis of societal-cultural changes in America. One can ask whether these permutations are the result of foreign adversaries deliberately infiltrating socialistic ideologies into the American culture or reflective of subliminal changes evolving from our own citizens. A review of historical socialistic ideologies shall be comparatively studied with respect to current governmental policies that are challenging our Constitutional standards. Competing interests potentially may lead to polarization and polarization latently can lead to social discourse and unrest. Two applicable case studies will be included to examine the present American political and cultural milieus with relevancy to historical documents and prose on socialistic ideology. If the evaluation reveals socialistic infiltration has transpired, further examination is warranted to ascertain whether the surrogate changes represented, however subtly and if allowed to continue, will be a contaminating influence on the intelligence community.

Problem Statement

If it is found that American society is slowly moving away from one of self-sufficiency to dependency on our government, will this attitudinal thinking potentially affect the shaping of
minds from outside influences, specifically our enemies and yes, our own government?
According to the Heritage Organization’s research by David Muhlhausen, PhD, and Patrick
Tyrrell, in the “2013 Index of Dependence on Government,” “there is rise in government
dependence occurring despite the nation undergoing an economic recovery” (Muhlhausen &
Tyrrell, 2013, p. 1). We are encountering increased government intervention in the economy, in
our education with the Common Core Program, and in healthcare with the Affordable Healthcare
Act. The question is whether this increased governmental intervention is the administrative
result of prescriptive socialistic ideologies or a result of natural evolution within the cultural
milieus.

Potentially, is the current political administration adopting socialistic ideology from
personal convictions or is the adoption of socialistic cultivation due to foreign influence intent on
destruction of our great political system, and is the Machiavellian theory of the end justifying the
means a compeer influence? Our country is spending massive amounts of money on social
programs, while the military and Intelligence Community are experiencing massive cuts. How
will this influence our intelligence community and strategic planning? The question evolves into
how the intelligence community will respond to threats from Russia, North Korea, Syria, and
other adversarial nations.

Any complete answer to these questions is, admittedly, beyond the scope of a thesis.
However, an examination of the potential for foreign influence as a means of establishing
justification for further study is possible in this format. This, then, is the objective of this thesis,
to establish a justification for further study.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

Defining Socialism and Socialistic Ideologies

Defining socialism and socialistic ideologies necessitates establishing a foundation for the understanding prior to assessing whether any influencing infiltration has presented itself into the American political and cultural milieus. The Online Law Dictionary defines socialism as “an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services” ("Defining Socialism," n.d.).

As an ideology, socialism has been traditionally defined as the antithesis of capitalism. However, reviewing the origin of the word expands and challenges this common belief. The term socialism derives from the Latin sociare, meaning to combine or to share. The literature review reveals an array of definitions and assumptions, often conflicting.

Although history does not repeat itself verbatim, trends in historical data can often lead to an understanding of potential future occurrences. With this in mind, the history of socialism in Russia and Cuba will be examined. As stated in chapter one of Heywood’s book, Political Ideologies an Introduction, “socialism has three core themes, as an alternative to capitalism, as an instrument of the labor movement and thirdly, as a political creed or ideology” (Heywood, 2012, p. 100). Upon the review of the two countries’ timeline of socialism, the correlates, if any, will be applied to the United States, with focus on Saul Alinsky’s teachings, the Clowden-Piven model, and current political policies.

Historical Socialistic Strategies – Foreign Based
To acquire an historical perspective of foreign socialism two noted authors, Lavrentiy Beria and Friedrich Hayek, were selected. The author of *Brain-Washing: A Synthesis of the Russian textbook on Psychopolitics*, Lavrentiy Beria was the First Lieutenant of the Soviet Secret Police for Stalin. The book actually contains the presentation by Beria to the American students who were attending the Lenin University prior to 1936. The book identifies techniques explaining how the Kremlin utilizes psycho-politics in capturing minds of citizens for the purposes of control. “In its contents you can see the diabolical plot of the enemies of Christ and America, as they seek to conquer our nation by subjecting the minds of our people to their will by various sinister means” (Beria, 1936, p. 1). The treatise was used as a primer, here in America, to educate communist agents to brainwash people and subvert entire populations.

In a nation where economic balances are not controlled, the appetite of the individual is unduly whetted by enchanting and fanciful persuasions to desire, and a type of insanity ensues, where each individual is persuaded to possess more than he can use, and to possess it even at the expense of his fellows (Beria, 1936, p. 14).

The question to be examined is whether any of these techniques are evidenced today in our country. Are there observable indicators characterized by any of these socialistic components? The interesting claim in this treatise, which may be drawing a parallel, is “remember, all lands are governed by the few and only pretend to consult with the many. It is no different in America. The petty official, the maker of laws alike can be made to believe the worst” (Beria, 1936, p. 60).

The piece of prose, *The Intellectuals and Socialism*, although written in 1949 by Friedrich Hayek, was selected to show the connection between Mr. Hayek’s predictions and current times. F. A. Hayek undoubtedly is one of the most eminent modern Austrian economists
and philosophers. His works have been extensively referenced over the years. In a very thought-provoking statement Hayek proposes:

It may be that a free society as we have known it carries in itself the forces of its own destruction, that once freedom has been achieved it is taken for granted and ceases to be valued, and that the free growth of ideas which is the essence of a free society will bring about the destruction of the foundations on which it depends (Hayek, 1949, p. 383-384).

As amazing as it may seem, de Tocqueville’s brilliance in 1835 is exemplified by his statement “…prescient sense that the destiny of half the globe would ultimately be in the hands of the Americans and the Russians, the one representing freedom, the other servitude” (Bevan, 2003, p. xxxvii). He describes our constitutional government as a much more living document than it is today, when it is seen largely as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate something which it has no power to do under the Constitution. De Tocqueville asserts:

The Presidency is an inherently weak office, empowered to do nothing but administer the laws Congress has passed. Equally quaint is his interpretation of the entire federal government as nothing more than an agency for conducting foreign policy, since all domestic concerns are handled by the states and localities (Bevan, 2003).

British and French thinkers came up with the general concept of socialism in the mid-1800s, calling for community-controlled wealth and property, administered by rulers through pragmatic reasoning, without religious influence. Religion and capitalism were viewed as harmful to society, resulting in inequality and the exploitation of the masses. This movement would influence Karl Marx, a Prussian (German) Jew. Marx wrote the book titled "Communist
"Manifesto" (1848), which advocated a system without classes and privately owned property ("Communism in Russia," n.d., p. 1).

The seeds of future Russian Communisms were sown with the abolition of serfdom in 1861. Serfdom is a form of slavery where peasants are tied to a piece of farmland. They are allowed to use the land to provide for themselves and their family, but are forced to succumb to the will of their master in all things, including military service whenever needed. The abolition of serfdom resulted in a mass exodus from the agricultural areas to the cities, where the new working class found employment in factories as part of Russia's industrial revolution. However, they had no leverage as a large collection of individuals and were easily exploited, working for miniscule wages. The consequential poverty epidemic made the general public very open to the idea of communism and socialism. After Russia lost to Japan in the Russian-Japanese War in 1905, and the sorry state of the Russian Empire, the conditions were ripe for a fundamental change ("Communism in Russia," n.d., p. 1).

In 1848, Western Europe was swept by a wave of revolutions. Marx wanted to use this chaos to his advantage and used a newspaper, the ‘Neue Rheinische Zeitung’ to launch his ten points:

1) The abolition of private property/ownership of land.
2) Income tax to be graded to income – the more an individual earned, the more they paid. The less you earned, the less you paid.
3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4) The confiscation of all property of immigrants and rebels.
5) The centralization of all credit into the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive economy.
6) Centralization of all means of communication and transport into the hands of the state.

7) The extension of factories and the instrument of production owned by the state, bringing into cultivation all land not being used that could be and an improvement in the fertility of the soil.

8) The equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies.

9) The combination of agriculture and manufacturing industries with the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by the more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10) Free education for all children in public schools. The abolition of child labor in factories; an educated child would be better for society in the long term, than a child not educated ("Karl Marx," n.d., para. 4).

We now transition to the year of 1959 in Cuba. Under the leadership of Fidel Castro, the Cuban people seized the power of the dictator Fulgencio Batista. Supported by the masses of workers and peasants, they desired a program of sweeping land reform and national independence from “Yankee” imperialism/capitalism.

The revolutionary government committed itself to massive campaigns and reforms that were objectively in the interests of the working class - a countrywide literacy campaign; guaranteed right to employment, education, and health care; equal rights for women, and an end to racial discrimination. Phenomenal social gains were made on all these fronts, testimony to what is possible when oppressed people take the reins of state power and wield them in the interests of the majority (Williams, Strauss, Brennan, & Durham, 2010, p. 3).
Although similar to the revolution in Russia, the workers and peasants in Cuba did attain a system of workers’ councils or an equivalent body of empowerment to exercise any form of social decision-making. With bold measures the revolutionary government transformed the landscape of Cuba. An immediate priority was the land transfer to the peasant and poor farmers. The utilities, sugar refineries, oil refineries and other major industries were expropriated from private ownership to the state. This newly organized state was designed to expropriate private property and replace it with a collectivized economic system to serve the majority and build socialism. With the country in dire financial straits, the Cuban government was forced into nationalizing all means of production. “Goals for production were established and implemented through 5-year plans. These plans were structured to meet social goals, including free, universal education and health care, full employment and housing for all” (Williams et al., 2010, p. 5). The collapse of the Soviet Union coupled with the U.S. blockade created incredible hardships for Cuba, with the proliferation of poverty.

The year is 1936 and Lavrentiy Beria is addressing a group of American students at the Lenin University on psychopolitics. This group of handpicked students would later return to America and aid the Communists in their conquest of America. Beria was First Lieutenant of the Soviet Secret Police for Stalin. The methods of psychopolitics are not as important in the context of this thesis as the goal.

By psychopolitics our chief goals are effectively carried forward. To produce a maximum of chaos in the culture of the enemy is our first most important step. Our fruits are grown in chaos, distrust, economic depression and scientific turmoil. At least a weary
populace can seek peace only in our offered Communist State, at last only communism
can resolve the problems of the masses (Beria, 1936, p. 3).

Beria further explained to the students they would be aided in a Capitalistic state by the
“corruption of the philosophy of man and the times” (Beria, 1936, p. 4), allowing them to seize
and control their mental processes “to spread our doctrine and rid us of our enemies within their
own borders” (Beria, 1936). Psychopolitics in the doctrine of Beria is simply brain-washing or
the “art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of
individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations
through mental healing” (Beria, 1936, p. 6).

As observed from the preceding history of socialism in Russia, the country was in the
midst of chaos, and confusion. The Communist Manifesto that Marx compiled offered some
structure to the members of the industrial working class. As Marxists, the foundation was there
for the nation to define its character, to determine whether the capitalist ruling class would
remain in control or if the oppressed masses would succeed.

**Historical Socialistic Strategies – United States Based**

Following the Civil War, the American political-economic system began to drift farther
from “the model of laissez-faire capitalism, as governments at the state and
federal level passed laws to regulate the market” (Bradley & Donway, 2010, p. 75).

[P]artisan and ideological warfare cannot obscure the need to conceptualize the evolving
political-economic system. If one is not allowed to say that the United States is
experiencing “creeping socialism,” in the sense of having more government-owned
companies, how can one characterize the political-economic system that has emerged since 1870 (Bradley & Donway, 2010, p. 76)?

Saul Alinsky stated the purpose of his book, *Rules for Radicals* is:

…concerned with how to create mass organizations to seize power and give it to the people; to realize the democratic dream of equality, justice, peace, cooperation, equal and full opportunities for education, full and useful employment, health, and the creation of those circumstances in which man can have the chance to live by values that give meaning to life (Alinsky, 1971, p. 3).

Alinsky based his work on the assumption that *The Prince* by Machiavelli was for the “haves” to hold onto power. The *Rules for the Radicals* is for the “have-nots” to take it away. Alinsky was a community organizer in Chicago who based his philosophy not on Stalin’s revolutionary violence, but on the Neo-Marxist strategies of Antonio Gramsci, an Italian Communist. Gramsci believed in a gradual movement of infiltration and the dialectic process vice revolution.

A Marxist begins with his prime truth that all evils are caused by the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalists. From this he logically proceeds to the revolution to end capitalism, then into the third stage of reorganization into a new social order of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and finally the last stage -- the political paradise of communism (Alinsky, 1971, p. 10).

It is documented that President Obama spent four years teaching the methods of Alinsky as a community organizer in Chicago.

In, a letter to the *Boston Globe*, Alinsky’s son wrote, “the Democratic National Convention had all the elements of the perfectly organized event, Saul Alinsky
Barack Obama’s training in Chicago by the great community organizers is showing its effectiveness. It is an amazingly powerful format, and the method of my late father always works to get the message out and get the supporters on board. When executed meticulously and thoughtfully, it is a powerful strategy for initiating change and making it really happen. Obama learned his lesson well (Geraghty, 2009, p. 2).

Additionally, former First Lady and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was so impressed with Saul Alinsky and his teachings she selected him and his earlier book *Reveille for Radicals*, as the theme for her college thesis. “She is also known to have met and been recruited by Alinsky” ("Hillary letters," 2014, p. 3).

There is some current controversy regarding President Obama’s possible subjection to the teachings of Saul Alinsky and the Cloward-Piven model. A church-based group in Chicago that embraced Saul Alinsky’s teachings, *Rules for Radicals*, employed President Obama in the 1980s. Thus, it is deemed appropriate to present an overview of what these teachings involved and what the Cloward-Piven model embodies.

First proposed in 1966 after Columbia University sociologists Richard Andrew Cloward and Frances Fox Piven, the Cloward-Piven Strategy seeks to hasten the fall of capitalism by overloading the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse (Poe, 2005, p. 1). Early promoters of the Cloward-Piven strategy would often cite Saul Alinsky’s rule number four from his book *Rules for Radicals*,

…make the enemy live up to their (sic) own book of rules. The promoters said the system’s failure to live up to its rulebook would then be used to discredit it altogether and
to replace the capitalist ‘rule book’ with a socialist on (Poe, 2005, p. 1).

Simply stated, a crisis is fabricated completely overwhelming current government programs that can only be solved with more national programs of governmental control. Some of the examples explored were the financial crisis of 2008 and the recent influx of illegal immigrants.

The converse of socialism is often simply stated as capitalism. Professor Thompson of Political Science at Ashland University and Coordinator of Publications and special programs at the John Ashbrook Center of Public Affairs in Ashland, Ohio, offered an insightful comparison in *Socialism vs. Capitalism: Which is the moral system?* Among additional resources contributing to the comparison of these two ideologies, is *Why Socialism Failed* by Mark Perry, PhD, from the University of Michigan. The article summarizes why socialism has failed in the United States and explains the basis for the success of capitalism. Contrasting with Dr. Perry’s views is a blog listing the 75 *Ways Socialism Has Improved America*, which states there is nothing to fear about socialism and much to embrace. Along this same trend of thought is 3 *Reasons Why Good Socialism Defeats Bad Capitalism*, where author Cedric Muhammad explores the fundamental misunderstandings of socialism and capitalism.

**Acquisition and Use of Power by the United States Government**

Numerous sources, in addition to the United States Constitution, were reviewed to obtain a perspective on the government’s legitimate acquisition and use of power. The research began with historical data and progressed to current times. Jude Dougherty’s essay, “Two Treatises on the Acquisition and Use of Power,” offers two historical treatises on the acquisition and use of power written in the middle of the twentieth century and states why the United States may instinctively turn to the past in troubled times.
Milton Friedman’s work, *Why Government is the Problem*, was insightful. In this collection of public policy essays, Friedman points out the major social problems of the United States are deteriorating education, lawlessness and crime, homelessness, the collapse of family values, and the crisis in medical care, which has been produced by well-intended actions of a so-called progressive government. Additionally, he conveys that the threat of terrorism around the world and in our own country may not be our biggest concern. A larger looming threat may actually be our own government as it strays from the assigned constitutional powers. A natural tendency of power is to grow. Often this growth is without authority or accountability.

Andrew Rudalevige’s blog, *Executive directives – and misdirection*, revealed eight areas of possible abuse of President’s executive authority, including “the release of Guantánamo detainees in exchange for Bowe Bergdahl, without following a statutory notice requirement” (Rudalevige, 2014, p. 5).

George Will describes in his June 22, 2014 editorial, “Stopping a lawless president,” that “Presidents must exercise some discretion in interpreting laws, must have some latitude in allocating finite resources to the enforcement of laws, and must have some freedom to act in the absence of law” (Will, 2014, p. E7).

The research question becomes what, if any, foreign doctrine may be influencing the President’s current decisions. Are the drivers of current political and intelligence community policies simply the result as Dougherty describes an “acceptance of all-embracing state authority [that] is largely due to fatigue and despair brought about by war or economic disorder” (Dougherty, 2010, p. 8)?
Chapter 3  
Methodology

Historical Data

Our democracy is historically defined in terms of capitalism. The antithesis of capitalism is utopian socialism. Utopian socialism is “an economy theory based on the premise that voluntary surrender by capital of the means of production would bring about the end of poverty and unemployment” ("Utopian socialism," n.d.). The defining factors of both capitalism and socialism were explored. Current day economic and social theories appear to be directed toward the following as noted per authors Newt Gingrich, Ronald Reagan, Edwin Feulner, and Lt. General John Rosa. “Every government service, every offer of government – financed security – is paid for in the loss of personal freedom” ("Reagan," 2013, p. 1).

If American society and culture is accepting the conversion from capitalism to socialism, the conversion may be producing effects on opinions within the intelligence community and how the intelligence community analyzes data that may be politically focused. To comprehend the significance of whether and why this is occurring becomes critical to the value of intelligence, especially if this influence is being deliberately perpetuated by a foreign entity. While it is not possible to explore the subject to a definitive depth without significant study beyond the scope of this thesis, it is possible to ferret signs or linkage to foreign adversarial influenced infiltration of socialistic ideology being interwoven into the societal fabric of America with the intention of affecting the American political architectural structure.

The initial research methodology defines, historically and currently, socialism from the philosophical to the current American mindset. Although it is easy to speculate or hypothesize
that there is or is not socialistic influence on current political decisions and policies, a case study involving contentious political decisions will provide some insight to the thesis hypothesis of possible peregrine socialistic influence on political decisions and the intelligence driving them or whether the cultural/societal changes are a natural evolution. Several other contentious examples will be captioned.

Brain-washing, the Russian textbook on psychopolitics written in 1936 sees the psychopolitician able to control the populace without a war. Psychopolitics is the “art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through mental healing” (Beria, 1936, p. 6). Psychopolitics historically was used in Russia before, during, and after the Cold war. They were very skilled practitioners at mental manipulation as they sought to convert individuals and nations to the Communist way of life. Their goal is simple: the eventual destruction of the American way of life. Today are we seeing inroads into our culture, our educational system, our political structure, tax system, business regulations, gun control, healthcare, and other arenas that were engineered many decades ago by the Communist regimes? If the case studies reveal any indicators of such manipulation, the impact on our country could be substantial.

In The Road to Serfdom, penned in 1944 by Professor Hayek:

…sounds a grim warning to Americans and Britons who look to the government to provide the way out of all our economic difficulties. Hayek demonstrates that fascism and what the Germans correctly call National Socialism are the inevitable results of the
increasing growth of state control and state power, of national ‘planning’ and of socialism (Hayek, 1944, p. 12).

If the polls citing 43 percent among the ages of 18-29 view socialism positively are correct (Kincaid, 2011, p.2) and the growing reliance on our government continues rising precipitously, the fabric of our constitution could be in peril. If indeed we are experiencing a migration of socialism in this country, our security is endangered by means our founding fathers desired to avoid. The framers adopted ten constitutional amendments, called the Bill of Rights, preserving individual rights and state authority. If the federal government is found to be breaching Constitutional limits, the framers of the constitution have established a means to amend the constitution to prevent further erosion of individual rights. The examination of documented case studies shall determine whether further exploration of this question is felicitous or not. It should be noted the research is limited to open source material intended to only provide a trend, or lack thereof, of socialistic influence.
Chapter 4  
Data Analysis

Beria – Marx – Alinsky Doctrines

Lavrentiy Beria, Soviet Secret Police Chief and a close associate of Stalin has been described as a meticulous manager, and a very intelligent henchman of Stalin. “The goals of psychopolitics described in an address to American students at the Lenin University are economic depression and scientific turmoil in the culture of their enemies (The United States)” (Beria, 1936, p. 3). He challenged the students to change the loyalty of the capitalistic Americans, to seize and to control their minds as an aid to spread the communistic doctrine. Through psychopolitics they would “create chaos, leave the nation leaderless, kill their enemies and bring to earth, through Communism, the greatest peace Man has ever know” (Beria, 1936, p. 4).

“The use of psychopolitics would allow for the maintaining of dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of the enemy nations through mental healing” (Beria, 1936, p. 6). In a very detailed manner, Beria endeavored to infiltrate the educational system in the United States believing imbuing the nation with the tenets of Communism should be applied at first to the educative measurers. The process would be started by placing the “tenets of Karl Marx, Pavlov, Lamarck, and the data of Dialectic Materialism in the textbooks of psychology, to such a degree that anyone thoroughly studying psychology becomes at once a candidate to accept the reasonableness of Communism” (Beria, 1936, p. 53). Beria wisely knew this would be a slow
process but a process that would allow for an extension of the communist order without the perils of an actual war with capitalistic nations.

The spread of Communism has never been by force of battle, but by the conquest of the mind. The end thoroughly justifies the means. The degradation of populaces is less inhuman than their destruction by atomic fission. The end of war is the control of a conquered people. If people can be conquered in the absence of war the end of war will have been achieved without the destruction of war. A worthy goal (Beria, 1936, p. 64).

Beria made no bones about the necessity of possible brutality in the accomplishment of his goals. As he stated, the end justifies the means. Late in the 1960s, Chicago community activist Saul Alinsky also sought to infiltrate the “system” and did so in a much different manner than Beria. In his book *Rules for Radicals*, written in 1971, he capitalized on the negativism and contempt that permeated society. This negativism possessed by the young generation extended to all institutions, from the police and the courts to the system itself. He wrote “we are living in a world of mass media which daily exposes society’s innate hypocrisy, its contradictions and the apparent failure of almost every facet of our social and political life” (Alinsky, 1971, p. xiv).

This generation was saying they did not want to spend their lives as their family had. “They (the youth of the 1970s) wanted to do something, to create, to be me, to do my own thing, to live” (Alinsky, 1971, p. xv). This generation was searching for meaning to their lives and to answer the question why am I here. Alinsky sought to provide order to a pending revolution. He shared his “rules for radicals” for those who wanted to change their world. Alinsky “elaborated the central concepts of action in human politics that operate regardless of the scene or the time” (Alinsky, 1971, p. xviii). But to accomplish change, he stressed the art of communication. Along with the art of communication was the necessity of humor and the ability to convey a
message of hope and aspirations to an audience. And this communication had to be presented with a non-challenging attitude. Following in the footsteps of the Italian socialist Gramsci, Alinsky recognized the importance of slowly advancing his concept.

This concept was the antitheses of an impatient youthful generation who desired for instant and dramatic change. “To build a powerful organization takes time. It is tedious, but that’s the way the game is played – if you want to play and not just yell, kill the umpire” (Alinsky, 1971, p. xx). The socialist doctrines of the foreign countries tended to all embrace control of the subjects’ mind, education, and the mass media or communication to imbue their agendas.

Alinsky recapitulated this theory. While Beria’s main tenet was mind control, Alinsky outlines his agenda in thirteen rules. He realized “a revolution without a prior reformation would collapse or become a totalitarian tyranny” (Alinsky, 1971, p. xxii). The teachings of Mr. Alinsky were effective and malignant. The era of the Vietman War created the environment to further his agenda, to change the world to match his vision. “The Prince, written by Machiavelli, was for the Haves on how to hold the power. The Rules for Radicals is written for the Have-Nots on how to take it away” (Alinsky, 1971, p. 3). Alinsky’s book is concerned with:

…how to create mass organizations to seize power and give it to the people; to realize the democratic dream of equality, justice, peace, cooperation, equal and full opportunities for education, full and useful employment, health, and the creation of those circumstances in which man can have the chance to live by values that give meaning to life (Alinsky, 1971, p. 3).

Karl Marx in the communist manifesto recognized the importance of controlling the education of the children. “Free education for all children in public schools. The abolition of
child labor in factories; an educated child would be better for society in the long term, than a child not educated” ("Karl Marx," n.d., para. 4).

**Educational Standards**

In this country today, we have the government program of Common Core State Standards where the federal government has established the baseline standards, which states are to adhere to in order to receive federal funding. “The federal dollars amount to $15.8 billion according to a 2012 estimate by the Pioneer Institute” (Ratner, 2014, p. A13). What this is purported to do and what is occurring are opposing actions. In the spirit of equality, all people are to be educated to the same standard and thus everyone receives the same opportunities in our capitalistic venue. However, what we have experienced over the years is not a raising of the bar, but rather a “dumbing down” of our educational system. Not only are we witnessing this dumbing down of math and reading skills but also more and more federal government centralized planning and operational control, e.g., the Department of Education vice local school boards. “At the 2010 annual conference of mathematics societies, Bill McCallum, a leading writer of Common Core math standards, said that the new standards would not be too high in comparison with other nations where math education excels” (Ratner, 2014, para. 2). Astoundingly, while the Common Core standards claim to be internationally benchmarked, they are not.

The Common Core fails any comparison with the standards of high-achieving countries, just as they failed compared to the old California standards. They are lower in the total scope of learned material, in the depth and rigor of the treatment of mathematical subjects, and in the delayed and often inconsistent and incoherent introductions of mathematical concepts and skills (Ratner, 2014, para. 10).
The Common Core Standards appear to be a step backward in education but a step closer to increased governmental control and indicative of socialistic ideologies. It is the taking of the power and decision-making authority from the local school boards and transferring it to the federal government. A failure to comply results in local school funding being withheld.

Mass Media

Another important aspect of control to further the spread of socialism is the media. The media was a major player in the late 1930s and the famous Hollywood Blacklist. The investigation of Hollywood radicals by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) in 1947 and 1951 was a continuation of pressures first exerted in the late 1930s and early 1940s by the Dies Committee and State Senator Jack Tenney's California Joint Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the dominant medium of mass culture, Communists were said to be placing subversive messages into Hollywood films and discriminating against unsympathetic colleagues. A further concern was that Communists were in a position to place negative images of the United States in films that would have wide international distribution (Georgakas, 1992, p. 1).

An adjunct consequence of the investigation was a series of anticommunist films: “The Red Menace (1949), I Married a Communist (1950), I Was a Communist for the FBI (1951), Walk East on Beacon (1952), My Son John (1952), Big Jim McClain (1952), and Trial (1955)” (Georgakas, 1992, p. 4).

The movement was in dormancy until the:
Hollywood Left began to revive in the late-1960s, and unlike the student New Left, the new Hollywood rebels, although not connected with the CP (Communist Party), felt warmly toward their predecessors and occasionally worked with them on joint projects. Films with radical bite began to appear with some regularity in the 1970s and 1980s (Georgakas, 1992, p. 4).

One of the classic films, *The Manchurian Candidate*, hit the silver screen in 1962 at the end of two important American moments: the anti-Communist “Red Scare” and the rising prominence of psychoanalysis in the American psyche through its use in advertising and war propaganda. …The Manchurian Candidate presents the audience with the then-contemporary issue of the Communist threat, but with a twist: Communists can truly be anyone, even yourself (Antwerp, 2009, p. 7).

The blacklist itself was the subject of *The Way We Were* (1973), which starred Barbara Streisand as a totally sympathetic Communist married to a liberal screenwriter. And today there are still examples of a supportive film industry in such films as: “Zero Dark Thirty; Argo; The Sessions; Bully; Prometheus; Dr. Seuss’s the Lorax; Les Miserables; Magic Mike; and Lincoln” (Collins, 2012, p. 1-3).

**Healthcare**

The other arena the Communist Manifesto deemed important to control was healthcare. This of course is for obvious reasons as spelled out by Beria. He sought “dominion over the minds and bodies of every person in the nation” (Beria, 1936, p. 3). Slowly this country has implemented the Affordable HealthCare Act of 2010. The Affordable Care Act claims to put consumers back in charge of their health care. “Under the law, a new Patient’s Bill of Rights gives the American people the stability and flexibility they need to make informed choices about
their health” ("Affordable Healthcare Act," 2014, p. 1). While the concept of offering healthcare at affordable rates to all citizens is enticing, the implementation has proven to be an overwhelming task plagued with colossal issues. There were claims of keeping your primary care physician, lowering of healthcare insurance premiums, and equal care for all citizens. In fact, the “death panels” warned about, and a mainstay of a socialistic society, are now part of our governmental healthcare act. A case in point is the parents of a 10 year old child in need of a lung transplant, had to appeal to the judicial system to reverse the panel’s decision. Under the Organ Procurement and Transplant Network, established in 1984, and managed by the United Network for Organ Sharing since 1986, children under the age of twelve were eligible for adult lung transplants. This policy was changed with the Affordable Healthcare Act. The family asked a federal judge to issue a restraining order to block U.S. Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius from having the agency that oversees transplants apply a policy that keeps children younger than 12 from being prioritized for available adult lung transplants (Ertelt, 2013, p. 1).

Many of the promises simply cannot be fulfilled and the deadlines for implementing some sections were unrealistic. Millions of Americans still remain without healthcare coverage. As a result of the President issuing waivers to the Affordable Healthcare Act, challenges are proceeding in the United States Supreme Court.

**Propaganda Influence**

In 1933 German Nazi Party member Joseph Goebbels became Adolf Hitler’s propaganda minister. “By exploiting mob emotions and by employing all modern methods of propaganda Goebbels helped Hitler into power”(Doob, 1950, p. 1). Goebbels was described as undeniably
intelligent and had brilliant insight into mass psychology. “As a hypnotic orator he was second only to Hitler, and in his staging of mass meetings and parades he was unsurpassed. Utterly cynical, he seems to have believed only in the self-justification of power” (Doob, 1950, p. 1).

Goebbels Principles of Propaganda are provided for the purpose of comparison to Saul Alinsky’s Rules of the Radicals.

1. Propagandist must have access to intelligence concerning events and public opinion.

2. Propaganda must be planned and executed by only one authority:
   a. it must issue all the propaganda directives;
   b. it must explain propaganda directives to important officials and maintain their morale;
   c. it must oversee other agencies' activities that have propaganda consequences.

3. The propaganda consequences of an action must be considered in planning that action.

4. Propaganda must affect the enemy's policy and action:
   a. by suppressing propagandistically desirable material which can provide the enemy with useful intelligence;
   b. by openly disseminating propaganda whose content or tone causes the enemy to draw the desired conclusions;
   c. by goading the enemy into revealing vital information about himself;
   d. by making no reference to a desired enemy activity when any reference would discredit that activity.
5. Declassified, operational information must be available to implement a propaganda campaign.

6. To be perceived, propaganda must evoke the interest of an audience and must be transmitted through an attention-getting communications medium.

7. Credibility alone must determine whether propaganda output should be true or false.

8. The purpose, content and effectiveness of enemy propaganda; the strength and effects of an expose; and the nature of current propaganda campaigns determine whether enemy propaganda should be ignored or refuted.

9. Credibility, intelligence, and the possible effects of communicating determine whether propaganda materials should be censored.

10. Material from enemy propaganda may be utilized in operations when it helps diminish that enemy's prestige or lends support to the propagandist's own objective.

11. Black rather than white propaganda may be employed when the latter is less credible or produces undesirable effects.

12. Propaganda may be facilitated by leaders with prestige.

13. Propaganda must be carefully timed:
   a. the communication must reach the audience ahead of competing propaganda;
   b. a propaganda campaign must begin at the optimum moment;
   c. a propaganda theme must be repeated, but not beyond some point of diminishing effectiveness.

14. Propaganda must label events and people with distinctive phrases or slogans:
   a. they must evoke desired responses which the audience previously possesses;
   b. they must be capable of being easily learned;
c. they must be utilized again and again, but only in appropriate situations;
d. they must be boomerang-proof.

15. Propaganda to the home front must prevent the raising of false hopes which can be blasted by future events.

16. Propaganda to the home front must create an optimum anxiety level:
   a. propaganda must reinforce anxiety concerning the consequences of defeat;
   b. propaganda must diminish anxiety (other than concerning the consequences of defeat) which is too high and which cannot be reduced by people themselves.

17. Propaganda to the home front must diminish the impact of frustration:
   a. inevitable frustrations must be anticipated;
   b. inevitable frustrations must be placed in perspective.

18. Propaganda must facilitate the displacement of aggression by specifying the targets for hatred.

19. Propaganda cannot immediately affect strong counter-tendencies; instead it must offer some form of action or diversion, or both (Doob, 1950, p. 1-3).

Now in reviewing Saul Alinsky’s *Rules for the Radicals* that follow striking likenesses can be noted.

1. Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.
2. Never go outside the experience of your people.
3. Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.
5. Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.
6. A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.
7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.

8. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.

9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.

10. The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.

11. If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside; based on every positive has a negative.

12. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it (Alinsky, 1971, p. 126-130).

As philosopher Leonard Peikoff states, America’s version also seeks to concentrate power in the state at the expense of individual liberty. It “does not represent a new approach to government; but is a continuation of the political absolutism — the absolute monarchies, the oligarchies, the theocracies, the random tyrannies — which has characterized most of human history.” It seeks to suppress criticism and opposition to the government. It denounces and eschews individualism, capitalism and inequity in compensation. It seeks out and targets enemies of the people like corporations and those not supportive of the government’s collectivist objectives (Larsen, 2009, p. 1).

Hillary Clinton was a student of the dogma of both of these individuals, and in particular, Saul Alinsky. There is even some speculation, although no actual proof, that her connections with Alinsky and his connections with the Communist party played an instrumental part of Hillary and Bill Clinton being sponsored to travel to Russia to address the proletariat. This was
unprecedented for non-Communist party members and without the approval of the KGB (Irvine & Kincaid, 2001). In retrospect:

It appears that President Clinton became an ally of both Russia and Communist China. China pumped untold millions of dollars into his 1996 re-election campaign and the Democratic National Committee. Attorney General Janet Reno refused to authorize an independent counsel investigation of that scandal [although mandated by federal statute] (Irvine & Kincaid, 2001, p. 2).

Two case studies were developed and are included in the appendices of this thesis. Case study A involves Benghazi. On September 11, 2012, the Ambassador to Libya, Christopher Stevens, was killed in an attack on the consulate. Immediately following this attack, the President labeled the event as a spontaneous protest over an anti-Islam video. Talking points were carefully crafted eliminating all reference to Islamists, al Qaeda or terrorists. The real reason why Ambassador Stevens was in this well-known hostile area to begin with, and not in the seat of government, Tripoli, was never affirmed. The Citizens Committee of Benghazi revealed the following:

… the Obama administration was accused of “switching sides” on our global war on terrorism by facilitating the arming of known al-Qaeda jihadist militias. How could this happen when U.S. law is quite explicit about providing material support to terrorists? In short, it’s prohibited. However, on March 29, 2011, President Obama announced a “Presidential Finding” for covert operations support to Libyan rebels who were the al Qaeda-affiliated jihadist militias under the political control of the Muslim Brotherhood (Lyons, 2014, p. 2-4).
What the Obama administration appears to have done, is craft a response to aide Mr. Obama’s re-election campaign. One of the President’s campaign themes was the elimination of the al Qaeda threat. Consequently, to acknowledge Mr. Stevens’ death was due to terrorist activity would have been counterproductive. Yes, our constitution grants the executive branch the right to conceal sensitive diplomatic and military information; it does not grant the right to conceal incompetence.

In case study B, the release of Bowe Bergdahl was probed. On May 31, 2014 the Taliban released Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl in exchange for five Taliban detainees being held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. This case study does not align itself to whether Sgt. Bergdahl was a legitimate POW or as others claim a defector. What the case study endeavors to ferret out is if the President breached established protocol, negotiating with a known terrorist organization and the driving force(s) for doing so.

Congressional investigators claim the Pentagon broke the law by failing to notify the relevant congressional committees at least thirty days in advance of the exchange. Additionally, “they used $988, 400 of a wartime account to make the transfer. The GAO said the Pentagon’s use of funds that hadn’t been expressly appropriated violated the Antideficiency Act” (Cassata, 2014, para. 2).

Perhaps the following statement by Senator Susan Collins, a member of the Intelligence Committee, summarizes the findings of this study: “the President’s decision is part of a disturbing pattern where he unilaterally decides that he does not have to comply with provisions of laws with which he disagrees” (Cassata, 2014, para. 11). Additionally, the return of Sgt. Bergdahl was complemented with political grandstanding.
If we let this abrogation of the presidential oath continue, we will ultimately undermine the Constitution and our way of life on a long–term basis, said Rep. Trent Franks, adding that the House must push back at what’s become a lawless presidency (McAuliff & Bendery, 2014, p. 3).

A trend of discriminatory law enforcement by the government continues even now with such actions where the civil rights of various classes of society are ignored in favor of those classes that will enhance civil unrest. An example of selective law enforcement is the Ferguson, MO, self-defense shooting that was altered by the media and the Justice Department into a violation of the attacker’s civil rights to assault a police officer in the performance of his duty. Would the same interruptive principles be applied if the individuals involved were of a different ethnicity?
Chapter 5
Conclusion

Findings

The thesis indicates an abuse or proliferation of presidential authority and powers that are beyond the scope of Constitutional authority. Without being pedantic or misleading there appears to be a dichotomy of executive powers and executive orders. Categorically I am not insinuating breaking of any laws, but the administrating as one sees fit authoritatively. “It is true that President Obama has issued fewer executive orders both in absolute terms, and on an order-per-year basis, than most of his recent or even recent-ish predecessors” (Rudalevige, 2014, p. 1). It is a misdirect to equate executive orders (a formal type of presidential directive) with executive powers.

While Obama issued only 20 executive orders in 2013 (the lowest single-year total in more than a century), that same year he issued 41 presidential memoranda to the heads of departments and agencies, along with nine additional presidential “determinations” designed to serve as the basis for bureaucratic behavior (Rudalevige, 2014, p. 2). Three examples of alleged abuse of Presidential authority are:

1. The implementation of the Affordable Care Act.
2. Waivers to the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act.
3. The release of Guantanamo detainees in exchange for Bowe Bergdahl, without following the statutory notice requirement.

The Constitution does not grant the executive branch the right to conceal incompetence, poor administration, and bad judgment. Indeed, these are the moments when congressional oversight is most needed. Article II of the Constitution, however, grants the
President the executive privilege to protect sensitive diplomatic and military information, as well as confidential advice that he receives from his aides ("Benghazi and constitution," 2014, p. 2).

Expressly is there any dichotomy in the Presidential decision to negotiate for the freedom of Bergdahl a known Muslim, and not for the freedom of Steven Sotloff, who was of the Jewish faith? Does this highlight a syllogism in the conduct of the President and any interplay of his allegiance to the teaching of Saul Alinsky? These aberrations do not appear to be the result of a natural evolution in society’s culture. Is this an example of the end justifies the means, the pushing of a negative long enough and it becomes a positive and or the Machiavellian theory of the Haves holding on to power? Perceptibly the thesis has revealed a significant trend that necessitates continued monitoring and possibly more in depth investigation. This trend, if allowed to metastasize, it may have a profound effect on our military and intelligence community. Or “de Tocqueville’s 1835 statement describing our constitutional government as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate something which it has no power to do under the Constitution” (Bevan, 2003, p. viii) may euphemistically become a reality.
Appendix A

A Case Study of Benghazi
Abstract

September 11, 2012, Ambassador to Libya, Christopher Stevens along with another diplomat and two U.S. security personnel were killed in the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi. In the days that followed, the White House maintained that Stevens’ death was the “result of a spontaneous protest, which is what the initial intelligence reports suggested, rather than a planned terrorist attack” ("Congressional investigation," 2014, p. 34). What events aided in the facilitation of the situation leading to the deaths? After the attack on the embassy, what were the political drivers and or conditions that led the administration to label the event as simply a spontaneous protest over an anti-Islam video rather than acknowledge the attack as the carefully planned and executed handiwork of groups linked to the al Qaeda network? This study will explore the special congressional committee’s findings to “seek a definitive answer on the causes of the attack and whether the Obama administration, in the midst of its 2012 re-election campaign, deliberately misled Congress and the American people” ("Benghazi and constitution," 2014, p. 1).
Introduction

According to an article in the Washington Post on October 10, 2012, “the State Department acknowledged it rejected appeals for more security at its diplomatic post in Libya in the months before a fatal terrorist attack in Benghazi” (Gearan, 2012, para. 1). The bipartisan Benghazi committee is investigating whether and why the Obama administration denied requests for additional security and did not order support for the consulate’s personnel. The investigating committee:

…released a copy of a diplomatic cable written by Stevens on the day he died in which he cataloged concerns about the rising violence and Islamist influence in eastern Libya but did not specifically ask for more protection. The committee also released earlier messages from other diplomatic staff members in Libya that were clear in their requests for more help (Gearan, 2012, p. 3).

According to the lawsuit by government watchdog group, Judicial Watch, under the Freedom of Information Act, “…the White House was instrumental in crafting talking points for former U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice alleging the terrorist attacks were the result of a YouTube video. The White house previously said the Central Intelligence Agency directed the talking points” (Quinn, 2014, p. 3).

There have been accusations that perhaps the State Department was interested in presenting a picture of an improving situation in Libya rather than in ensuring the safety of its staff there. But more important is why were Mr. Stevens and his associates in such an unsafe area to begin with? Especially considering there had been an earlier bombing at the Benghazi post that was undoubtedly a test by the terrorists that went unaddressed by authorities.
Throughout 2012, violent jihadist activity became increasingly commonplace in Benghazi and elsewhere throughout Libya and North Africa. At or near the U.S. mission in Benghazi, for instance, there were many acts of terrorism featuring the use of guns, improvised explosive devices, hand grenades, rocket-propelled grenades, and car-bombs, along with explicit threats against Americans issued by known terrorists ("Benghazi executive summary," 2013, p. 1).

What drove the administration to state the attack was spontaneous when the facts revealed the assault in Benghazi was a pre-planned and well-armed paramilitary attack carried out by a group linked to al-Qaeda? The underlying questions that remains are why the obvious cover-up and was it directed by outside sources? According to former acting CIA Director Mike Morell:

I took out the word “Islamists” in front of “extremists.” I took it out because we were dealing with protests and demonstrations across much of the Muslim world as a result of the video and the last thing I wanted to do was to do anything to further inflame those passions (Freedman, 2014, p. 1).

Was this admission an effort to placate or even support our enemies at the potential cost of American lives and national security? In the end, the implications of Morell’s testimony before the House Intelligence Committee on April 2nd, 2014, are clear.

There was either extreme incompetence driving the decisions at the CIA, or there was a clear political mission in the months leading up to the 2012 elections that overshadowed everything else, including truth and human life. There is no place
in our national security posture for the rampant incompetence, deceit, and lack of concern for human life that Morrell has unveiled (Freedman, 2014, p. 2).

Mr. Morrell admitted in his testimony before the April 2\(^{nd}\), 2014, House Intelligence Committee that he “had received word from the Chief of Station in Tripoli that there had been no demonstration, but he had discounted it and had given more credibility to his team of intelligence analysts in Washington” (Freedman, 2014, para. 5).

Equally as perplexing as the false talking points is the real reason for our presence in a hostile region. At an April 22\(^{nd}\) news conference by the Citizens Committee of Benghazi, the following two points were revealed:

First, the Obama administration was accused of “switching sides” on our global war on terrorism by facilitating the arming of known al-Qaeda jihadist militias. How could this happen when U.S. law is quite explicit about providing material support to terrorists? In short, it’s prohibited. However, on March 29, 2011, President Obama announced a “Presidential Finding” for covert operations support to Libyan rebels who were the al-Qaeda affiliated jihadist militias under the political control of the Muslim Brotherhood.

It should be remembered that this is the same Muslim Brotherhood that has infiltrated all our national security agencies and the White House.

The second extraordinary revelation was that on March 20, 2011, Libya’s Moammar Gadhafi was willing to discuss abdicating and going into exile. According to retired Rear Adm. Charles R. Kubic, Gen. Abdulgades Yusef Dibri, head of Gadhafi’s personal security, conveyed to him the Libyan leader’s willingness to consider direct talks with the United States under a “white flag of
truce.” Gen. Kubic immediately telephoned the U.S. Africa Command with this sensitive information. It should be recalled that as late as March 18, this is what Mr. Obama was insisting Gadhafi do (Lyons, 2014, p. 2-4).

For an ambassador to be killed while serving is rare, but attacks on embassies and consulates are not, and they have often resulted in death. Stevens’ murder also coincides with the closing stages of a presidential campaign in which Barack Obama claimed to have al-Qaeda “on the run” (“Congressional investigation,” 2014, p. 28).

The Obama administration officials have the ability to resist open discussions of sensitive issues. The Constitution does not grant the executive branch the right to conceal incompetence, poor administration, and bad judgment. Indeed, these are the moments when congressional oversight is most needed. Article II of the Constitution, however, grants the President the executive privilege to protect sensitive diplomatic and military information, as well as confidential advice that he receives from his aides. As interpreted by the Supreme Court, the other branches of government may overcome such “executive privilege” if they need the information to perform their own core constitutional duties. “Absent a claim of need to protect military, diplomatic, or sensitive national security secrets,” the Court declared in the Watergate Tapes case (United States v. Nixon, 1974), “we find it difficult to accept the argument that even the very important interest in confidentiality of presidential communications is significantly diminished by production of such material” to a federal court in a criminal prosecution (“Benghazi and constitution,” 2014, p. 2).
The Los Angeles Times in a November 21, 2011 issue further underscores that the talking points were not selectively edited for political reasons, but:

The adjustments were focused on producing talking points that provided the best information available at the time, protected sensitive details and reflected the evolving nature of rapidly incoming intelligence…The CIA drafted the initial talking points, and they were not edited to minimize the role of extremists, diminish terrorist affiliations, or play down that this was an attack, said a second U.S. official familiar with how the material was edited (Brown, Armbruster, & Aleaziz, 2012, p. 16).

**Method**

The case study involved reviewing not only the findings from the Citizens Committee on Benghazi, but other credible open source material such as the Congressional Investigations and a sundry of other credible sources. All of these sources are listed in the Reference Sources to be Reviewed section of this case study. With the pre-established ideological definitions of socialism and socialistic political ideologies, the philosophy of Saul Alinsky, the principals of the Clowden-Piven theory, and the teaching of Beria are summarized in a table format. With the format established it is then a matter of verifying if any indicators of these foreign and American ideological doctrines are present in the Benghazi situation. Additionally, a brief synopsis of Ambassador Stevens’ educational and professional background is included. If any linkage is found, further
study beyond this thesis would be appropriate. Lastly, what is the corollary to the intelligence community?  

**Ideologies to be reviewed**

1. Socialism: Defined by the Online Law Dictionary as an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services.

2. Psychopolitics: The art and science, expounded by Lavrentiy Beria, of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, and officers, and the effecting thereby of the conquest of enemy nations.

3. *The Intellectuals and Socialism* by F.A. Hayek predicted that a free society carries in itself the forces of its own destruction once freedom is achieved and taken for granted.

1. The primary source for the case study is the Congressional Hearings conducted by the bipartisan Benghazi committee. Additional open source material is referenced as well throughout the study. In the body of the case study, I will discuss the research and findings by exploring the consummation of the Citizens Committee on Benghazi, the special congressional hearings, and the President’s decision to arm known al Qaeda jihadists in Libya in March of 2011 and possible constitutional violations represented. The document reviews attempts to answer the question of why was Ambassador Stevens in Benghazi instead of Tripoli, the seat of government for Libya? Benghazi was known to be a very dangerous and unstable area.
4. De Tocqueville’s 1835 statement describing our constitutional government as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate something which it has no power to do under the Constitution.

5. The Communist Manifesto by Marx:

1. The abolition of private property/ownership of land.

2. Income tax to be graded to income – the more an individual earned, the more they paid. The less you earned, the less you paid.

3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

4. The confiscation of all property of immigrants and rebels.

5. The centralization of all credit into the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive economy.

6. Centralization of all means of communication and transport into the hands of the state.

7. The extension of factories and the instrument of production owned by the state. 
   Bringing into cultivation all land not being used that could be, and an improvement in the fertility of the soil.

8. The equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies.

9. The combination of agriculture and manufacturing industries with the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by the more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in public schools. The abolition of child labor in factories; an educated child would be better for society in the long term, than a
child not educated ("Karl Marx," n.d., para. 4).

6. **Rules for the Radicals** tactics originating from Saul Alinsky:

1. Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.

2. Never go outside the experience of your people.

3. Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.


5. Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.

6. A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.

7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.

8. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.

9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.

10. The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.

11. If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside; based on every positive has a negative.

12. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.
7. Clowden-Piven theory is to overload the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse and when the system fails, replace the capitalist rulebook with a socialist one.

Ambassador Stevens’ Background

According to Mr. Stevens’ obituary written in the Seattle Times, he is described in “many ways as the model American diplomat, committed, idealistic, willing to take risks and eager to find out what was really happening in obscure corners of the world” ("Stevens’ obituary," 2012, para. 1). He was a graduate of UC Berkeley in 1982 and UC Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco in 1989. After law school and two years as an international-trade attorney in Washington, Stevens grew dissatisfied and joined the Foreign Service. He spent much of his career in the Middle East, “serving in Syria, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Israel, where he focused on the Palestinian territories, and in State Department offices overseeing policy in the region” ("Stevens’ obituary," 2012, p. 2).

From 2007 to 2009, he served as the No. 2 U.S. diplomat in Tripoli after the U.S. resumed diplomatic relations with Moammar Gadhafi's government. And last year, during the height of the revolution that eventually toppled Gadhafi, he secretly slipped back into Libya aboard a Greek cargo ship to serve as U.S. envoy to the rebels battling the strongman ("Stevens’ obituary," 2012, p. 1).

Mr. Stevens appeared to have a yearning to mingle with Arabs to get a street-level view of events. He sometimes chafed about the post September 11 security measures that often prevented diplomats from reaching into the
hinterland. As political officer in Jerusalem, given the oft-touchy assignment of working with the Palestinian leadership, he tried to get into the West Bank, even when violence flared between Palestinians and Israelis. Also he is said to have relished contacts, even with some of the region’s unsavory personalities, and was not one to shy away from mercurial situations (Stevens’ obituary,” 2012, p.2).

Is Mr. Stevens’ affinity for danger just an adventurous personality or the result of political ideologies and the desire to further his beliefs?

**Reference Sources Reviewed**

1. House Intelligence Committee
2. US Senate and House Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Benghazi
3. CIA Role in Benghazi Attack from the Huffington Post
4. Benghazi and the Constitution from the online library of liberty
5. Citizens Commission of Benghazi
6. The Seattle Times Obituary of U.S. diplomat J. Christopher Stevens

**Procedure of Evaluation**

Each of the above sources was reviewed for any possible links to the ideologies and any indicators found in the sources are noted in table format.

**References Reviewed**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideologies</th>
<th>House Intelligence Committee</th>
<th>US Senate and House Foreign Relations Committee hearing</th>
<th>CIA Role in Benghazi Attack</th>
<th>Benghazi and the Constitution</th>
<th>Citizens Commission of Benghazi</th>
<th>The Seattle Times Obituary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialism: Defined by the Online Law Dictionary as an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopolitics: The art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations by Lavrentiy Beria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Intellectuals and Socialism</em> by F.A. Hayek predicted that a free society carries in itself the forces of its own destruction once freedom is achieved and taken for granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Tocqueville’s 1835 statement describing our constitutional government as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
something which it has no power to do under the Constitution.

The Communist Manifesto by Marx:

1) The abolition of private property/ownership of land.

2) Income tax to be graded to income – the more an individual earned, the more they paid. The less you earned, the less you paid.

3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

4) The confiscation of all property of immigrants and rebels.

5) The centralization of all credit into the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive economy.

6) Centralization of all means of communication and transport into the hands of the state.

7) The extension of factories and the instruments of production owned by the state. Bringing into cultivation all land not being used that could be and an improvement in the fertility of the soil.
8) The equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies.

9) The combination of agriculture and manufacturing industries with the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by the more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10) Free education for all children in public schools. The abolition of child labor in factories; an educated child would be better for society in the long term, than a child not educated ("Karl Marx," n.d., para. 4).

Rules for the Radicals tactics originating from Saul Alinsky:

1. Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.

2. Never go outside the experience of your people.

3. Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.


5. Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.

6. A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.

7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.
8. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.

9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.

10. The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.

11. If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside; based on every positive has a negative.

12. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.

Clowden-Piven theory is to overload the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse and when the system fails, replace the capitalist rulebook with a socialist one.

Results of the Evaluation
All the above resources were reviewed for indication of the inclusion of the ideologies and none were noted.

**Discussion**

After extensive review of the references I ascertained that Ambassador Stevens’ personality as much as his political ideologies played a role. He had a disposition for adventure. He demonstrated this early in his professional life when after no more than two years as an attorney, he decided to join the Peace Corp. However, one cannot discount the provocation of UC of Berkeley, which is known to be liberal/progressive in its philosophy. Another possible theory as several sources indicated, is the US was involved with the arming of rebels for the purpose of over throwing Syrian President Assad.

A Libyan ship reportedly carrying weapons and bound for Syrian rebels may have some link to the September 11 terror attack on the US Consulate in Benghazi. Shipping records confirmed that the Libyan-flagged vessel Al Entisar, was received in the Turkish port of Iskenderun – 35 miles from the Syrian border – on September 6th. Approximately one hour before that attack began on September 11th, Stevens met with the Turkish Consul General Ali Sait Akin (Herridge & Browne, 2012, p. 1).

“When asked to comment on the arms shipment, a State Department representative dismissed the idea, saying Stevens was there for diplomatic meetings, and to attend the opening of a cultural center” (Herridge & Browne, 2012, p. 2). And although the
…negotiation said to have taken place may have nothing to do with the attack on the consulate later that night or the Libyan mystery ship, it could explain why Stevens was traveling in such a volatile region on the 11th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks” (Herridge & Browne, 2012, p. 2).

A more conclusive theory is not possible since the resources available were limited and more reliable academic sources were not located. If the sources had been available indicating an arms trade agreement with a known terrorist organization, a constitutional violation would have been evidenced. There is an indication of a cover-up for the political advancement of the President with his re-election then in the very near future. But no direct indicators of socialistic ideologies were observed.
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Appendix B

A Case Study of Bowe Bergdahl
Abstract

On May 31, 2014 the Taliban released Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl in exchange for five Taliban detainees being held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Promptly the media responded to the news: …that the Obama administration secured the release of the prisoner of war (POW) Sgt. Bowe Bergdahl from the Taliban by parsing whether or not the administration violated longstanding policy by negotiating Bergdahl’s release. In reality, experts say the U.S. has a long history of such negotiations, and Bergdahl’s release was conducted using an intermediary nation (Leung, Sandmeyer, & Watson, 2014, p. 1).

The intermediary in this case was the Qatar government. Soon afterwards, the debate emerged as one side condemns the Obama administration for negotiating with terrorists and the other side praises it for making sure no soldier gets left behind. In addition, some are opining Mr. Obama is giving kidnappers new incentives to seize Americans.

This prisoner swap entails many legal, military, and diplomatic issues. But was the swap in any way influenced by socialistic ideologies? This case study does not align itself to whether Sgt. Bergdahl was a legitimate POW or as others claim a defector. What the case study endeavors to ferret out is if the President breached established protocol, negotiated with a known terrorist organization and the driving force(s) for doing so. Is the Bergdahl case an example of the Machiavelli theory giving primacy to holding onto power over ethical considerations to meet that end?
Introduction

Congressional investigators say “the Pentagon broke the law when it swapped Army Sgt. Bergdahl, a prisoner in Afghanistan for five years, for five Taliban leaders” (Cassata, 2014, p. B2).

As usual, reality is more complex. There is some to praise, some to condemn and much to wrestle with in the exchange. The truth is, anyone who believes this is a simple decision open to immediate criticism or celebration is probably driven by politics, and not knowledge of international or military affairs (Eichenwald, 2014, p. 1).

The narrative would be less contestable if Mr. Bergdahl were a clear-cut warrior-hero as described by Susan Rice, the president’s national security advisor, “who – a day after his [Bergdahl’s] release – called him an American captured on the battlefield who served with honor and distinction” ("The Economist," 2014, p. 40). But the felicitous narrative soon fell apart.

Skeptics, including former members of Mr. Bergdahl’s platoon, toured TV studios to call him a deserter who walked off his base unarmed, and - they allege – cost at least six comrades their lives during the months of searching. They want him court-martialed ("The Economist," 2014, p. 40).

Members of Bergdahl’s platoon say he knew what he was doing walking away from his post in eastern Afghanistan on June 30, 2009. This is the same soldier who just before vanishing from his post, wrote his parents “the horror that is America is disgusting” (Stephens, 2014, para. 3).
Whether the enemy took Sgt. Bergdahl, he deserted the Army or defected to the Taliban remains to be established. But just to be clear where the former operator is coming from, Article 85 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice states: Any person found guilty of desertion or attempt to desert shall be punished, if the offense is committed in time of war, by death or such other punishment as a court-martial may direct (Stephens, 2014, para. 4).
Method

The case study involved reviewing not only the findings from the House Armed Services Committee on Bergdahl, but other credible open source material, for example the Government Accountability Office and sundry other sources. Each of these sources is listed in the reference sources section of this case study. With the pre-established ideological definitions of socialism and socialistic political ideologies, the philosophy of Saul Alinsky, the principals of the Clowden-Piven theory, and the teachings of Beria are summarized in a table format. With the format established, it is then a matter of verifying if any indicators of these foreign and American ideological doctrines are present in the Bergdahl situation. Additionally, a brief synopsis of Bowe Bergdahl’s personal and military background is included. If any linkage is found, further study beyond this thesis would be appropriate. Lastly, what is the corollary to the intelligence community?

2 The primary source for the case study is the Congressional Hearings conducted by the bipartisan Bergdahl committee. Additional open source material is referenced as well throughout the study. In the body of the case study, I will discuss the research and findings by exploring the consummation of the House Armed Services Committee delving into the Bergdahl arrangement. The document review does not attempt to answer if Sgt. Bergdahl was or was not a POW, but rather what was the driving force behind the President’s decision to do the prisoner exchange? And did this decision add to a pattern of Presidential abuse of power?
Ideologies to be reviewed

1. Socialism: Defined by the Online Law Dictionary as an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services.

2. Psychopolitics: The art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations by Lavrentiy Beria.

3. The Intellectuals and Socialism by F.A. Hayek predicted that a free society carries in itself the forces of its own destruction once freedom is achieved and taken for granted.

4. De Tocqueville’s 1835 statement describing our constitutional government as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate something which it has no power to do under the Constitution.

5. The Communist Manifesto by Marx:

   1. The abolition of private property/ownership of land.
   2. Income tax to be graded to income – the more an individual earned, the more they paid. The less you earned, the less you paid.
   3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
   4. The confiscation of all property of immigrants and rebels.
   5. The centralization of all credit into the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive economy.
6. Centralization of all means of communication and transport into the hands of the state.

7. The extension of factories and the instruments of production owned by the state. Bringing into cultivation all land not being used that could be and an improvement in the fertility of the soil.

8. The equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies.

9. The combination of agriculture and manufacturing industries with the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by the more equable distribution of the population over the country.


6. **Rules for the Radicals** tactics originating from Saul Alinsky:

1. Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.

2. Never go outside the experience of your people.

3. Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.


5. Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.

6. A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.

7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.
8. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.

9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.

10. The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.

11. If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterepide; based on every positive has a negative.

12. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.

7. Clowden-Piven theory is to overload the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse and when the system fails, replace the capitalist rulebook with a socialist one.

Sgt. Bergdahl’s Background

_The Economist_ describes Bergdahl as an “intense young man home-schooled in rural Idaho, who after dabbling in ballet and Buddhism joined the army but grew disgusted with war” ("The Economist," 2014, p. 40). He has been described as a restless youth with an intense interest in survivalism. In 2008 Bergdahl enlisted in the Army where he initially appeared to embrace Army life, fellow soldiers said, always reading about humanitarian causes, ethics, or philosophy. Later when his unit traveled to the National Training Center in California to prepare for deployment,
simulating combat situations in extreme conditions his fellow soldiers say, Bergdahl began to act oddly and garnered the propensity to keep to himself. “Excerpts of journals he sent to a friend shortly before going missing, published by the Washington Post, suggest a young soldier struggling to handle the mental stress of war” ("Bergdahl Profile," 2014, p. 2).

Reference sources reviewed

1. The meaning of Bowe Bergdahl
2. Media Pretends that Negotiations over Bergdahl release were Unprecedented
3. The timeline you need to understand the Bowe Bergdahl story
4. How American history judges Bowe Bergdahl
5. The Truth Behind the Bowe Bergdahl POW Prisoner Swap
6. GAO: Pentagon broke law in Bergdahl swap

Procedure of Evaluation

Each of the above sources was reviewed for any possible links to the ideologies and any indicators found in the sources are noted in table format.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideologies</th>
<th>The meaning of Bowe Bergdahl</th>
<th>Media Pretends that Negotiations over Bergdahl release were Unprecedented</th>
<th>The timeline you need to understand the Bowe Bergdahl story</th>
<th>How American history judges Bowe Bergdahl</th>
<th>The Truth Behind the Bowe Bergdahl POW Prisoner Swap</th>
<th>GAO: Pentagon broke law in Bergdahl swap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialism: Defined by the Online Law Dictionary as an economic and social theory that seeks to maximize wealth and opportunity for all people through public ownership and control of industries and social services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopolitics: The art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations by Lavrentiy Beria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Intellectuals and Socialism</em> by F.A. Hayek predicted that a free society carries in itself the forces of its own destruction once freedom is achieved and taken for granted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
de Tocqueville’s 1835 statement describing our constitutional government as an obstacle to be circumvented when the federal government wants to undertake or regulate something which it has no power to do under the Constitution.

The Communist Manifesto by Marx:
1) The abolition of private property/ownership of land.
2) Income tax to be graded to income – the more an individual earned, the more they paid. The less you earned, the less you paid.
3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4) The confiscation of all property of immigrants and rebels.
5) The centralization of all credit into the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive economy.
6) Centralization of all means of communication and transport into the hands of the state.

7) The extension of factories and the instruments of production owned by the state. Bringing into cultivation all land not being used that could be and an improvement in the fertility of the soil.

8) The equal obligation of all to work and the establishment of industrial and agricultural armies.

9) The combination of agriculture and manufacturing industries with the gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by the more equable distribution of the population over the country.

10) Free education for all children in public schools. The abolition of child labor in factories; an educated child would be better for society in the long term, than a child not educated ("Karl Marx," n.d., para. 4).
### Rules for the Radicals

tactics originating from Saul Alinsky:

1. Power is not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have.
2. Never go outside the experience of your people.
3. Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.
5. Ridicule is man’s most potent weapon.
6. A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.
7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.
8. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions, and utilize all events of the period for your purpose.
9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.
10. The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.
11. If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside; based on every positive has a negative.

12. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.

13. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it.

Clowden-Piven theory is to overload the government bureaucracy with a flood of impossible demands, thus pushing society into crisis and economic collapse and when the system fails, replace the capitalist rulebook with a socialist one.

Results of the Evaluation

All the above resources were reviewed for indication of the inclusion of the ideologies and none were noted.

Discussion

The Obama administration is far from the first government – be it American or foreign – to have decided to negotiate with individuals it does not
recognize as constituting legitimate rulers, or even with groups identified as terrorists. While that doesn’t provide absolute justification for doing so, it does underscore that these decisions have, throughout history, proven to be more complex than the absolutists choose to believe (Eichenwald, 2014, p. 7-8).

The Defense department did fail to notify the relevant congressional committees at least thirty days in advance of the exchange - a clear violation of the law. Additionally, “they used $988,400 of a wartime account to make the transfer. The GAO said the Pentagon’s use of funds that hadn’t been expressly appropriated violated the Antideficiency Act” (Cassata, 2014, para. 2).

There is little evidence available to support the administration’s claim that it determined Bergdahl’s health was rapidly deteriorating and thus they determined it was “necessary and appropriate to forgo 30 days’ notice of the transfer in order to obtain Sgt. Bergdahl’s safe return” (Cassata, 2014, p. 7).

Perhaps the following statement by Senator Susan Collins, a member of the Intelligence Committee summarizes the findings of this study: “the President’s decision is part of a disturbing pattern where he unilaterally decides that he does not have to comply with provisions of laws with which he disagrees” (Cassata, 2014, para. 11).

Additionally, the return of Sgt. Bergdahl was complemented with political grandstanding. If we let this abrogation of the presidential oath continue, we will ultimately undermine the Constitution and our way of life on a long – term basis, said Rep. Trent Franks, adding that the House must push back at what’s become a lawless presidency (McAuliff & Bendery, 2014, p. 3).
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