

Source:

Wayne LaPierre

America Disarmed - Inside the U.N. and Obama's
Scheme to Destroy the Second Amendment
2011

Chapter 19

George Soros

The marching axis of adversaries of First and Second Amendment rights has a central banker, and his name is George Soros. The billionaire bankroller is trying to revoke the Bill of Rights through his checkbook.

There are some folks who say that George Soros is fundamentally a bad guy. He has been criminally convicted in France of “financial misdeeds,” which is their term for insider trading.¹ His company, Soros Fund Management, was fined by Hungary’s State Financial Supervisory Authority for illegal short selling, which destroyed much of the value of the largest Hungarian bank.²

Other people say he is a good guy because he supplied resources to activists in eastern Europe who were seeking to change the Communist regimes in their countries, or to open up their societies after Communism fell.³

Still others would argue that Soros is the very model of the modern major megalomaniac.⁴ He wrote: “If the truth be known, I carried some rather potent messianic fantasies with me from childhood, which I felt I had to control, otherwise they might get me in trouble.”⁵ And, “I admit I have always harbored an exaggerated sense of my self-importance—to put it bluntly, I fancied myself as some kind of god or an economic reformer like Keynes, or, better, a scientist like Einstein.”⁶

Interviewed by a British newspaper, Soros was asked about his messianic self-image. He explained: “It is a sort of disease when you consider yourself some kind of god, the creator of everything, but I feel comfortable about it now since I began to live it out.”⁷

In his own mind, says he, “I am sort of a *deus ex machina*” (Latin for “God from the machine”⁸). “Next to my fantasies about being God, I also have very strong fantasies of being mad,” he once said. “In fact, my grandfather was actually paranoid. I have a lot of madness in my family. So far I have escaped it.”⁹

Whatever he is, he is not what the public thinks: “I am something unnatural. I’m very comfortable with my public persona because it is one I have created for myself. It represents what I like to be as distinct from what I really am. You know, in my personal capacity I’m not actually a selfless philanthropic person. I’ve [*sic*] very much self-centered.”¹⁰

Neither gods nor madmen think they have to obey human rules, and neither does George Soros: “I do not accept the rules imposed by others. If I did, I would not be alive today. I am a law-abiding citizen, but I recognize that there are regimes that need to be opposed rather than accepted. And in periods of regime change, the normal rules don’t apply.”¹¹ “Regime change,” as we shall see, is the term he uses to characterize an American election.

Personally, I’m not interested in looking into George Soros’s eyes and trying to see his soul. I’m interested in what he actually does. And what he is actually doing—and has been doing for over a decade—is bankrolling the destruction of American constitutional rights and the freedom of other people around the world.

Soros Bankrolls “Junk” Lawsuits against U.S. Gun Industry

Soros first drew public notice on the gun issue in late 1998 when he funded a junk lawsuit against firearm manufacturers. The suit had been brought by Elisa Barnes, an antigun attorney in New York City, and it helped set up the tidal wave of junk lawsuits that were later filed by big-city mayors.¹² Rebecca Peters, Soros’s top antigun employee, was sent into the courtroom, claiming that she was merely an observer in the case.¹³ The case resulted in a \$4 million verdict against three handgun manufacturers, and attorney Barnes

said that Soros’s money “made all the difference in the world.”¹⁴ (The verdict was later overturned in a unanimous 7–0 decision of the New York Court of Appeals, New York’s highest state court.¹⁵)

By spring 1999, Soros’s Center on Crime, Communities and Culture (part of his Open Society Institute) was running a meeting of thirty private foundations, convincing them to put money into antigun work.¹⁶ He anted up \$5 million for the Funders’ Collaborative for Gun Violence Prevention, and placed Rebecca Peters in charge.¹⁷

Next came a grant to the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) for another junk lawsuit against gun companies, a sad betrayal of the NAACP’s historic advocacy of civil rights.¹⁸

Soros also provided a major grant to fund the planning of the so-called “Million” Mom March (MMM)—a series of nationwide rallies featuring shrill gun-haters such as Rosie O’Donnell.¹⁹ The MMM organizers were so grateful that they called Rebecca Peters “our fairy godmother.”²⁰ The MMM was one of many Clinton-Soros collaborations during the Clinton presidency, and the Office of the First Lady was closely involved in MMM organizing.

Promoting antigun research is another Soros specialty. His Funders’ Collaborative for Gun Violence Prevention has made grants to pay for research from the antigun Harvard Injury Control Center.²¹ One reason that Soros got into the research business was that Congress had ordered the federally funded Centers for Disease Control to stop producing junk science gun control propaganda masquerading as public health research.²² Another Soros grant went to the Educational Fund to Stop Gun Violence, the research/legal affiliate of a handgun prohibition lobby.

Rebecca Peters directed Soros’s Center on Crime, Communities and Culture in producing a report titled “Gun Control in the United States.”²³ According to the report, “42 states fall below minimum standards for public safety, since they lack basic gun laws such as licensing and registration.” The rating scale was 0 to 100, with only seven states scoring above 30 percent, and 20 states getting negative numbers. The average score was a mere 9 percent.

Notably, the report refused to examine the strength of state laws to punish criminals who use guns.

The claims about “minimum standards for public safety” probably surprised many people in the states that the Soros group praised, since, as of the time of the report, they suffered a 21 percent higher crime rate than the “below minimum standard” states.²⁴

The Soros report called for prohibiting *possession* of long guns by anyone under eighteen, and handguns by anyone under twenty-one. In other words, Soros and his team want to make it illegal for you to take your seventeen-year-old son hunting, or to take your twenty-year-old daughter to the pistol range when she comes home on leave from the U.S. Army. The obvious agenda was to destroy the American gun culture by sending you to prison if you try to pass it on to the next generation.

The 2000 election was supposed to be the year of victory for the gun prohibition movement. Soros was generous in state antigun initiatives. For example, in Oregon, few people were interested in gathering petitions to put an antigun show initiative on the ballot. So George Soros gave money to Handgun Control, Inc., with the purpose of passing the money through to the Oregon antigunners. The Oregonians then hired paid petition gatherers, earning \$1.45 per signature, and were able to make the ballot.²⁵

Soros also donated to an antigun show initiative in Colorado.²⁶ Both campaigns were built around the lie of the “gun show loophole,” a phrase designed to trick voters into believing that laws about the sales of guns at gun shows are different, and weaker, than laws about the sales of guns anywhere else.

The Oregon and Colorado initiatives both passed. In California, antigun advocates credited the money from Soros and his foundation allies for the legislative enactment of gun rationing laws and a ban on small handguns.²⁷

Taking Away Your Gun Rights

The international gun prohibition lobby is essentially George Soros’s creation. IANSA’s funding is secret, but the Soros connection is not. From the creating of IANSA until July 2010, the group was run by Rebecca Peters. IANSA has networked hundreds of other organizations around the world into its prohibition web, and IANSA has also spun off affiliates, such as Control Arms. If there were no IANSA, there would be no international gun ban movement.

IANSA is “the organization officially designated by the U.N. Department of Disarmament Affairs (DDA) to coordinate civil society involvement to the U.N. small arms process.”²⁸

IANSA’s dangerous and deadly machinations are not confined to the corridors of the United Nations. Soros’s organization works around the world for the destruction of the human right of self-defense.

Chapter 7 tells the tragic story of how countries that have been trapped by the Soros axis have fallen prey to increased violence and decreased freedom. Soros’s network is vast.

Soros got his way in South Africa; and so in a country where more than half of all women will be raped in the course of their lives (and, very possibly, infected with AIDS as a result), the police told women that they could not have handgun permits for protection. They should just stay home, the police said, or only go out when accompanied by their husbands.

Soros compared the Bush administration to Hitler’s dictatorship, and called the United States “a danger to the world.”²⁹ Yet it is Soros himself who promotes the kind of gun laws favored by Hitler’s National Socialists, and it is Soros himself who is endangering the people of the world by exterminating their right of self-defense against *genocidaires*, tyrants, and criminals.

The South African law was the model that Soros’s proxies brought to Panama, and then to Costa Rica.³⁰ In Costa Rica, the bill was pushed by President Oscar Arias. Who funds the Arias Foundation? George Soros.³¹

Who is the world's leading "humanitarian" spokesman for the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty, a Soros project to impose an embargo on arms sales to the United States and Israel? Oscar Arias.

Make no mistake that IANSA and Soros have any long-run agenda that is nothing short of total prohibition. IANSA even wants the police to be disarmed, because, as Rebecca Peters says, "When police begin to carry guns, that motivates criminals to carry guns."

IANSA is so extreme that it complains that the gun laws of England are too lax, and that gun ownership rates in England are too high. IANSA gloats when guns are taken from sportsmen; the group's website celebrated when the government of Uruguay destroyed thousands of firearms, the majority of which had been "gathered" from the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fishing. IANSA was pleased with "the country's first destruction of weapons previously used for hunting and sports."³² So it is no surprise that Soros and his minions went all out to try to pass the gun confiscation referendum in Brazil.³³

But the people of Brazil stood together, and repudiated Soros's anti-freedom agenda. So did the people of the United States in the 2004 election, when they rejected Soros's candidate, John Kerry, who would have let Soros and IANSA have their way at the 2006 U.N. antigun conference, creating a worldwide binding global antigun treaty, with the United States under its thumb.

John Kerry would have picked a U.S. ambassador to the U.N. who would have done the bidding of Soros and Peters. But President Bush nominated under secretary of state John Bolton, and the Soros machine went to war.

The website of Soros's Open Society Institute hosted a well-funded campaign titled "Stop Bolton!" Laughably, the Soros website used the heading "United Nations Reform" for its attempt to destroy one of the most pro-reform diplomats in U.N. history. One of the many organizations serving in Soros's anti-Bolton campaign was the Center for American Progress—run by John Podesta, who had been President Bill Clinton's White House chief of staff, and who would later run transition planning for president-to-be Barack

Obama.³⁴ As usual, much of the American media picked up the talking points generated by Soros and his proxies.

The NRA and other groups fought back. In the end, there were plenty of senators ready to vote to confirm John Bolton, but they could not vote because for the first time in history, a nominee for United Nations Ambassador was filibustered. President Bush hung tough, and used the constitutional provision allowing him to make a "recess appointment." Thus, Bolton was able to serve from August 2005 until December 2006, which, at least, was long enough to thwart Soros at the U.N.'s antigun conference in June-July 2006.

Soros and Censoring Free Speech

The McCain-Feingold campaign speech restriction law was written to impair the ability of National Rifle Association members to collectively participate in elections. It is a law that was bought and paid for by George Soros and his ultra-rich buddies, carefully written to suppress your speech while empowering theirs. And that law was just the beginning of their plans to take away your First Amendment rights.

The McCain-Feingold law set up a sixty-day period of censorship before general elections, and thirty days before primaries. During that period, corporations (which include public interest groups like the NRA) and unions are forbidden from buying "issue advocacy" advertising that mentions a federal candidate, or which refers to the candidate by title (e.g., "our senator").

Here's an example of an illegal act under McCain-Feingold: In mid-September, the Senate is considering a bill to register all guns. The NRA buys ads on national television networks, saying: "Gun registration doesn't solve crimes. It invades your privacy rights, and makes gun confiscation easy. Please call your senator and ask him to vote against the gun registration bill."

The advertisement is inside the sixty-day pre-election censorship period. The ad does not mention any names, but it does say "your senators." So

viewers in Pennsylvania would know that the ad is referring, in part, to the two senators from Pennsylvania. One of the senators from Pennsylvania is running for reelection, and so are two dozen other senators around the country.³⁵

Thus, the advertisement was forbidden under McCain-Feingold, with criminal penalties attached. It was the worst federal censorship law in American history—worse even than the Sedition Act of 1798. (At least for the Sedition Act, speech could not be punished if it was truthful.)

Congress passed and, unfortunately, President Bush signed the McCain-Feingold censorship law because they thought that the American people were demanding it, to “get the money out of politics.” As it turned out, Congress was tricked. The “grassroots” support was a fabrication, the creation of a coterie of the ultra-rich and their foundations. Soros put in \$18 million.³⁶ Eighty-eight percent of the \$140 million that was spent to push McCain-Feingold came from Soros’s Open Society Institute and seven of its foundation allies.³⁷

One of the groups in the Soros axis was the Pew Charitable Trusts. After McCain-Feingold had been signed into law, a former program officer at Pew, named Sean Treglia, spilled the beans. Journalist Ryan Sager obtained a videotape of Treglia speaking at the University of Southern California, Annenberg School for Communication, in March 2004.

“I’m going to tell you a story that I’ve never told any reporter,” said Treglia. “Now that I’m several months away from Pew and we have campaign-finance reform, I can tell this story.”

The billionaires would spread their money around “to create an impression that a mass movement was afoot—that everywhere they looked, in academic institutions, in the business community, in religious groups, in ethnic groups, everywhere, people were talking about reform.”³⁸

Some asked, “What would have happened had a major news organization gotten ahold of this at the wrong time?”

“We had a scare,” Treglia answered. “As the debate was progressing and getting pretty close, George Will stumbled across a report that we had

done and attacked it in his column. And a lot of his partisans were becoming aware of Pew’s role and were feeding him information. And he started to reference the fact that Pew had played a large role in this—that this was a liberal attempt to hoodwink Congress.”

Treglia continued: “But you know what the good news is from my perspective?” He answered his own question: “Journalists didn’t care . . . So no one followed up on the story. And so there was a panic there for a couple of weeks because we thought the story was going to begin to gather steam, and no one picked it up.”

What Pew, and Soros, and the rest of the axis did to the First Amendment is little different from what they have been trying with the Second Amendment: create groups such as the Million Mom March or IANSA that purport to speak for the views of vast numbers of ordinary citizens—but that really represent little more than the views of the Soros axis itself. Count on a compliant media to amplify these voices and present them as if they were true citizen organizations. And then have your most powerful political friends—such as Hillary Clinton and Kofi Annan—use their power to further bolster the groups and their Soros message.

The NRA has fought Soros every step of the way, defending the First and Second Amendments. We helped beat him in 2006 at the U.N., and saved the Second Amendment. But he won in Congress with McCain-Feingold in 2002, and dealt a devastating blow to the First Amendment. The NRA took the case to the U.S. Supreme Court, while the Soros axis paid lawyers to defend the censorship law. Soros won 5–4 in the case of *McConnell v. Federal Election Commission*.

Dissenting in *McConnell v. FEC*, Justice Clarence Thomas warned that the Court had paved the way for censorship of other media. The Obama Department of Justice agreed. In the spring 2009 case of *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, the Obama administration told the Supreme Court that it would be constitutional for the censorship law to be extended even to block the publication of books.

Astroturfing

Astroturfing

Fortunately, the Court's January 2010 decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* removed unconstitutional restrictions on NRA's ability to speak freely at election time. The ruling is a victory for anyone who believes that the First Amendment applies to each and every one of us. It is a defeat for arrogant elitists such as George Soros who wanted to carve out free speech as a privilege for themselves; and for those who believed that speech had a dollar value and should be treated and regulated like currency, and not a freedom. The Court's decision reaffirms that the Bill of Rights was written for every American, and it will amplify the voice of average citizens who want their voices heard.

The NRA has been in the forefront of defending the First Amendment so we can protect the Second Amendment. This ruling is clearly a victory for our continuing efforts to educate voters on where politicians stand on our fundamental, individual right to keep and bear arms.

Soros Axis and Obama Target the Airwaves

It is radio, however, where the Soros axis and Obama have set their sights next. They want to control the content of radio programs.

There has been a lot of discussion about Obama using the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to restore the so-called Fairness Doctrine. This doctrine was applied to television and radio from 1949 until 1987, when the Reagan administration lifted it. In theory, it was supposed to mean that radio and TV stations had to present balanced viewpoints. In practice, it was rarely applied to news programs, no matter how egregiously biased, or how unfairly they slanted a program against gun owners. The Fairness Doctrine was very effective in deterring radio stations from airing talk programs where the host forthrightly declared his or her own position or ideology. In fact, talk radio programs as we now know them came into existence only because the Fairness Doctrine was repealed.

Certainly there are some in Congress and other advocates—almost all of whom happen to be antigun—who have called for reinstating the Fairness Doctrine, and even for extending it to other media, such as the Internet.

Although the First Amendment forbids government infringement of the freedom of the press, there used to be a common view that radio and television were not entitled to the same protections as newspapers or other print media. The theory was that the broadcast spectrum was very finite; since a given city might have only three or five television stations, and since the government “owned” the airwaves (supposedly), the government should ensure that programming was balanced.

That rationale is no longer plausible. Thanks to cable TV, satellite TV and radio, and the Internet, there is near-infinite availability of different television and radio channels—delivered by traditional radio and TV airwaves, or by cable TV lines, or by satellite transmission, or by any of the many ways that the Internet is accessed.

While the threat of a reimposed Fairness Doctrine remains, I think that Obama will more likely try another approach—taken from the Soros-Clinton mastermind John Podesta.³⁹ (More on Podesta in a little bit.)

Here's how it would work. Every radio and television station needs a broadcast license from the Federal Communications Commission. The five FCC Commissioners are appointed to staggered terms by the president. Already, four of the five commissioners are Obama picks.

The radio and television licenses must be renewed every few years. Now, it would be a little crude (and too obviously unconstitutional) for Obama-appointed commissioners to create a rule saying, “In order to renew a broadcast license, a radio station must drop conservative talk programs such as those hosted by Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh, or Sean Hannity. The station must replace these popular hosts with other programs that will not criticize President Obama, and that will support his agenda, including gun control.”

But there's a way to impose this same rule without saying so directly. Podesta's think tank, the Center for American Progress (CAP), has outlined

the plan. Obama's campaign adopted it. CAP's 2007 research paper, *The Structural Imbalance of Political Talk Radio*, reports how many hours of right-wing and left-wing talk radio are broadcast in different U.S. markets. The paper shows that the number of hours of right-leaning programs greatly exceeds the number for left-leaning programs.

The explanation is easy, although Podesta's group ignored it: radio stations are in business to make money. They make money by attracting large audiences, since the bigger the audience, the higher the advertising rate a station can charge. Radio stations often pick conservative hosts because they attract the largest audiences. Perhaps one reason audiences like to listen to conservative talk radio hosts is that the opposite perspective dominates most network and local television news programs, and most newspapers. The difference is that the leftist writers and television reporters pretend to be neutral, whereas the radio hosts are honest about their perspectives.

Podesta and CAP were not interested in encouraging more balance in newspapers or television. Rather, they figured that if they could change the ownership of the radio stations, then the radio stations might stop buying the conservative talk programs:

We believe that minority and female owners, who tend to be more local, are more responsive to the needs of their local communities and are therefore less likely to air the conservative hosts because this type of programming is so far out of step with their local audiences. Additionally, minority-owned stations are more likely to be found in areas with high minority populations—areas that also report high percentages of progressives and liberals.⁴⁰

So under the CAP theory, radio stations are forcing conservative talk radio hosts onto reluctant listeners, and the solution is to use FCC ownership rules so that more stations are locally owned, especially by nonwhite owners.

The analysis is dubious. The residents of Washington, D.C., are overwhelmingly Democratic and nonwhite. Yet the *Rush Limbaugh Show* gets great ratings there. Meanwhile, the all-Left-all-the-time Air America had such a tiny D.C. audience that the ratings agencies could not even rate it. Even in Madison, Wisconsin, where Leftist ideas are very popular, Air America ratings have been dismal.⁴¹

So dismal, in fact, that on January 21, 2010, Air America Radio ceased live programming and announced that it would file for Chapter 7 bankruptcy protection. The problem with Air America was that, in terms of pure radio skill, none of its hosts were as talented as Limbaugh, Hannity, or Beck. Besides, if you lived in D.C. or Madison and you wanted left-leaning radio, you could just tune into a National Public Radio station, with its high production values and program quality.

The CAP report concludes: "Ultimately, these results suggest that increasing ownership diversity, both in terms of the race/ethnicity and gender of owners, as well as the number of independent local owners, will lead to more diverse programming, more choices for listeners and more owners who are responsive to their local communities and serve the public interest."⁴²

Barack Obama's campaign plan to change radio adopts the CAP strategy: "Barack Obama believes that the nation's rules ensuring diversity of media ownership are critical to the public interest. Unfortunately, over the past several years, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has promoted the concept of consolidation over diversity."⁴³

So, "as president, he will encourage diversity in the ownership of broadcast media, promote the development of new media outlets for expression of diverse viewpoints and clarify the public interest obligations of broadcasters who occupy the nation's spectrum. An Obama presidency will promote greater coverage of local issues and better responsiveness by broadcasters to the communities they serve."⁴⁴

In other words: Adopt new FCC rules or guidelines against one company owning several radio stations. When license renewal time comes, force

the company to sell some or most of its stations to local owners, with female or minority owners being favored. The radio corporations, knowing that they need to curry favor with the FCC on a wide range of regulatory issues, will obediently sell to local insiders who are favored by the Obama machine.

Now, once the new, Obama-favored owners have their own local stations, some of them might decide they just want to make the most profits possible, and so they would keep the conservative hosts, in order to attract the largest audiences.

Most owners, however, would probably be savvy enough to know that their new broadcast license will itself be coming up for renewal in a few years. And when it does, the owners had better be in the good graces of the Federal Communications Commission. So the owners will dump the conservative talk show hosts, and replace them with something “local” that will not annoy the Obama machine. Like a sports talk program. Or a program by a “community activist” who spouts the Obama line.

Obama has taken the first step, appointing as chief diversity officer at the Federal Communications Commission a far-left radical named Mark Lloyd. Lloyd favors extensive new federal controls over the political content of radio and television programs, and dismisses “exaggerated” concern for the First Amendment.⁴⁵

From Maine to Hawaii, radio programs that criticize the Obama administration may be taken off the air—thanks to technical regulatory changes that can be passed off to the American public as promoting local business and giving minorities a break. You can hardly deny that George Soros made a good investment in John Podesta and the Center for American Progress.

More Paid Speech for Soros

McCain-Feingold became law thanks in part to \$18 million from the George Soros axis. According to *USA Today*, “Soros says he always suspected that any campaign-finance changes would have ‘loopholes’ because money and power are elemental forces.”⁴⁶

“Suspected” is probably an understatement. “Knew in advance and planned for it” might be more accurate, since Soros could hire the finest lawyers in the world to tell him about the loopholes in the McCain-Feingold draft bill. And perhaps to make sure that they stayed in the bill.

Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky could also see some of the loopholes. He warned the Senate: “We haven’t taken a penny of money out of politics, we have only taken the parties out of politics. This is a massive transfer of speech away from the two great political parties to the press, to academia, to Hollywood, to billionaires . . . This is a stunningly stupid thing to do.”⁴⁷

Or it’s a stunningly clever thing to do, for a billionaire with a long-term strategy. In the 2004 presidential election, George Soros would spend \$27 million,⁴⁸ and the circle of ultra-rich allies he recruited would spend much more, exploiting the McCain-Feingold loopholes. The *Wall Street Journal* observed that by drastically reducing donations to political parties, Soros had “cleared a path to make himself the biggest bankroller in Democratic politics.”⁴⁹

The spending of the Soros axis was all the more powerful because their McCain-Feingold law had restricted not only donations to parties, but had also infringed the freedom of speech of citizen groups such as the National Rifle Association. As the *Wall Street Journal* had observed, “Joining with other small donors in one larger cause (the Sierra Club or NRA) is sometimes the only way, other than voting, that the non-rich can influence politics,” but (thanks to Soros), “small donors have had their speech restricted by the limits on advertising imposed on traditional lobbying groups 60 days before an election.”⁵⁰

Speaking on behalf of McCain-Feingold, antigun senator Chris Dodd of Connecticut had inveighed against “money that threatens to drown out the voice of the average voter of average means.” Yet McCain-Feingold cracked down on “the average voter of average means” who supported groups such as the NRA, leaving those voters silenced while the plutocrats tried to buy the election.

Soros's Open Society Institute had promoted McCain-Feingold by warning about "the corrupting influence of very large donors." Yet Soros asserted that it was all right for him to spend vastly more than what might have been spent by one of the "large donors" who had been shut down by McCain-Feingold: "Campaign reform was designed to get special interests out of politics. And I have no special interests; I'm not interested in any favorable treatment of any kind. I'm really concerned with the public interest."⁵¹

In an article titled "Super Rich Step into Political Vacuum: McCain-Feingold Paved Way for 527s," the *Washington Post* explained how Soros organized the plutocracy to exploit the McCain-Feingold loopholes.⁵²

Harold Ickes, a hatchet man from the Clinton administration, wrote a memo in 2001, well before McCain-Feingold had been enacted, warning that because McCain-Feingold would drastically reduce donations to political parties, the Democrats should start using 527 organizations for fund-raising.

A "527" gets its name from the section of the Internal Revenue Code that defines what it is. A 527 is not allowed to urge the election of a candidate, but it can engage in activities such as voter registration, get-out-the-vote, or issue advocacy.

One of the perversities of McCain-Feingold was that it left 527s completely free to advocate on issues, whereas the NRA was restricted from issue advocacy during the sixty-day preelection censorship period.

Ickes and some other Democratic powerhouses decided to create a 527, and to call it America Coming Together (ACT). Ickes also planned another 527, dubbed "the Media Fund," to buy campaign ads. (The Media Fund ads would be the kind of "sham ads" that McCain-Feingold had aimed to shut down; although they did not explicitly urge a vote for or against a candidate, they promoted Kerry and attacked Bush.)

George Soros was angry at George W. Bush, and had hired political consultants to figure out how he could use the 527 loophole. Soros and his consultants studied ACT, to decide if it were structurally sound, and decided that it was.⁵³

Soros set up a small meeting in July 2003 at his estate in Southampton, Long Island. Exactly who was at the meeting remains a secret, but the result was that Soros pledged \$10 million to get ACT started, and his wealthy friends also joined in.

Clinton to Soros: "This Is the Ball Game."

Soros hosted a dinner that November in Manhattan, featuring former president Bill Clinton, to raise millions more for ACT and the Media Fund. Clinton told the donors: "If we'd had these two groups in 2000, we wouldn't be sitting here tonight. This is the ball game."

The Clintons have long been part of the Soros network. Strobe Talbott—who had been Clinton's Oxford roommate, and who served as his deputy secretary of state—worked closely with Soros and considered him "a sort of shadow arm of the State Department."⁵⁴ When the Clintons were in the White House, Soros never had trouble when he wanted to meet with the president or First Lady.⁵⁵

Soon, the National Rifle Association was spreading the word about Soros's scheme. Soros fired back with an op-ed.⁵⁶ He wrote that there had been "a lot of name-calling about my donations," by the National Rifle Association.

He insisted: "I have scrupulously abided by both the letter and the spirit of the law . . . I have contributed to independent organizations that by law are forbidden to coordinate their activities with the political parties or candidates."

Back when McCain-Feingold was being pushed through Congress, Soros had given money to a group called Democracy 21 to help support the bill. The group's president, Fred Wertheimer, now said that "George Soros started out as part of the solution, and he's ended up as part of the problem." He accused Soros of helping to start "a soft-money arms race."⁵⁷

Brigham Young University political science professor David Magleby explained that "Soros breathed life and funds into what has become a well-developed array of new groups tailor-made to operate under the new rules . . .

He was a beacon for the old Democratic soft money . . . Soros put the new groups in business. He set up the storefront.”⁵⁸

As Soros had written, his 527s were legally forbidden to coordinate with political parties or candidates. But they did coordinate.

The *Washington Post* observed that “ACT often seems remarkably in sync with Democratic Party activities.”⁵⁹

Harold Ickes, the chief of staff of ACT (and formerly, director of the Media Fund) was also a member of the executive committee of the Democratic National Committee. According to the *Post*, “Official minutes and meeting transcripts show the executive committee got campaign briefings from Kerry’s campaign manager, Mary Beth Cahill, and top DNC officials.”⁶⁰

Ickes told the *Post* that his dual role did not violate the anti-coordination law, because the DNC Executive Committee meetings did not discuss DNC communication strategies. Besides that, the DNC supposedly kept its own executive committee in the dark about almost everything: “The executive committee of the DNC knows less about what the DNC is doing than the average newspaper reader.”⁶¹ Sure.

ACT’s purpose was voter registration and turn-out in swing states. The Democratic National Committee, by some odd but uncoordinated coincidence, mostly abandoned the traditional party roles of voter registration and turn-out in some key swing states, and ACT filled the gap.⁶² Not that ACT and the DNC were illegally coordinating, of course.

ACT had nearly six thousand paid employees, and seventy-eight field offices.⁶³ Ninety-one percent of ACT’s money came from people who gave \$100,000 or more.⁶⁴ Soros put six million dollars into the Media Fund, for its sham ads on TV and radio.⁶⁵

MoveOn.org had been set up during the latter part of the Clinton administration, to defend Clinton against impeachment and conviction. The group stayed in business, and by the 2004 election, had set up its own 527. Soros gave them \$15 million during the 2003–04 election cycle.⁶⁶

The laws against coordination with political parties did not stop MoveOn.org from working with the Democratic National Committee. For example, the DNC website announced, “The Democratic Party is partnering with MoveOn.org” for “a massive public mobilization” against the Bush tax cuts.⁶⁷

Likewise, the party’s website enthused:

The DNC is also conducting a major petition drive in partnership with MoveOn.org. More than 310,000 Americans have signed the petition to protect our courts—with more than 172,000 of those signatures coming in the past 36 hours. The petition calls on Bush and the Republicans to stop nominating judges that are out of step with mainstream Americans and praising the Democrats for standing up for their rights.

Other Soros expenditures were to more mysterious groups. Soros Fund Management gave \$500,000 to the Campaign for a Progressive Future (CPF). So did the Irene Diamond Fund, Soros’s old partner in financing antigun junk lawsuits. Soros also made a separate personal donation. CPF did nothing to draw attention to itself, but another group described the CPF as an “organization that supports candidates opposed by the National Rifle Association.”⁶⁸

There was also America Votes, a get-out-the-vote organization consisting of some respectable organizations, as well as ACORN (a far left entity infamous for fraudulent voter registration), plus the Brady Campaign and its subsidiary the Million Mom March. George’s son Jonathan Soros gave them \$250,000, and George himself contributed \$500,000 in 2005⁶⁹

One of the ironies of the 2004 election was that some ordinary citizens who were sincerely opposed to George Bush put “Billionaires for Bush” bumper stickers on their cars. The bumper stickers were supposed to be an ironic comment about Bush. Probably very few of the folks driving the cars with the bumper stickers realized that Kerry himself was married to a billionaire, and that the pro-Kerry campaign was dependent on a small coterie

of the ultrarich led by George Soros. Perhaps never in American history has a major party presidential candidate been so indebted to a few plutocrats as was John Kerry to the Soros cabal in 2004.

The web of Soros is immense. A report by Discover the Networks revealed that Soros and his Open Society Institute have funded 143 different organizations in recent years.⁷⁰ Among the beneficiaries of his largesse are the Alliance for Justice and People for the American Way—a pair of misnamed lobbies dedicated to opposing the confirmation of judges who support First and Second Amendment rights. Also on the list are a host of organizations that promote gun control, including the American Constitution Society, American Friends Service Committee, The American Prospect, Amnesty International, ACORN, Brookings Institution, the Nation Institute, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Sojourners, and the infamous Southern Poverty Law Center, which has a specialty in bogus reports claiming that gun rights activists are incipient terrorists. There's also the Coalition for an International Criminal Court, anti-hunting groups such as Defenders of Wildlife, and numerous anti-Israel, anti-U.S., pro-illegal immigration, and extreme Left organizations.

The Soros Philosophy: No Sovereignty for You!

One of the groups that agreed with Soros about the importance of stopping the nomination of John Bolton was Citizens for Global Solutions, formerly known as the World Federalist Association. It is the leading U.S. organization promoting the eradication of U.S. sovereignty and its replacement with global government by the United Nations.⁷¹

George Soros thinks that America is a deeply flawed nation. He has written that he has always “felt that modern society in general and America in particular suffer from a deficiency of values.”⁷²

Speaking at Columbia University's commencement, he told the students and their parents: “If President Bush is reelected, we must ask the question, ‘What is wrong with us?’”⁷³

In the upside-down world of George Soros, America is what's wrong with the world. Soros opposed not only the invasion of Iraq, but also the invasion of Afghanistan that destroyed al-Qaeda's training camps there.⁷⁴

Soros scolded: “When President Bush says, as he does frequently, that freedom will prevail, in fact he means that America will prevail.”⁷⁵ Well, that's how things usually work out. When America wins, freedom wins (as in the American Revolution and World War II). When America loses (as in Vietnam), there's never a democracy on the winning side.

Soros considers him an acolyte of the great philosopher Karl Popper. Soros took Popper's classes at the London School of Economics.⁷⁶ Popper's great work is the two-volume *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.⁷⁷ Popper, having experienced Nazi and Communist totalitarianism in Europe, argued that successful societies must be “open” rather than “closed,” must embrace change, must have transparent and responsive governments, must be tolerant of all opinions, must recognize that all “truths” are contingent rather than absolute, and must never assume that their own beliefs or morals are infallible or are superior to those of others.

Soros adored Popper's work, and Soros's Open Society Institute is named after Popper's books. Many of Soros's good works in Eastern Europe, helping to build civil society, have been precisely the kind of projects that Popper might have applauded.

Popper was also extremely distrustful of strong nationalism, which he viewed as leading to closed, retrograde, intolerant societies, and to tribalism. According to Soros, what really got him upset about George W. Bush was Bush's strong sense of American nationalism.⁷⁸

However, Soros's war on the First and Second Amendments indicates that Soros, who has always fancied himself a great philosopher,⁷⁹ has drastically misunderstood Popper. At the least, the anti-Bill of Rights projects of Soros's “Open Society Institute” promote the opposite of what Popper meant by an open society.

The Open Society and Its Enemies is built around Popper's critique of three philosophers: Plato, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (a nineteenth-century German who elaborated on Plato's political ideas and created the intellectual basis for fascism), and Karl Marx. All three were advocates of government censorship. Soros's efforts to suppress political speech in the United States have much more in common with Plato, Hegel, and Marx than with the openness advocated by Popper.

Second, Plato and Hegel strongly believed that the government should have a monopoly of force. Every government that has ever called itself "Marxist" has adopted the same principle.

Popper believed the opposite. He devoted considerable energy to arguing that Plato was an ally of the Thirty Tyrants, who took over Athens in 404 BC. The Tyrants murdered approximately 8 percent of the Athenian population. Popper lauded the Athenian resistance: "The democrats fought on. At first only seventy strong, they prepared under the leadership of Thrasybulus and Antyus the liberation of Athens, where Critias [leader of the Thirty Tyrants] was meanwhile killing scores of citizens." After months of warfare, the democrats destabilized the Tyrants, who then lost their support from Sparta, and democracy was restored to Athens.⁸⁰

Yet IANSA and Soros are doing everything possible to ensure that a democratic rebellion against a dictatorship becomes impossible. Soros proxies, such as IANSA, are absolutely insistent that the world's citizens not have arms with which to resist tyranny and mass murder by government. At the U.N. gun control conferences, and in the Arms Trade Treaty, they are attempting to outlaw the supplying of arms to democratic groups that are fighting to liberate their nations from tyrants. Soros here is working against what Karl Popper advocated:

I am not in all cases and all circumstances against a violent revolution. I believe with some medieval and Renaissance Christian thinkers who taught the admissibility of tyrannicide that

there may indeed, under a tyranny, be no other possibility, and a violent revolution may be justified.⁸¹ . . . In other words, the use of violence is justified only under a tyranny which makes reforms without violence impossible, and it should have only one aim, that is, to bring about a state of affairs which makes reforms without violence possible . . .

There is only one further use of violence in political quarrels which I should consider justified. I mean the resistance, once democracy has been attained, to any attack (whether from within or without the state) against the democratic constitution and the use of democratic methods. Any such attack, especially if it comes from the government in power, or if it is tolerated by it, should be resisted by all loyal citizens, even to the use of violence. In fact, the working of democracy rests largely on the understanding that a government which attempts to misuse its powers and to establish itself as a tyranny (or which tolerates the establishment of a tyranny by anybody else) outlaws itself, and that citizens have not only a right but also a duty to consider the action of such a government as a crime, and its members as a dangerous gang of criminals.⁸²

Although Popper's writing style is different from that of James Madison or Thomas Jefferson, his viewpoint on the issue of resistance to tyranny is the same. The above paragraphs are an excellent summary of the philosophy of the Second Amendment. The Soros war on the Second Amendment is a war on the Open Society itself.

It says a lot that Soros's closest ally at the United Nations, Mark Malloch Brown, was not only a fervent gun ban advocate, but also ran something that was nicknamed the United Nations Dictators Program. Despite Soros's past good works in Eastern Europe, he has become one of the chief modern enemies of the Open Society.

Popper über gewaltsame Revolutionen

Soros is a critic of what he calls “excessive individualism.”⁸³ There’s no doubt that to both friends and enemies of the Second Amendment, the firearm is a very powerful symbol of individualism, and that the possession of firearms promotes attitudes of individualism and self-reliance.

Yet there’s one more twist in trying to figure out what motivates Soros. Consider what Soros did to political speech: in the name of “reform,” he successfully pushed for a law that partly suppressed the speech of the political parties and of citizen organizations. With traditional speech (including the spending of money to communicate that speech to large audiences) diminished, Soros became the grand moneybags of the Democratic, and his fund-raising network was essential to the party’s 2004 presidential campaign.

Now, Soros and his agents are working hard to drastically reduce gun possession around the world by ordinary people. Yet even while promoting gun bans, Soros was funding armed revolutionaries. In Serbia in the final years of the twentieth century, he spent lavishly to fund sympathetic organizations, including an organization all-Left-all-the-time of seventy thousand militant youths, called Otpor. On Serbian election night, September 26, 2000, the vote was disputed, because both sides had cheated. A few days later, Soros’s forces took to the streets. Although they worked hard to gain the support (or at least not the opposition) of the police and military, they did use guns and Molotov cocktails. And Otpor blockaded the capital of Belgrade, leading forces armed with AK-47 rifles, mortars, and antitank weapons. The government collapsed, and Soros’s side took over.⁸⁴

I’d say that this counts as a good deed by Soros, since the Serbian president whom he ousted was the mass murderer Slobodan Milošević. But it does make me wonder. Some campaign finance activists were sincere in wanting to “get the money out of politics,” and never realized until it was too late that they might have been a pawn in a broader Soros strategy of getting *other people’s* money out of politics, thereby making his own political money much more important. I wonder if Soros-funded groups such as the Brady Campaign (who are unquestionably sincere and earnest in wanting to get rid of guns) may also be pawns. Perhaps the bumper sticker for the twenty-first

century might read, “When guns are outlawed, only George Soros’s friends will have guns.”

There were plenty of people, including perhaps Senators McCain and Feingold, who did not realize what a gigantic loophole that campaign finance “reform” would create for George Soros. Who knows what the Soros loophole might be in some future gun ban?

We do know that George Soros does not feel obliged to play by other people’s rules during times of “regime change”—a time he defines to include American elections. He asserts that his efforts to oust George W. Bush were essentially the same as his (successful) efforts to overthrow dictatorships in Yugoslavia, Croatia, and Slovakia.⁸⁵

George Soros and Barack Obama

George Soros came very close to successfully buying the election for John Kerry. Had he prevailed, the U.N. would have created a global gun control treaty in 2006. President Kerry would have appointed two Supreme Court justices (Sonia Sotomayor was already being mentioned as a nominee), and *District of Columbia v. Heller* would have been a 6–3 loss instead of 5–4 win. The Second Amendment would have been judicially nullified, and the Soros/IANSA axis of global gun banners would be marching toward final victory.

If not for the National Rifle Association, Soros would have been triumphant. About six million votes were cast in Ohio, a state where about a third of households own firearms. So there were about two million votes cast by gun-owning families. If John Kerry had gotten just sixty thousand of George Bush’s votes, Kerry would have become president of the United States. Did NRA convince at least sixty thousand Ohio voters not to believe John Kerry’s bogus claim that he was a staunch friend of the Second Amendment? I’m sure of it.

One of the Soros 527 groups, America Coming Together, had hoped to keep going after 2004, but had to shut down because once Bush was

reelected, many donors lost interest.⁸⁶ Soros, however, knows how to work in the long term. He soon went to work with his fellow far-left billionaires to build a political infrastructure that would put a suitable agent in the White House in 2009.

Billionaires for Big Government is the title of the report from the Capital Research Center (CRC) that describes what happened next: “In April 2005, Soros and the other major players assembled a large group for a secret planning session. Seventy millionaires and billionaires met in Phoenix, Arizona, to discuss how to develop a long-term strategy.”⁸⁷

At first they called it the “Phoenix Project.” Then the name was changed to the “Democracy Alliance”—a rather inaccurate moniker for a plutocratic cabal dedicated to a secret political takeover of the United States.

Reporting on Soros’s machinations in the *Washington Post*, the *Post* explained that the “Democracy Alliance” was “made up of billionaires and millionaires.” As one California trial lawyer put it: “Like a lot of elite groups, we fly beneath the radar.”⁸⁸

According to the *Post*, “The goal was to invest in groups that could be influential in building what activists call ‘political infrastructure’—institutions that can support Democratic causes not simply in the next election, but for years to come.” The *Post* said that more than two dozen organizations had already been funded by the DA.⁸⁹

One of the DA’s beneficiaries has been People for the American Way (an antigun organization that vehemently fought the confirmation of Supreme Court Justices John Roberts and Samuel Alito). Another has been the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), a deeply corrupt organization known for fraudulent voter registration. Barack Obama had worked closely with ACORN since his early days on the South Side of Chicago, and in 2008, ACORN put a massive effort into electing him.⁹⁰

The DA has also been funding John Podesta and his Center for American Progress (CAP), the organization that forms the key link between the gun banning of the Clinton and the Obama administrations. I’ve already

told you how CAP created Barack Obama’s blueprint to get rid of pro-gun talk radio hosts.

Soros had given CAP \$3 million in 2003.⁹¹ In the first round of DA funding, CAP got \$5 million more.⁹² As White House chief of staff under Bill Clinton from 1998 to 2001, John Podesta had been at the top of the chain of command for Clinton’s final gun control programs: the lawsuits against the firearms industry, the exploitation of the Columbine murders for political gain, the fabrication of the Soros-funded and Clinton-directed “Million” Mom March as a supposedly grassroots organization of housewives, and the rest of the dirty work carried out by Rahm Emanuel, Eric Holder, and the Clinton crew.

Back in July 2008, Barack Obama began planning his presidential transition. The *Atlantic* reported that “Podesta’s Center for American Progress is working with the Third Way think tank on a Homeland Security Presidential Transition Initiative.”⁹³

The *Atlantic* called CAP a “Third Way think tank” because it is related to an organization called the Third Way. (“Third Way” is a political term of art for the policies of politicians such as Bill Clinton and Tony Blair, who see themselves as charting a “third way” between capitalism and socialism.) The Third Way group was founded in 2004. Jonathan Cowan is its president, and Jim Kessler is vice president for policy.

Kessler had once been Sen. Charles Schumer’s main staffer on gun control.⁹⁴ Cowan had been chief of staff to Clinton’s Housing and Urban Development secretary, Andrew Cuomo—at the time when Cuomo was cooking up a plan for public housing authorities all over the United States to file junk lawsuits against gun companies. (The NRA found out, and convinced Congress to shut down the plan.)

Between the Clinton years and the 2004 creation of Third Way, Cowan and Kessler ran a gun control organization called Americans for Gun Safety (AGS). That group (now defunct) had its own billionaire funder, Andrew McKelvey, owner of the job search website Monster.com. AGS, Cowan, and Kessler strove to portray themselves as sensible moderates on the gun issue,

but they could not even bring themselves to acknowledge that the Second Amendment is an individual right, or to criticize the D.C. handgun ban.

They did, however, make an important contribution to the rhetoric of antigun politicians. They conducted polling that showed that “gun safety” was a more popular term than “gun control.” (As it should be, since the NRA is the nation’s oldest gun safety organization. But referring to gun control as “gun safety” is a deception.)

Kessler and Cowan also wrote the gun control script that Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, and John Kerry would later follow: don’t retreat an inch on any of your positions on gun control; but begin every answer to a question about gun control by declaring how much you respect the Second Amendment.⁹⁵

Like George Soros’s manipulative trading of foreign currencies, much of what his Axis of Plutocracy does is hidden from public view. For example, although we know that the Soros-funded Center for American Progress took the early lead in guiding Obama’s staffing of the Department of Homeland Security, we cannot know for sure whether CAP helped set the stage for the Department’s report—released just a few weeks after Obama took office—that was sent to every law enforcement agency in the United States, and that warned that people who were worried about Obama’s gun control policy might be domestic terrorists.

We do know that since the late twentieth century, two donors have stood far above all the rest as consistent, extremely generous funders of the gun prohibition movement. One of those donors was George Soros. The other was the Joyce Foundation. Barack Obama served on the Joyce Foundation board for years, and, after being defeated in a 2000 race for the U.S. House of Representatives, considered becoming its president. As a member of the board of directors of the Joyce Foundation, Obama voted over and over for large grants for anti-Second Amendment research and for gun prohibition advocacy.⁹⁶

George Soros worked for years and invested shrewdly in everything that was necessary for “regime change” in America—for a president who shared his views on guns, and who would embrace rather than resist Soros’s domestic and international antigun agenda. Soros has succeeded.

Chapter 20

Obama Appointments

Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton have plenty of helpers for their anti-rights schemes. First of all, there’s the legal quadumvirate: State Department legal adviser Harold Koh, for inventing new antigun legal theories loosely based on international law; attorney general Eric Holder, to take those theories to the Supreme Court; and justices Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan, to turn those theories into the law of the land.

At the head of the antigun army was White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel, formerly the director of President Bill Clinton’s antigun campaign. The Obama team stands ready for the day when gun owners will become the target of Emanuel’s rule: “You don’t ever want a crisis to go to waste; it’s an opportunity to do important things that you would otherwise avoid.”¹

Rahm Emanuel: Top General in Bill Clinton’s Antigun Army

Every army needs a general, and in the Obama army, that man was White House chief of staff Rahm Emanuel. And make no mistake—Emanuel is a ruthless and fierce enemy of the Second Amendment.

After raising millions of dollars for Bill Clinton’s presidential campaign, Emanuel served as assistant to the president for political affairs, and then as senior adviser to the president for policy and strategy. In practice, he was in charge of the Clinton antigun campaign.

To pass the 1994 ban on so-called assault weapons, Clinton had told reluctant Democrats that once the ban was passed, the Clinton administration would be finished with gun control. Add this to the list of Clinton lies.