

me more of the later 1960s New Left/Old Right dialogue or encounter than anything since then," he says. "Consequently, I find myself more in dialogue with old-fashioned conservatives than I have been, and I suspect that this is widely true."

The Bush wars have brought together anti-imperialists of Left and Right, but their coalescence is being forged not so much overseas as in our backyards. A "wonderful example," says Buhle, "is conservation, small-town life, and the bird population. All kinds of conservatives and small-town Republicans find themselves fending off new demands for exploitation of public resources (threats to water supplies and such)." Farmers markets are another meeting ground, he notes, as the organic and Eat Local and community-supported agriculture movements introduce folks who look homeward rather than into Baghdad suns. Left? Right? What difference does it make? The model organic farm in my neck of the woods, a truly inspiring extended-family venture, was begun by a former college hockey player and active member of the New York State Conservative Party. I know greens, right-to-lifers, NRA members, and just plain apolitical farmers who are relocalizing life, brightening their little corner of the world in their daily acts.

The imperialists, the depersonalizers, the warmakers—a Biblical 40 years have passed since 1968, and they are with us still. But look around and you'll see that the seeds planted by the New Left have not all fallen on hard ground. I think maybe they're ready to flower. ■

*Bill Kauffman's Ain't My America: The Long, Noble History of Antiwar Conservatism and Middle American Anti-Imperialism has just been published by Henry Holt/Metropolitan.*

**Some officers at the Central Intelligence Agency are beginning to wonder if Director Michael Hayden has had a Saul on the road to Damascus experience,**

possibly smitten by the voice of Dick Cheney while traversing the streets of McLean in his armored limousine. Hayden has impressed staff with his willingness to take a hard line with the White House when his analysts have drawn conclusions that do not reflect official policy, as when he supported the controversial National Intelligence Estimate on Iran that was prepared in 2007. But lately he appears to have become much more accommodating. At the end of April, he stated, "It is my opinion, it is the policy of the Iranian government, approved to highest level of that government, to facilitate the killing of Americans in Iraq. Just make sure there's clarity on that." Analysts who have examined the evidence for the Iranian government's direct involvement in killing Americans wonder what exactly Hayden might be referring to. Iranian policy is hardly likely to be benign toward the huge U.S. military presence next door and in the Persian Gulf, but the mullahs have been both pragmatic and cautious in their responses and have generally proved unwilling to provoke retaliation by Washington. Hayden's statement refers to his "opinion," a word that does not sit well with intelligence analysts, who generally prefer to determine whether a proposition is supported by available facts. The director's conclusion that he is providing "clarity" is also disputed. One CIA wag suggested that Hayden is really only expressing clarity about his opinion.



**Intelligence experts are also wondering about Hayden's statement that Syria was close to having the capability to produce one or two nuclear weapons per year prior to the Israeli bombing of a suspected reactor**

last September. There is no evidence to suggest that the Syrians were anywhere close to having such a capability, even if the destroyed building was a nuclear facility, which is by no means certain. Intelligence on the reactor itself came largely from the Israelis and consisted of a video and photos allegedly shot in and around the building, as well as related reports on North Korean activity. The White House has had the information since last summer, but it was tightly held, and very few analysts at CIA or elsewhere in the intelligence community were allowed to review it. Several who saw the evidence were not convinced, asking how the photos were obtained and suspecting that they had been faked. The building's configuration did not necessarily indicate a reactor, and analysts immediately noted that it was lacking anti-aircraft defenses, a protective perimeter, a reprocessing plant to produce a weapon, an adequate power supply, and sufficient water for cooling. There is also no evidence that Syria has any uranium stockpile. Hayden eventually found a couple of senior analysts who were willing to participate in the dog-and-pony show for Congress, but many in the intelligence community remain unconvinced that the Syrian building was a reactor.

*Philip Giraldi, a former CIA Officer, is a fellow at the American Conservative Defense Alliance.*

# The Wright Answer

The speech Obama should deliver—but won't.

By Steve Sailer

HOW DID AS SMOOTH an operator as Barack Obama so mishandle the roadblock he must have known stood between him and the White House: his intimate two-decade-long relationship with his far leftist minister, the erudite and articulate Rev. Dr. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr.? And what, if anything, can he do to repair the damage?

As I asked more than a year ago, "Why has Obama tied his fate to the Rev. Jeremiah Wright, a tactless race man who is the living opposite of the myth Obama is trying to project about himself?"

Obama's candidacy is based on encouraging white voters to assume naïvely that his mixed-race ancestry means he is genetically programmed for racial and political moderation. Indeed, in his long-postponed denunciation of Wright on April 29, the reeling Obama made explicit the amusingly eugenic thinking implicit in Obamamania:

That's in my DNA, trying to promote mutual understanding to insist that we all share common hopes and common dreams as Americans and as human beings.

This kind of fantasizing about Obama was embarrassingly widespread before television finally began paying attention to Wright in March. For example, back on Dec. 30, 2007, conservative columnist George Will enthused about how he can just tell that Obama must share Will's views on race:

Obama seems to understand America's race fatigue, the unbearable

boredom occasioned by today's stale politics generally and by the perfunctory theatrics of race especially. ... The political implications of this transcendence of confining categories are many, profound and encouraging.

Yet if I could see from reading pages 274-295 in Obama's 1995 autobiography *Dreams From My Father: A Story of Race and Inheritance* that Obama's spiritual mentor would be campaign trouble, why couldn't Obama? You might think that such a cool-headed vivisectionist of other people's political and racial fantasies would have guessed that his surrogate father figure wouldn't let him get away with misleading the public about the ideological comradeship that led Obama to Wright in the 1980s. Unfortunately, Obama's self-pity keeps him from being as cold-eyed an analyst of himself as he is of others.

Normally, Obama is to the average politician as the great art forger Eric Hebborn was to the run-of-the-mill counterfeiter. Hebborn tried to follow a moral code of his own devising. On 17th-century paper, he would sketch in the style of, say, Rembrandt, but he would not forge Rembrandt's signature. Hebborn's view was that if Sotheby's was foolish and greedy enough to talk themselves into hoping that they were buying a Rembrandt drawing, well, that was their fault, not his.

Similarly, Obama prefers to mislead without lying outright. He likes to obscure the truth under so many

thoughtful nuances, dependent clauses, Proustian details, lawyerly evasions, and eloquent summarizations of his opponents' arguments that his audiences ultimately make up little fantasies about how he must agree with them. Like Hebborn, Obama seems to feel that he's not to blame if the press and public want to be fooled.

Sadly, though, Obama lied repeatedly, and artlessly, about the Wright sermons now posted on YouTube, asserting that he had never heard such things and they were being taken out of context. The day after Wright's National Press Club barnburner on April 28 exploded these excuses, Obama pathetically claimed, "The person I saw yesterday was not the person that I met 20 years ago."

The reality, of course, is that when the agnostic Obama discovered during his stint as a racial activist in 1980s Chicago that he needed to join a church to have a political career on the South Side, he carefully picked Wright out of all the black ministers he'd met through his job.

In fact, Obama had worried that Wright's Trinity United Church of Christ was too suffused with "middleclassness" to Fight the Power. Obama wrote on page 283 of *Dreams*:

'Some people say,' I interrupted, 'that the church is too upwardly mobile.'

The reverend's smile faded. 'That's a lot of bull,' he said sharply. ...

Still, I couldn't help wondering. ... Would the interest in maintaining