

FOIA Marker

This is not a textual record. This FOIA Marker indicates that material has been removed during FOIA processing by Obama Presidential Library staff.

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM)

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

Stack:	Row:	Sect.:	Shelf:	Pos.:	FRC ID:	Location or Hollinger ID:	NARA Number:	OA Number:
M	22	14	9	2	6886	8669	6414	7155

Folder Title:

1212793

Withdrawn/Redacted Material

Obama Presidential Library

DOCUMENT NO.	FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
001	Schedule	Schedule of the President	4	09/27/2016	P6/b6;
002	Calendar	[Calendar]	7	09/2016	P6/b6;
003	Briefing	Council of Economic Advisers Daily Economic Briefing	4	09/26/2016	P5;
004	Memorandum	Radio Interview with Ryan Seacrest	3	09/25/2016	PRM;
005	Memorandum	Radio Interview with Steve Harvey - From: Hillary for America Press Office	3	09/25/2016	PRM;
006	Transcript	Transcript of Hillary Clinton's September Interview	5	09/20/2016	PRM;

COLLECTION TITLE:

FRC 8545 |

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Withdrawn/Redacted Material

Obama Presidential Library

DOCUMENT NO.	FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
007	Memorandum	Radio Interview with Ryan Seacrest - From: Hillary for America Press Office	3	09/25/2016	PRM;
008	Memorandum	Interview with Ta-Nehisi Coates for the Atlantic - From: Jen Psaki	2	09/26/2016	P5;
009	Information Sheet	Moments	11	N. D.	P5;
010	Q and A	Background Topline Points and Q&A	6	N. D.	P5;

COLLECTION TITLE:

FRC 8545 |

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Paul Raizk

1212793
FG001-07

Executive Office of The President
Barcode Scanning Sheet



Collection Code:

SECLOG

Scanned by
ORM

Staff Name:

Document Date:

September 27, 2016

Correspondent:

Subject/Description:

BRIEFING PAPERS



SCHEDULE OF THE PRESIDENT

PRIVATE

MEETING BREAKDOWN FOR PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2016

WASHINGTON, DC

FYI: House in Session → 9/30

FYI: Senate in Session → 9/30

Back from the OVAL

9/27/16

10:00 – 10:30 am PRESIDENTIAL DAILY BRIEFING

Location: The Oval Office

PRESS: CLOSED

Attendees:

- 1. Denis McDonough
- 2. Avril Haines
- 3. Lisa Monaco
- 4. Ben Rhodes
- 5. Colin Kahl
- 6. Director Clapper

11:00 – 11:30 am WHMO DEPARTURE PHOTOS

Location: The Oval Office

POC: Carl Barnett

Attendees: 83 participants // 50 clicks

PRESS: CLOSED

Format:

- The Military Aide introduces each service member and their guest(s) to **YOU**
- The participants walk forward in front of the Resolute Desk and pose for a photo with **YOU**
- Following the photo, participants depart and the next group enters the Oval Office
- **YOU** repeat this process for all participants and their guests

Attendees:

- 1. Dabney Kern, Acting Director, White House Military Office
- 2. LCDR Richard Lawlor, Military Aide to the President
- 3. 50 departing WHMO personnel and their immediate family (manifested in event memo)

11:45 – 11:50 am MOVE TO THE DOCTOR’S OFFICE

11:50 – 12:20 pm OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS TIME

Location: The Doctor’s Office

POC: Pat Cunnane

PRESS: CLOSED

Attendees:

- 1. Eric Schultz
- 2. David Simas



12:20 – 12:25 pm

MOVE TO THE OVAL OFFICE

12:30 – 1:30 pm



1:30 – 2:15 pm

DESK TIME

Location: The Oval Office
PRESS: CLOSED

P6/b(6)

2:15 – 2:45 pm



2:45 – 2:55 pm

INTERVIEW PREP

Location: The Oval Office
POC: Peter Velz
PRESS: CLOSED

- Attendees:**
1. Valerie Jarrett
 2. Jen Psaki
 3. Addie Whisenant, Senior Director of African American Media

2:55 – 3:55 pm

INTERVIEW WITH TA-NEHISI COATES FOR THE ATLANTIC

Location: The Oval Office
POC: Pat Cunnane
Attendees: **YOU** + Ta-Nehisi Coates, National Correspondent, The Atlantic
Setup: Seated Interview
PRESS: CLOSED // WILL RUN IN THE JANUARY ISSUE OF THE ATLANTIC

Format:

- **YOU** greet Ta-Nehisi Coates at the entrance to the Oval Office
- **YOU** participate in a 45-minute interview
- Interview concludes and **YOU** thank Ta-Nehisi Coates
- Ta-Nehisi Coates departs

3:55 – 4:25 pm



4:25 – 4:30 pm

LOAD MOTORCADE

4:30 – 4:40 pm

EN ROUTE THE DIXON RESIDENCE

Spare: Dr. Jennifer Pena, Amanda Lucidon



LIMO: POTUS
Control: LCDR Rik Lawlor
Support: Joe Paulsen, Marvin Nicholson, Luke Rosa, Caitria Mahoney,
CPT Jennifer Miller
Press: Dominique Mann, PRESS POOL

4:40 – 4:45 pm

4:45 – 4:50 pm

4:50 – 5:45 pm

P6/b(6)



Attendees manifested in event memo

5:45 – 5:50 pm

LOAD MOTORCADE

5:50 – 6:00 pm

EN ROUTE THE WHITE HOUSE

Spare: Dr. Jennifer Pena, Amanda Lucidon

LIMO: POTUS

Control: LCDR Rik Lawlor

Support: David Simas, Joe Paulsen, Marvin Nicholson, Luke Rosa, Caitria Mahoney, CPT Jennifer Miller

Press: Dominique Mann, PRESS POOL

6:00 – 6:30 pm

WRAP UP

Location: The Oval Office

POC: Jenny Wang

PRESS: CLOSED

RON

THE WHITE HOUSE

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
<p>25</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>AM/PM- No Schedule</p> <p>RON WH</p>	<p>26</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>FYI: House in Session → 9/30 FYI: Senate in Session → 9/30</p> <p>Scheduler: Bollinger</p> <p>10:30-11:00 am- PDB 11:00-11:50 am- Desk Time 11:50-11:55 am- Call Prep 11:55-12:15 pm- Conference Call w/Rabbis for Rosh Hashanah 12:30-1:00 pm- Lunch 1:00-1:30 pm- POTUS Time 1:30-2:00 pm- Desk Time 2:00-2:05 pm- Move to the Residence 2:05-2:20 pm- Drop-By Wounded Warrior Tour 2:20-2:25 pm- Move to the Oval Office 2:40-2:55 pm- Oval Office Drop-By 3:05-3:10 pm- Event Prep 3:15-3:20 pm- En Route Mellon Auditorium 3:20-3:25 pm- Arrive Mellon Auditorium 3:25-3:35 pm- Photo Line 3:35-3:40 pm- Move to Off Stage Announce 3:40-4:10 pm- Remarks to the Tribal Nations Conference 4:15-4:20 pm- En Route WH 4:30-5:15 pm- Cabinet Engagement (DHS) 5:30-6:00 pm- Wrap Up 6:00-6:30 pm- Desk Time</p> <p>RON WH</p>	<p>27</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Bollinger</p> <p>10:00-10:30 am- PDB 11:00-11:30 am- WHMO Departure Photos 11:45-11:50 am- Move to Doc Office or Map Room 11:50-12:20 pm- OPSO Radio Time 12:20-12:25 pm- Move to Oval Office</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>1:30-2:15 pm- Desk Time</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>2:45-2:55 pm- Interview Prep 2:55-3:55 pm- Interview with Ta-Nehisi Coates</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>5:50-6:00 pm- En Route WH 6:00-6:30 pm- Wrap</p> <p>RON WH</p>	<p>28</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC FORT LEE, VA WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>10:00-10:30 am- PDB 11:00-11:20 am- NASCAR Sprint Cup Championship Visit 11:20-11:25 am- Move to the Oval Office 11:35-11:55 am- Oval Office Drop-By 12:10-12:20 pm- Make-A-Wish Visit 12:30-12:35 pm- Load Marine One 12:35-12:45 pm- Lift to JBA 12:45-12:50 pm- Arrive JBA//Load AF1 12:50-1:30 pm- Wheels Up JBA to Richmond Int'l Airport//Lunch En Route 1:30-1:35 pm- Arrive Richmond Int'l Airport//Load Marine One 1:35-1:50 pm- Lift from Richmond Int'l Airport to Fort Lee 1:50-1:55 pm- Arrive TBD LZ // Load Motorcade 1:55-2:00 pm- En Route Clark Fitness Center at Fort Lee 2:00-2:05 pm- Arrive Clark Fitness Center at Fort Lee//Arrival Greet//Move to Hold 2:05-2:15 pm- Prep</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>2:20-2:25 pm- Move to Off-Stage Announce 2:25-3:40 pm- CNN Town Hall 3:40-3:45 pm- Photos with Motorcade Drivers and Law Enforcement 3:50-3:55 pm- En Route TBD</p>	<p>29</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>10:00-10:30 am- PDB 11:00-12:05 am - Receiving Line with U.S. Olympic Team 12:05-12:20 pm- Visit of U.S. Olympic Team</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>1:30-2:00 pm- POTUS Time 2:00-2:30 pm- Desk Time</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>3:45-4:05 pm- PPO Recognition Photos 4:20-4:50 pm- OLA Calls 5:00-5:15 pm- Oval Office Drop-By 5:30-6:00 pm- Wrap Up 6:00-6:30 pm- Desk Time</p> <p>RON WH</p>	<p>30</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>FYI: SxSL Build begins</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>10:20-10:40 am- En Route Annandale High School 10:40-10:45 am- Arrive Annandale High School//Arrival Greet//Move to TBD 10:45-10:55 am- Hold for Photo Line 10:55-11:00 am- Move to Off-Stage Announce 11:00-11:30 am- Hold for Remarks 11:35-11:55 am- En Route WH 11:55-12:00 pm- Arrive WH//Move to Oval Office 12:00-12:30 pm- POTUS Time 12:30-12:35 pm- Arrive WH//Proceed to Oval Office 12:35-1:05 pm- Lunch 1:05-2:15 pm- POTUS Time/Desk Time 2:15-2:30 pm- Joint FLOTUS Oval Office Drop-By 2:45-2:55 pm- Promotion Ceremony for Dr. Ronny Jackson 3:00-3:10 pm- Promotion Ceremony for CDR Rik Lawlor 3:10-3:15 pm- Move to TBD Location 3:15-3:35 pm- Weekly Address & Video Tapings 3:35-3:40 pm- Move to the Oval Office 3:55-4:20 pm- WH Departure Photos 4:30-5:00 pm- Wrap Up</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>RON WH</p>	

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			<p>3:55-4:00 pm- Arrive TBD//Move to TBD 4:00-4:15 pm- Remarks to Troops at Fort Lee 4:15-4:45 pm- Rope Line with Troops from Fort Lee 4:50-4:55 pm- En Route Landing Zone 4:55-5:00 pm- Arrive Landing Zone // Load Marine One 5:00-5:15 pm- Lift from Fort Lee to Richmond Int'l Airport 5:15-5:20 pm- Arrive Richmond Int'l Airport//Load AF1 5:20-6:00 pm- Wheels Up Richmond Int'l Airport to JBA 6:00-6:05 pm- Arrive JBA//Load Marine One 6:05-6:15 pm- Lift from JBA to the South Lawn 6:15-6:20 pm- Arrive the South Lawn//Proceed to the Residence</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 20px; margin: 5px 0;"></div> <p>RON WH</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">P6/b(6)</div>		

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
						<p>1</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p>
<p>2</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>P6/b(6)</p>	<p>3</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>6:00-6:20 pm- Hold for South by South Lawn Photo Line 6:20-6:25 pm- Move to Residence</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>6:55-7:00 pm- Move to TBD 7:00-7:45 pm- Panel Discussion for South by South Lawn</p>	<p>4</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>FYI: Senate in Session → 10/7</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Note: Rain date for South by South Lawn Events</p> <p>Note: Hold 10 min for Oval Office Drop-By</p>	<p>5</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>TAMPA, FL</p> <p>MIAMI, FL</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p>	<p>6</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)</p> <p>Note: Hold time for Weekly Address & Video Taping</p> <p>Note: Hold 15 min for Drop-By to WH Kitchen Garden Fall Harvest</p> <p>11:45-11:50 am- Move to the Residence 11:50-12:10 pm- Visit of Pittsburgh Penguins</p>	<p>7</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>CHICAGO, IL</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p>	<p>8</p> <p>CHICAGO, IL</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p>
<p>9</p> <p>CHICAGO, IL</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p>	<p>10</p> <p>COLUMBUS DAY</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p>	<p>11</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>TBD, NC</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Rothblum</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p> <p>[Redacted]</p> <p>Note: Hold time for Oval Office Drop-By w/Eisenhower Fellows (AM)</p> <p>Note: Hold time for USSS Departure Photos (AM)</p>	<p>12</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Bollinger</p> <p>Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)</p> <p>4:25-5:10 pm- Hispanic Heritage Month Reception</p>	<p>13</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>PITTSBURGH, PA</p> <p>TBD, OH</p> <p>TBD, OH</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p>	<p>14</p> <p>TBD, OH</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Boyle</p> <p>HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL</p>	<p>15</p> <p>WASHINGTON, DC</p> <p>Scheduler: Bollinger</p>

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
16 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Bollinger	17 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: No lifts on 10/17 or 10/18 Scheduler: Bollinger Note: Hold time for NSC Departure Photos	18 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: No lifts on 10/17 or 10/18 Scheduler: Rothblum Note: Hold time for Italy State Visit <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div>	19 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Boyle Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	20 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Bollinger	21 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Boyle Note: Hold PM for Social Event Note: Hold 10 min for Oval Office Drop-By	22 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Boyle
23 WASHINGTON, DC TBD, NV TBD, CA Scheduler: Boyle HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL	24 TBD, CA TBD, CA Scheduler: Bollinger HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL	25 TBD, CA WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Bollinger <div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 15px; width: 100%;"></div> HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL	26 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Boyle Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	27 WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Bollinger Note: Hold time for WHMO Departure Photos	28 WASHINGTON, DC TBD WASHINGTON, DC Scheduler: Boyle HOLD FOR DOMESTIC TRAVEL	29 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: No lifts on 10/29-31 Scheduler: Boyle
30 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: No lifts on 10/29-31 Scheduler: Boyle	31 HALLOWEEN WASHINGTON, DC FYI: No lifts on 10/29-31 Scheduler: Boyle Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">P6/b(6)</div>				

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
		1 WASHINGTON, DC	2 WASHINGTON, DC	3 WASHINGTON, DC	4 WASHINGTON, DC	5 WASHINGTON, DC
6 WASHINGTON, DC	7 WASHINGTON, DC	8 ELECTION DAY WASHINGTON, DC	9 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold 60 mins per ADB</i> <i>Note: Hold time for WH Internship Program Photo</i>	10 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for Visit of Cleveland Cavaliers</i> <i>Note: Hold 60 mins per ADB</i> <i>Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)</i>	11 VETERAN'S DAY WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold time for Veteran's Day Breakfast (ER)</i> <i>Note: Hold for In-Town</i>	12 WASHINGTON, DC
13 WASHINGTON, DC Princeton vs. GW Women's Basketball Game	14 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: House in Session → 11/17 FYI: Senate in Session → 11/18	15 HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL	16 HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL	17 HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL	18 HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL	19 FYI: APEC, Peru (11/19-20) HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL
20 FYI: APEC, Peru (11/19-20) HOLD FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL	21 WASHINGTON, DC	22 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold time for Medal of Freedom Award Ceremony</i> <i>Note: Hold 5 min for Oval Office Drop-By</i>	23 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for Turkey Pardoning</i> <i>Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)</i>	24 THANKSGIVING WASHINGTON, DC	25 WASHINGTON, DC	26 WASHINGTON, DC
27 WASHINGTON, DC	28 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: Senate in Session → 12/2	29 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: House in Session → 12/2	30 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for EOP Reception #1</i> <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #1</i>			

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
				1 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for Tree Lighting</i> Note: Hold 15 min for Oval Office Drop-By Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	2 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #2</i> <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #3</i>	3 WASHINGTON, DC
4 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: Kennedy Center Honors Event	5 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: House in Session → 12/8 FYI: Senate in Session → 12/9 <i>Note: Hold for Congressional Ball</i>	6 WASHINGTON, DC	7 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #4</i> <i>Note: Hold for Press Reception #1</i>	8 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #5</i> <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #6</i>	9 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #7</i> <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #8</i>	10 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: Army-Navy Game, Baltimore, MD
11 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for USSS Reception</i>	12 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: Senate in Session → 12/16 <i>Note: Hold for Senior Staff Dinner</i>	13 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: House in Session → 12/16 <i>Note: Hold for EOP Reception #2</i> <i>Note: Hold for Press Reception #2</i>	14 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for Hanukkah Celebration</i> <i>Note: Hold for General Reception #9</i>	15 WASHINGTON, DC <i>Note: Hold for Residence Reception</i>	16 WASHINGTON, DC HONOLULU, HI	17 HONOLULU, HI
18 HONOLULU, HI	19 HONOLULU, HI	20 HONOLULU, HI	21 HONOLULU, HI	22 HONOLULU, HI	23 HONOLULU, HI	24 HONOLULU, HI
25 CHRISTMAS DAY HONOLULU, HI	26 HONOLULU, HI	27 HONOLULU, HI	28 HONOLULU, HI	29 HONOLULU, HI	30 HONOLULU, HI	31 HONOLULU, HI

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
1 WASHINGTON, DC	2 WASHINGTON, DC	3 WASHINGTON, DC Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	4 WASHINGTON, DC	5 WASHINGTON, DC	6 WASHINGTON, DC	7 WASHINGTON, DC
8 WASHINGTON, DC	9 WASHINGTON, DC	10 WASHINGTON, DC Note: Hold 60 min for WH Departure Photos (PM)	11 WASHINGTON, DC	12 WASHINGTON, DC	13 WASHINGTON, DC	14 WASHINGTON, DC
15 WASHINGTON, DC	16 WASHINGTON, DC	17 WASHINGTON, DC	18 WASHINGTON, DC	19 WASHINGTON, DC	20 WASHINGTON, DC FYI: Inauguration	

THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington

September 26, 2016

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: Jeff Zients

SUBJECT: Daily Economic Briefing

Attached is the daily updated economic information from CEA and the daily update from Treasury.

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Briefing	Council of Economic Advisers Daily Economic Briefing	4	09/26/2016	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

FRC 8545 [

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

WHMO Departure Photos

THE WHITE HOUSE

Washington

Sept 26, 2016

WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE DEPARTURE PHOTO EVENT

DATE: Sept 27, 2016
LOCATION: Oval Office
TIME: 11:00 – 11:30 AM
From: Carl Barnett

I. PURPOSE

Traditionally, YOU have posed for monthly departure photos with personnel assigned to the White House Military Office. These events provide YOU with a forum to thank the members for their service and support while assigned to the White House. Participants will either be retiring from active duty or departing the White House Military Office for new assignments.

II. PARTICIPANTS

- White House Military Office Representative
- LCDR Richard I. Lawlor, Military Aide to the President
- 50 departing WHMO personnel and their immediate family member(s)

III. PRESS PLAN

CLOSED Press.

IV. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- The Military Aide will introduce each service member and their guest(s) to YOU.
- The participants will walk forward in front of the Resolute Desk where YOU will pose for a photograph.

V. REMARKS

N/A

VI. ATTACHMENT

- A. List of Participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY (34 participants; 19 clicks)

- SGT William Milton, USA & Ms. Alexie Milton, Sister
- SGT Christopher Chew, USA
- SSG Daniel Davenport, USA
- MAJ Evelyn Kempe, USA & Mrs. Marilyn Balogh, Sister
- MSG Ranata Thornton, USA & Mr. Deandre Thorton, Husband
- SGT Elisha Vernon, USA & Elena Vernon, Mother
- ETCM Brett Bergeron, USN & Mrs. Nicole Bergeron, Wife
- Sgt Isaac Tomac, USMC
- SGT Timothy Schwab, USA
- SGT Justin Joyner, USA & Mrs. Jacquelyn Paige, Friend
- Sgt Alec Andrzejek, USMC & Allen Storby, Grandpa
- Cpl Jacob Andrzejek, USMC & Karrine Storby, Mother
- SGT Ricardo Rios, Jr., USA & Mrs. Madelynn Rios, Wife
- SSG Theophilus Harp, USA & Mrs. Makisha Brown, Wife
- SSG Marcus Jefferson, USA & Mrs. Ernestine Jefferson, Wife
- SGT Richard Cofell, USA & Mrs. Ariel Cofell, Wife
- PO1 Adrian Bautista, USN & Kristine Joyce Bautista, Wife
- MSgt Mark James Johnson, USAF & Sara Johnson, Wife
- SGT Gary Barton, USA & Mary Barton, Wife

MARINE HELICOPTER SQUADRON ONE (25 participants; 16 clicks)

- CDR John Sims, USN & Mrs. Margaret Douglass, Mother
- MSgt Anthony Colston, USMC & Tonia Colston, Wife
- SSgt Andy Lormeus, USMC & Mrs. Anne-Marie Lormeus, Mother
- Sgt Connor O'Neill, USMC & Mrs. Mary O'Neill, Mother
- Sgt Manuel Cisneros, USMC
- Sgt William Colt, USMC
- Sgt Nicholas Hodges, USMC
- Sgt Trenton Robinson, USMC
- Sgt Aaron Saran, USMC
- Cpl Kyle Finseth, USMC
- Cpl Elizabeth Flanagan, USMC
- Cpl Jesse Jensen, USMC & Mrs. Paige Jensen, Wife
- Cpl Danny Johnson, USMC & Mrs. Brittany Johnson, Wife
- Cpl Richard Martinezojea, USMC & Guadalupe Ojea, Mother
- Cpl Gentry Seely, USMC & Nina Guevarra, Wife
- Cpl Paul Stevens, USMC & Mrs. Stacey Brausch, Mother

CAMP DAVID (9 participants; 6 clicks)

- CPO Denny Thao, USN
- Cpl Michael Whitmire, USMC
- Cpl Collin Shoffstall, USMC & Mr. Michael Shoffstall, Father
- Cpl Frank Gonzales, USMC & Mr. Frank Gonzales, Father
- Cpl Jonathan Janosz, USMC & Ms. Allyson Sweet, Fiance
- Cpl Ryan Coleman, USMC

WHITE HOUSE OPERATIONS (4 participants; 2 clicks)

- LtCol Todd Mercer, USAF & Mrs. Laura Mercer, Wife
- CPT Jay Berger, USA & Mrs. Kelli Berger, Wife

POLICY, PLANS AND REQUIREMENTS (1 participants; 1 clicks)

- SSG Lijia Burgos, USA

WHITE HOUSE MEDICAL UNIT (2 participants; 1 click)

- Maj Suzanne See, USAF & Mr. Stephen Wright, Father

WHITE HOUSE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY (3 participants; 2 click)

- SSG Dennis George, USA & Mrs. Nadja George, Wife
- SSG Roslyn Willis, USA

WHITE HOUSE SOCIAL AIDES (4 participants; 2 clicks)

- LT Casey Botts, USN & Mrs. Susan Botts, Mother
- Capt Benjamin Schramm, USMC & Ms. Victoria Schramm, Sister

WHITE HOUSE MILITARY OFFICE (1 participants; 1 clicks)

- TSgt Julie Uranga, USAF

Total With Guests: 83 Total WHMO Members (# of clicks): 50

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Memorandum	Radio Interview with Ryan Seacrest	3	09/25/2016	PRM;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM)

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Memorandum	Radio Interview with Steve Harvey - From: Hillary for America Press Office	3	09/25/2016	PRM;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM)

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Transcript	Transcript of Hillary Clinton's September Interview	5	09/20/2016	PRM;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM)

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Memorandum	Radio Interview with Ryan Seacrest - From: Hillary for America Press Office	3	09/25/2016	PRM;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

Records Management, White House Office of (WHORM)

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

**Interview with Ta-Nehisi
Coates**

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Memorandum	Interview with Ta-Nehisi Coates for the Atlantic - From: Jen Psaki	2	09/26/2016	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

FRC 8545 [

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

A

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Information Sheet	Moments	11	N. D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

FRC 8545 [

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

B

Withdrawal Marker

Obama Presidential Library

FORM	SUBJECT/TITLE	PAGES	DATE	RESTRICTION(S)
Q and A	Background Topline Points and Q&A	6	N. D.	P5;

**This marker identifies the original location of the withdrawn item listed above.
For a complete list of items withdrawn from this folder, see the
Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet at the front of the folder.**

COLLECTION:

FRC 8545 [

SERIES:

Subject Files - FG001-07 (Briefing Papers)

FOLDER TITLE:

1212793

FRC ID:

6886

OA Num.:

7155

NARA Num.:

6414

FOIA ID and Segment:

22-16972-F

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

Deed of Gift Restrictions

- A. Closed by Executive Order 13526 governing access to national security information.
- B. Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Records Not Subject to FOIA

Court Sealed - The document is withheld under a court seal and is not subject to the Freedom of Information Act.

TA-NEHISI COATES ARTICLES

Fear of a Black President

As a candidate, Barack Obama said we needed to reckon with race and with America's original sin, slavery. But as our first black president, he has avoided mention of race almost entirely. In having to be "twice as good" and "half as black," Obama reveals the false promise and double standard of integration.

TA-NEHISI COATES SEPTEMBER 2012

The irony of President Barack Obama is best captured in his comments on the death of Trayvon Martin, and the ensuing fray. Obama has pitched his presidency as a monument to moderation. He peppers his speeches with nods to ideas originally held by conservatives. He routinely cites Ronald Reagan. He effusively praises the enduring wisdom of the American people, and believes that the height of insight lies in the town square. Despite his sloganeering for change and progress, Obama is a conservative revolutionary, and nowhere is his conservative character revealed more than in the very sphere where he holds singular gravity—race.

Part of that conservatism about race has been reflected in his reticence: for most of his term in office, Obama has declined to talk about the ways in which race complicates the American present and, in particular, his own presidency. But then, last February, George Zimmerman, a 28-year-old insurance underwriter, shot and killed a black teenager, Trayvon Martin, in Sanford, Florida. Zimmerman, armed with a 9 mm handgun, believed himself to be tracking the movements of a possible intruder. The possible intruder turned out to be a boy in a hoodie, bearing nothing but candy and iced tea. The local authorities at first declined to make an arrest, citing Zimmerman's claim of self-defense. Protests exploded nationally. Skittles and Arizona Iced Tea assumed totemic power. Celebrities—the actor Jamie Foxx, the former Michigan governor Jennifer Granholm, members of the Miami Heat—were photographed wearing hoodies. When Representative Bobby Rush of Chicago took to the House floor to denounce racial profiling, he was removed from the chamber after donning a hoodie mid-speech.

The reaction to the tragedy was, at first, trans-partisan. Conservatives either said nothing or offered tepid support for a full investigation—and in fact it was the Republican governor of Florida, Rick Scott, who appointed the special prosecutor who ultimately charged Zimmerman with second-degree murder. As civil-rights activists descended on Florida, National Review, a magazine that once opposed integration, ran a column proclaiming "Al Sharpton Is Right." The belief that a young man should be able to go to the store for Skittles and an iced tea and not be killed by a neighborhood--watch patroller seemed un-controversial.

By the time reporters began asking the White House for comment, the president likely had already given the matter considerable thought. Obama is not simply America's first black president—he is the first president who could credibly teach a black-studies class. He is fully versed in the works of Richard Wright and James Baldwin, Frederick Douglass and Malcolm X. Obama's two autobiographies are deeply concerned with race, and in front of black audiences he is apt to cite important but obscure political figures such as George Henry White, who served

from 1897 to 1901 and was the last African American congressman to be elected from the South until 1970. But with just a few notable exceptions, the president had, for the first three years of his presidency, strenuously avoided talk of race. And yet, when Trayvon Martin died, talk Obama did:

When I think about this boy, I think about my own kids, and I think every parent in America should be able to understand why it is absolutely imperative that we investigate every aspect of this, and that everybody pulls together—federal, state, and local—to figure out exactly how this tragedy happened ...

But my main message is to the parents of Trayvon Martin. If I had a son, he'd look like Trayvon. I think they are right to expect that all of us as Americans are going to take this with the seriousness it deserves, and that we're going to get to the bottom of exactly what happened.

The moment Obama spoke, the case of Trayvon Martin passed out of its national-mourning phase and lapsed into something darker and more familiar—racialized political fodder. The illusion of consensus crumbled. Rush Limbaugh denounced Obama's claim of empathy. The Daily Caller, a conservative Web site, broadcast all of Martin's tweets, the most loutish of which revealed him to have committed the un-pardonable sin of speaking like a 17-year-old boy. A white--supremacist site called Stormfront produced a photo of Martin with pants sagging, flipping the bird. Business Insider posted the photograph and took it down without apology when it was revealed to be a fake.

Newt Gingrich pounced on Obama's comments: "Is the president suggesting that if it had been a white who had been shot, that would be okay because it wouldn't look like him?" Reverting to form, National Review decided the real problem was that we were interested in the deaths of black youths only when nonblacks pulled the trigger. John Derbyshire, writing for Taki's Magazine, an iconoclastic libertarian publication, composed a racist advice column for his children inspired by the Martin affair. (Among Derbyshire's tips: never help black people in any kind of distress; avoid large gatherings of black people; cultivate black friends to shield yourself from charges of racism.)

The notion that Zimmerman might be the real victim began seeping out into the country, aided by PR efforts by his family and legal team, as well as by various acts of stupidity—Spike Lee tweeting Zimmerman's address (an act made all the more repugnant by the fact that he had the wrong Zimmer-man), NBC misleadingly editing a tape of Zimmerman's phone conversation with a police dispatcher to make Zimmer-man seem to be racially profiling Martin. In April, when Zimmerman set up a Web site to collect donations for his defense, he raised more than \$200,000 in two weeks, before his lawyer asked that he close the site and launched a new, independently managed legal-defense fund. Although the trial date has yet to be set, as of July the fund was still raking in up to \$1,000 in donations daily.

But it would be wrong to attribute the burgeoning support for Zimmerman to the blunders of Spike Lee or an NBC producer. Before President Obama spoke, the death of Trayvon Martin was generally regarded as a national tragedy. After Obama spoke, Martin became material for an Internet vendor flogging paper gun-range targets that mimicked his hoodie and his bag of

Skittles. (The vendor sold out within a week.) Before the president spoke, George Zimmerman was arguably the most reviled man in America. After the president spoke, Zimmerman became the patron saint of those who believe that an apt history of racism begins with Tawana Brawley and ends with the Duke lacrosse team.

The irony of Barack Obama is this: he has become the most successful black politician in American history by avoiding the radioactive racial issues of yesteryear, by being “clean” (as Joe Biden once labeled him)—and yet his indelible blackness irradiates everything he touches. This irony is rooted in the greater ironies of the country he leads. For most of American history, our political system was premised on two conflicting facts—one, an oft-stated love of democracy; the other, an undemocratic white supremacy inscribed at every level of government. In warring against that paradox, African Americans have historically been restricted to the realm of protest and agitation. But when President Barack Obama pledged to “get to the bottom of exactly what happened,” he was not protesting or agitating. He was not appealing to federal power—he was employing it. The power was black—and, in certain quarters, was received as such.

No amount of rhetorical moderation could change this. It did not matter that the president addressed himself to “every parent in America.” His insistence that “everybody [pull] together” was irrelevant. It meant nothing that he declined to cast aspersions on the investigating authorities, or to speculate on events. Even the fact that Obama expressed his own connection to Martin in the quietest way imaginable—“If I had a son, he’d look like Trayvon”—would not mollify his opposition. It is, after all, one thing to hear “I am Trayvon Martin” from the usual placard-waving rabble-rousers. Hearing it from the commander of the greatest military machine in human history is another.

By virtue of his background—the son of a black man and a white woman, someone who grew up in multiethnic communities around the world—Obama has enjoyed a distinctive vantage point on race relations in America. Beyond that, he has displayed enviable dexterity at navigating between black and white America, and at finding a language that speaks to a critical mass in both communities. He emerged into national view at the Democratic National Convention in 2004, with a speech heralding a nation uncolored by old prejudices and shameful history. There was no talk of the effects of racism. Instead Obama stressed the power of parenting, and condemned those who would say that a black child carrying a book was “acting white.” He cast himself as the child of a father from Kenya and a mother from Kansas and asserted, “In no other country on Earth is my story even possible.” When, as a senator, he was asked if the response to Hurricane Katrina evidenced racism, Obama responded by calling the “ineptitude” of the response “color-blind.”

Racism is not merely a simplistic hatred. It is, more often, broad sympathy toward some and broader skepticism toward others. Black America ever lives under that skeptical eye. Hence the old admonishments to be “twice as good.” Hence the need for a special “talk” administered to black boys about how to be extra careful when relating to the police. And hence Barack Obama’s insisting that there was no racial component to Katrina’s effects; that name-calling among children somehow has the same import as one of the oldest guiding principles of American policy—white supremacy. The election of an African American to our highest political office

was alleged to demonstrate a triumph of integration. But when President Obama addressed the tragedy of Trayvon Martin, he demonstrated integration's great limitation—that acceptance depends not just on being twice as good but on being half as black. And even then, full acceptance is still withheld. The larger effects of this withholding constrict Obama's presidential potential in areas affected tangentially—or seemingly not at all—by race. Meanwhile, across the country, the community in which Obama is rooted sees this fraudulent equality, and quietly seethes.

Obama's first term has coincided with a strategy of massive resistance on the part of his Republican opposition in the House, and a record number of filibuster threats in the Senate. It would be nice if this were merely a reaction to Obama's politics or his policies—if this resistance truly were, as it is generally described, merely one more sign of our growing “polarization” as a nation. But the greatest abiding challenge to Obama's national political standing has always rested on the existential fact that if he had a son, he'd look like Trayvon Martin. As a candidate, Barack Obama understood this.

“The thing is, a black man can't be president in America, given the racial aversion and history that's still out there,” Cornell Belcher, a pollster for Obama, told the journalist Gwen Ifill after the 2008 election. “However, an extraordinary, gifted, and talented young man who happens to be black can be president.”

Belcher's formulation grants the power of anti-black racism, and proposes to defeat it by not acknowledging it. His is the perfect statement of the Obama era, a time marked by a revolution that must never announce itself, by a democracy that must never acknowledge the weight of race, even while being shaped by it. Barack Obama governs a nation enlightened enough to send an African American to the White House, but not enlightened enough to accept a black man as its president.

Before Barack Obama, the “black president” lived in the African American imagination as a kind of cosmic joke, a phantom of all that could never be. White folks, whatever their talk of freedom and liberty, would not allow a black president. They could not tolerate Emmett's boyish gaze. Dr. King turned the other cheek, and they blew it off. White folks shot Lincoln over “nigger equality,” ran Ida Wells out of Memphis, beat Freedom Riders over bus seats, slaughtered Medgar in his driveway like a dog. The comedian Dave Chappelle joked that the first black president would need a “Vice President Santiago”—because the only thing that would ensure his life in the White House was a Hispanic president--in-waiting. A black president signing a bill into law might as well sign his own death certificate.

And even if white folks could moderate their own penchant for violence, we could not moderate our own. A long-suffering life on the wrong side of the color line had denuded black people of the delicacy necessary to lead the free world. In a skit on his 1977 TV comedy show, Richard Pryor, as a black president, conceded that he was “courting an awful lot of white women” and held a press conference that erupted into a riot after a reporter requested that the president's momma clean his house. More recently, the comedian Cedric the Entertainer joked that a black president would never have made it through Monicagate without turning a press conference into

a battle royal. When Chappelle tried to imagine how a black George W. Bush would have justified the war against Saddam Hussein, his character (“Black Bush”) simply yelled, “The nigger tried to kill my father!”

Thus, in hard jest, the paradoxes and problems of a theoretical black presidency were given voice. Racism would not allow a black president. Nor would a blackness, forged by America’s democratic double-talk, that was too ghetto and raw for the refinement of the Oval Office. Just beneath the humor lurked a resonant pain, the scars of history, an aching doubt rooted in the

belief that “they” would never accept us. And so in our Harlems and Paradise Valleys, we invoked a black presidency the way a legion of 5-foot point guards might invoke the dunk—as evidence of some great cosmic injustice, weighty in its import, out of reach.

And yet Spud Webb lives.

When presidential candidate Barack Obama presented himself to the black community, he was not to be believed. It strained credulity to think that a man sporting the same rigorously managed haircut as Jay-Z, a man who was a hard-core pickup basketball player, and who was married to a dark-skinned black woman from the South Side, could coax large numbers of white voters into the booth. Obama’s blackness quotient is often a subject of debate. (He himself once joked, while speaking to the National Association of Black Journalists in 2007, “I want to apologize for being a little bit late, but you guys keep on asking whether I’m black enough.”) But despite Obama’s post-election reluctance to talk about race, he has always displayed both an obvious affinity for black culture and a distinct ability to defy black America’s worst self-conceptions.

The crude communal myth about black men is that we are in some manner unavailable to black women—either jailed, dead, gay, or married to white women. A corollary myth posits a direct and negative relationship between success and black culture. Before we actually had one, we could not imagine a black president who loved being black. In *The Audacity of Hope*, Obama describes his first kiss with the woman who would become his wife as tasting “of chocolate.” The line sounds ripped from *Essence* magazine. That’s the point.

These cultural cues became important during Obama’s presidential run and beyond. Obama doesn’t merely evince blackness; he uses his blackness to signal and court African Americans, semaphoring in a cultural dialect of our creation—crooning Al Green at the Apollo, name-checking Young Jeezy, regularly appearing on the cover of black magazines, weighing the merits of Jay-Z versus Kanye West, being photo-graphed in the White House with a little black boy touching his hair. There is often something mawkish about this signaling—like a Virginia politico thickening his southern accent when talking to certain audiences. If you’ve often been the butt of political signaling (Sister Souljah, Willie Horton), and rarely the recipient, these displays of cultural affinity are powerful. And they are all the more powerful because Obama has been successful. Whole sections of America that we had assumed to be negro-phobic turned out in support of him in 2008. Whatever Obama’s other triumphs, arguably his greatest has been an expansion of the black imagination to encompass this: the idea that a man can be culturally black and many other things also—biracial, Ivy League, intellectual, cosmopolitan, temperamentally conservative, presidential.

It is often said that Obama's presidency has given black parents the right to tell their kids with a straight face that they can do anything. This is a function not only of Obama's election to the White House but of the way his presidency broadcasts an easy, almost mystic, blackness to the world. The Obama family represents our ideal imagining of ourselves—an ideal we so rarely see on any kind of national stage.

What black people are experiencing right now is a kind of privilege previously withheld—seeing our most sacred cultural practices and tropes validated in the world's highest office. Throughout the whole of American history, this kind of cultural power was wielded solely by whites, and with such ubiquity that it was not even commented upon. The expansion of this cultural power beyond the private province of whites has been a tremendous advance for black America. Conversely, for those who've long treasured white exclusivity, the existence of a President Barack Obama is discombobulating, even terrifying. For as surely as the iconic picture of the young black boy reaching out to touch the president's curly hair sends one message to black America, it sends another to those who have enjoyed the power of whiteness.

In America, the rights to own property, to serve on a jury, to vote, to hold public office, to rise to the presidency have historically been seen as belonging only to those people who showed particular integrity. Citizenship was a social contract in which persons of moral standing were transformed into stakeholders who swore to defend the state against threats external and internal. Until a century and a half ago, slave rebellion ranked high in the fevered American imagination of threats necessitating such an internal defense.

In the early years of our republic, when democracy was still an unproven experiment, the Founders were not even clear that all white people should be entrusted with this fragile venture, much less the bestial African. Thus Congress, in 1790, declared the following:

All free white persons who have, or shall migrate into the United States, and shall give satisfactory proof, before a magistrate, by oath, that they intend to reside therein, and shall take an oath of allegiance, and shall have resided in the United States for one whole year, shall be entitled to all the rights of citizenship.

In such ways was the tie between citizenship and whiteness in America made plain from the very beginning. By the 19th century, there was, as Matthew Jacobson, a professor of history and American studies at Yale, has put it, “an un-questioned acceptance of whiteness as a prerequisite for natural-ized citizenship.” Debating Abraham Lincoln during the race for a U.S. Senate seat in Illinois in 1858, Stephen Douglas asserted that “this government was made on the white basis” and that the Framers had made “no reference either to the Negro, the savage Indians, the Feejee, the Malay, or an other inferior and degraded race, when they spoke of the equality of men.”

After the Civil War, Andrew Johnson, Lincoln's successor as president and a unionist, scoffed at awarding the Negro the franchise:

The peculiar qualities which should characterize any people who are fit to decide upon the management of public affairs for a great state have seldom been combined. It is the glory of white men to know that they have had these qualities in sufficient measure to build upon this

continent a great political fabric and to preserve its stability for more than ninety years, while in every other part of the world all similar experiments have failed. But if anything can be proved by known facts, if all reasoning upon evidence is not abandoned, it must be acknowledged that in the progress of nations Negroes have shown less capacity for government than any other race of people. No independent government of any form has ever been successful in their hands. On the contrary, wherever they have been left to their own devices they have shown a constant tendency to relapse into barbarism.

The notion of blacks as particularly unfit for political equality persisted well into the 20th century. As the nation began considering integrating its military, a young West Virginian wrote to a senator in 1944:

I am a typical American, a southerner, and 27 years of age ... I am loyal to my country and know but reverence to her flag, BUT I shall never submit to fight beneath that banner with a negro by my side. Rather I should die a thousand times, and see Old Glory trampled in the dirt never to rise again, than to see this beloved land of ours become degraded by race mongrels, a throw back to the blackest specimen from the wilds.

The writer—who never joined the military, but did join the Ku Klux Klan—was Robert Byrd, who died in 2010 as the longest-serving U.S. senator in history. Byrd's rejection of political equality was echoed in 1957 by William F. Buckley Jr., who addressed the moral disgrace of segregation by endorsing disenfranchisement strictly based on skin color:

The central question that emerges—and it is not a parliamentary question or a question that is answered by merely consulting a catalog of the rights of American citizens, born Equal—is whether the White community in the South is entitled to take such measures as are necessary to prevail, politically and culturally, in areas in which it does not predominate numerically? The sobering answer is Yes—the White community is so entitled because, for the time being, it is the advanced race.

Buckley, the founder of National Review, went on to assert, “The great majority of the Negroes of the South who do not vote do not care to vote and would not know for what to vote if they could.”

The idea that blacks should hold no place of consequence in the American political future has affected every sector of American society, transforming whiteness itself into a monopoly on American possibilities. White people like Byrd and Buckley were raised in a time when, by law, they were assured of never having to compete with black people for the best of anything. Blacks used inferior public pools and inferior washrooms, attended inferior schools. The nicest restaurants turned them away. In large swaths of the country, blacks paid taxes but could neither attend the best universities nor exercise the right to vote. The best jobs, the richest neighborhoods, were giant set-asides for whites—universal affirmative action, with no pretense of restitution.

Slavery, Jim Crow, segregation: these bonded white people into a broad aristocracy united by the salient fact of unblackness. What Byrd saw in an integrated military was the crumbling of the

ideal of whiteness, and thus the crumbling of an entire society built around it. Whatever the saintly nonviolent rhetoric used to herald it, racial integration was a brutal assault on whiteness. The American presidency, an unbroken streak of nonblack men, was, until 2008, the greatest symbol of that old order.

Watching Obama rack up victories in states like Virginia, New Mexico, Ohio, and North Carolina on Election Night in 2008, anyone could easily conclude that racism, as a national force, had been defeated. The thought should not be easily dismissed: Obama's victory demonstrates the incredible distance this country has traveled. (Indeed, William F. Buckley Jr. later revised his early positions on race; Robert Byrd spent decades in Congress atoning for his.) That a country that once took whiteness as the foundation of citizenship would elect a black president is a victory. But to view this victory as racism's defeat is to forget the precise terms on which it was secured, and to ignore the quaking ground beneath Obama's feet.

During the 2008 primary, The New Yorker's George Packer journeyed to Kentucky and was shocked by the brazen declarations of white identity. "I think he would put too many minorities in positions over the white race," one voter told Packer. "That's my opinion." That voter was hardly alone. In 2010, Michael Tesler, a political scientist at Brown University, and David Sears, a professor of psychology and political science at UCLA, were able to assess the impact of race in the 2008 primary by comparing data from two 2008 campaign and election studies with previous surveys of racial resentment and voter choice. As they wrote in *Obama's Race: The 2008 Election and the Dream of a Post-Racial America*:

No other factor, in fact, came close to dividing the Democratic primary electorate as powerfully as their feelings about African Americans. The impact of racial attitudes on individual vote decisions ... was so strong that it appears to have even outstripped the substantive impact of racial attitudes on Jesse Jackson's more racially charged campaign for the nomination in 1988.

Seth Stephens-Davidowitz, a doctoral candidate in economics at Harvard, is studying how racial animus may have cost Obama votes in 2008. First, Stephens--Davidowitz ranked areas of the country according to how often people there typed racist search terms into Google. (The areas with the highest rates of racially charged search terms were West Virginia, western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, upstate New York, and southern Mississippi.) Then he compared Obama's voting results in those areas with John Kerry's four years earlier. So, for instance, in 2004 Kerry received 50 percent of the vote in the media markets of both Denver and Wheeling (which straddles the Ohio--West Virginia border). Based on the Democratic groundswell in 2008, Obama should have received about 57 percent of the popular vote in both regions. But that's not what happened. In the Denver area, which had one of the nation's lowest rates of racially charged Google searching, Obama received the predicted 57 percent. But in Wheeling, which had a high rate of racially charged Google searching, Obama's share of the popular vote was only 48 percent. Of course, Obama also picked up some votes because he is black. But, aggregating his findings nationally, Stephens-Davidowitz has concluded that Obama lost between 3 and 5 percentage points of the popular vote to racism.

After Obama won, the longed-for post-racial moment did not arrive; on the contrary, racism intensified. At rallies for the nascent Tea Party, people held signs saying things like Obama Plans White Slavery. Steve King, an Iowa congressman and Tea Party favorite, complained that Obama “favors the black person.” In 2009, Rush Limbaugh, bard of white decline, called Obama’s presidency a time when “the white kids now get beat up, with the black kids cheering ‘Yeah, right on, right on, right on.’ And of course everybody says the white kid deserved it—he was born a racist, he’s white.” On Fox & Friends, Glenn Beck asserted that Obama had exposed himself as a guy “who has a deep-seated hatred for white people or the white culture ... This guy is, I believe, a racist.” Beck later said he was wrong to call Obama a racist. That same week he also called the president’s health-care plan “reparations.”

One possible retort to this pattern of racial paranoia is to cite the Clinton years, when an ideological fever drove the right wing to derangement, inspiring militia movements and accusations that the president had conspired to murder his own lawyer, Vince Foster. The upshot, by this logic, is that Obama is experiencing run-of-the-mill political opposition in which race is but a minor factor among much larger ones, such as party affiliation. But the argument assumes that party affiliation itself is unconnected to race. It pretends that only Toni Morrison took note of Clinton’s particular appeal to black voters. It forgets that Clinton felt compelled to attack Sister Souljah. It forgets that whatever ignoble labels the right wing pinned on Clinton’s health-care plan, “reparations” did not rank among them.

Michael Tesler, following up on his research with David Sears on the role of race in the 2008 campaign, recently published a study assessing the impact of race on opposition to and support for health-care reform. The findings are bracing. Obama’s election effectively racialized white Americans’ views, even of health-care policy. As Tesler writes in a paper published in July in *The American Journal of Political Science*, “Racial attitudes had a significantly greater impact on health care opinions when framed as part of President Obama’s plan than they had when the exact same policies were attributed to President Clinton’s 1993 health care initiative.”

While Beck and Limbaugh have chosen direct racial assault, others choose simply to deny that a black president actually exists. One in four Americans (and more than half of all Republicans) believe Obama was not born in this country, and thus is an illegitimate president. More than a dozen state legislatures have introduced “birther bills” demanding proof of Obama’s citizenship as a condition for putting him on the 2012 ballot. Eighteen percent of Republicans believe Obama to be a Muslim. The goal of all this is to delegitimize Obama’s presidency. If Obama is not truly American, then America has still never had a black president.

White resentment has not cooled as the Obama presidency has proceeded. Indeed, the GOP presidential-primary race featured candidates asserting that the black family was better off under slavery (Michele Bachmann, Rick Santorum); claiming that Obama, as a black man, should oppose abortion (Santorum again); or denouncing Obama as a “food-stamp president” (Newt Gingrich).

The resentment is not confined to Republicans. Earlier this year, West Virginia gave 41 percent of the popular vote during the Democratic primary to Keith Judd, a white incarcerated felon

(Judd actually defeated Obama in 10 counties). Joe Manchin, one of West Virginia's senators, and Earl Ray Tomblin, its governor, are declining to attend this year's Democratic convention, and will not commit to voting for Obama.

It is often claimed that Obama's unpopularity in coal--dependent West Virginia stems from his environmental policies. But recall that no state ranked higher on Seth Stephens--Davidowitz's racism scale than West Virginia. Moreover, Obama was unpopular in West Virginia before he became president: even at the tail end of the Democratic primaries in 2008, Hillary Clinton walloped Obama by 41 points. A fifth of West Virginia Democrats openly professed that race played a role in their vote.

What we are now witnessing is not some new and complicated expression of white racism—rather, it's the dying embers of the same old racism that once rendered the best pickings of America the exclusive province of unblackness. Confronted by the thoroughly racialized backlash to Obama's presidency, a stranger to American politics might conclude that Obama provoked the response by relentlessly pushing an agenda of radical racial reform. Hardly. Daniel Gillion, a political scientist at the University of Pennsylvania who studies race and politics, examined the Public Papers of the Presidents, a compilation of nearly all public presidential utterances—proclamations, news-conference remarks, executive orders—and found that in his first two years as president, Obama talked less about race than any other Democratic president since 1961. Obama's racial strategy has been, if anything, the opposite of radical: he declines to use his bully pulpit to address racism, using it instead to engage in the time-honored tradition of black self-hectoring, railing against the perceived failings of black culture.

His approach is not new. It is the approach of Booker T. Washington, who, amid a sea of white terrorists during the era of Jim Crow, endorsed segregation and proclaimed the South to be a land of black opportunity. It is the approach of L. Douglas Wilder, who, in 1986, not long before he became Virginia's first black governor, kept his distance from Jesse Jackson and told an NAACP audience: "Yes, dear Brutus, the fault is not in our stars, but in ourselves ... Some blacks don't particularly care for me to say these things, to speak to values ... Somebody's got to. We've been too excusing." It was even, at times, the approach of Jesse Jackson himself, who railed against "the rising use of drugs, and babies making babies, and violence ... cutting away our opportunity."

The strategy can work. Booker T.'s Tuskegee University still stands. Wilder became the first black governor in America since Reconstruction. Jackson's campaign moved the Democratic nominating process toward proportional allocation of delegates, a shift that Obama exploited in the 2008 Democratic primaries by staying competitive enough in big states to rack up delegates even where he was losing, and rolling up huge vote margins (and delegate-count victories) in smaller ones.

And yet what are we to make of an integration premised, first, on the entire black community's emulating the Huxt-ables? An equality that requires blacks to be twice as good is not equality—it's a double standard. That double standard haunts and constrains the Obama presidency, warning him away from candor about America's sordid birthmark.

Another political tradition in black America, running counter to the one publicly embraced by Obama and Booker T. Washington, casts its skepticism not simply upon black culture but upon the entire American project. This tradition stretches back to Frederick Douglass, who, in 1852, said of his native country, “There is not a nation on the earth guilty of practices more shocking and bloody than are the people of the United States at this very hour.” It extends through Martin Delany, through Booker T.’s nemesis W. E. B. Du Bois, and through Malcolm X. It includes Martin Luther King Jr., who at the height of the Vietnam War called America “the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today.” And it includes Obama’s former pastor, he of the famous “God Damn America” sermon, Jeremiah Wright.

The Harvard Law professor Randall Kennedy, in his 2011 book, *The Persistence of the Color Line: Racial Politics and the Obama Presidency*, examines this tradition by looking at his own father and Reverend Wright in the context of black America’s sense of patriotism. Like Wright, the elder Kennedy was a veteran of the U.S. military, a man seared and radicalized by American racism, forever remade as a vociferous critic of his native country: in virtually any American conflict, Kennedy’s father rooted for the foreign country.

The deep skepticism about the American project that Kennedy’s father and Reverend Wright evince is an old tradition in black America. Before Frederick Douglass worked, during the Civil War, for the preservation of the Union, he called for his country’s destruction. “I have no love for America,” he declaimed in a lecture to the American Anti-Slavery Society in 1847. “I have no patriotism ... I desire to see [the government] overthrown as speedily as possible and its Constitution shivered in a thousand fragments.”

Kennedy notes that Douglass’s denunciations were the words of a man who not only had endured slavery but was living in a country where whites often selected the Fourth of July as a special day to prosecute a campaign of racial terror:

On July 4, 1805, whites in Philadelphia drove blacks out of the square facing Independence Hall. For years thereafter, blacks attended Fourth of July festivities in that city at their peril. On July 4, 1834, a white mob in New York City burned down the Broadway Tabernacle because of the antislavery and anti-racist views of the church’s leaders. Firefighters in sympathy with the arsonists refused to douse the conflagration. On July 4, 1835, a white mob in Canaan, New Hampshire, destroyed a school open to blacks that was run by an abolitionist. The ante-bellum years were liberally dotted with such episodes.

Jeremiah Wright was born into an America of segregation—overt in the South and covert in the North, but wounding wherever. He joined the Marines, vowing service to his country, at a time when he wouldn’t have been allowed to vote in some states. He built his ministry in a community reeling from decades of job and housing discrimination, and heaving under the weight of drugs, gun violence, and broken families. Wright’s world is emblematic of the African Americans he ministered to, people reared on the anti-black-citizenship tradition—poll taxes, states pushing stringent voter-ID laws—of Stephen Douglas and Andrew Johnson and William F. Buckley Jr. The message is “You are not American.” The countermessage—God damn

America—is an old one, and is surprising only to people unfamiliar with the politics of black life in this country. Un-fortunately, that is an apt description of large swaths of America.

Whatever the context for Wright's speech, the surfacing of his remarks in 2008 was utterly inconvenient not just for the Obama campaign but for much of black America. One truism holds that black people are always anxious to talk about race, eager to lecture white people at every juncture about how wrong they are and about the price they must pay for past and ongoing sins. But one reason Obama rose so quickly was that African Americans are war-weary. It was not simply the country at large that was tired of the old Baby Boomer debates. Blacks, too, were sick of talking about affirmative action and school busing. There was a broad sense that integration had failed us, and a growing disenchantment with our appointed spokespeople. Obama's primary triumphs in predominantly white states gave rise to rumors of a new peace, one many blacks were anxious to achieve.

And even those black Americans who embrace the tradition of God Damn America do so not with glee but with deep pain and anguish. Both Kennedy's father and Wright were military men. My own father went to Vietnam dreaming of John Wayne, but came back quoting Malcolm X. The poet Lucille Clifton once put it succinctly:

They act like they don't love their country

No

what it is

is they found out

their country don't love them.

In 2008, as Obama's election became imaginable, it seemed possible that our country had indeed, at long last, come to love us. We did not need our Jeremiah Wrights, our Jesse Jacksons, our products of the polarized '60s getting in the way. Indeed, after distancing himself from Wright, Obama lost almost no black support.

Obama offered black America a convenient narrative that could be meshed with the larger American story. It was a narrative premised on Crispus Attucks, not the black slaves who escaped plantations and fought for the British; on the 54th Massachusetts, not Nat Turner; on stoic and saintly Rosa Parks, not young and pregnant Claudette Colvin; on a Christlike Martin Luther King Jr., not an avenging Malcolm X. Jeremiah Wright's presence threatened to rupture that comfortable narrative by symbolizing that which makes integration impossible—black rage.

From the "inadequate black male" diatribe of the Hillary Clinton supporter Harriet Christian in 2008, to Rick Santelli's 2009 rant on CNBC against subsidizing "losers' mortgages," to Representative Joe Wilson's "You lie!" outburst during Obama's September 2009 address to Congress, to John Boehner's screaming "Hell no!" on the House floor about Obamacare in 2010, politicized rage has marked the opposition to Obama. But the rules of our racial politics require that Obama never respond in like fashion. So frightening is the prospect of black rage given voice and power that when Obama was a freshman senator, he was asked, on national television,

to denounce the rage of Harry Belafonte. This fear continued with demands that he keep his distance from Louis Farrakhan and culminated with Reverend Wright and a presidency that must never betray any sign of rage toward its white opposition.

Thus the myth of “twice as good” that makes Barack Obama possible also smothers him. It holds that African Americans—enslaved, tortured, raped, discriminated against, and subjected to the most lethal homegrown terrorist movement in American history—feel no anger toward their tormentors. Of course, very little in our history argues that those who seek to tell bold truths about race will be rewarded. But it was Obama himself, as a presidential candidate in 2008, who called for such truths to be spoken. “Race is an issue that I believe this nation cannot afford to ignore right now,” he said in his “More Perfect Union” speech, which he delivered after a furor erupted over Reverend Wright’s “God Damn America” remarks. And yet, since taking office, Obama has virtually ignored race.

Whatever the political intelligence of this calculus, it has broad and deep consequences. The most obvious result is that it prevents Obama from directly addressing America’s racial history, or saying anything meaningful about present issues tinged by race, such as mass incarceration or the drug war. There have been calls for Obama to take a softer line on state-level legalization of marijuana or even to stand for legalization himself. Indeed, there is no small amount of in-consistency in our black president’s either ignoring or upholding harsh drug laws that every day injure the prospects of young black men—laws that could have ended his own, had he been of another social class and arrested for the marijuana use he openly discusses. But the intellectual argument doubles as the counterargument. If the fact of a black president is enough to racialize the wonkish world of health-care reform, what havoc would the Obama touch wreak upon the already racialized world of drug policy?

The political consequences of race extend beyond the domestic. I am, like many liberals, horrified by Obama’s embrace of a secretive drone policy, and particularly the killing of American citizens without any restraints. A president aware of black America’s tenuous hold on citizenship, of how the government has at times secretly conspired against its advancement—a black president with a broad sense of the world—should know better. Except a black president with Obama’s past is the perfect target for right-wing attacks depicting him as weak on terrorism. The president’s inability to speak candidly on race cannot be bracketed off from his inability to speak candidly on every-thing. Race is not simply a portion of the Obama story. It is the lens through which many Americans view all his politics.

But whatever the politics, a total submission to them is a disservice to the country. No one knows this better than Obama himself, who once described patriotism as more than pageantry and the scarfing of hot dogs. “When our laws, our leaders, or our government are out of alignment with our ideals, then the dissent of ordinary Americans may prove to be one of the truest expressions of patriotism,” Obama said in Independence, Missouri, in June 2008. Love of country, like all other forms of love, requires that you tell those you care about not simply what they want to hear but what they need to hear.

But in the age of the Obama presidency, expressing that kind of patriotism is presumably best done quietly, politely, and with great deference.

This spring I flew down to Albany, Georgia, and spent the day with Shirley Sherrod, a longtime civil-rights activist who embodies exactly the kind of patriotism that Obama esteems. Albany is in Dougherty County, where the poverty rate hangs around 30 percent—double that of the rest of the state. On the drive in from the airport, the selection of vendors—payday loans, title loans, and car dealers promising no credit check—evidenced the statistic.

When I met Sherrod at her office, she was working to get a birthday card out to Roger Spooner, whose farm she'd once fought to save. In July 2010, the conservative commentator Andrew Breitbart posted video clips on his Web site of a speech Sherrod had delivered to the NAACP the previous March. The video was edited so that Sherrod, then an official at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, appeared to be bragging about discriminating against a white farmer and thus enacting a fantasy of racial revenge. The point was to tie Obama to the kind of black rage his fevered enemies often impute to him. Fearing exactly that, Sherrod's supervisors at the USDA called her in the middle of a long drive and had her submit her resignation via BlackBerry, telling her, "You're going to be on Glenn Beck tonight."

Glenn Beck did eventually do a segment on Sherrod—one in which he attacked the administration for forcing her out. As it turned out, the full context showed that Sherrod was actually documenting her own turn away from racial anger. The farmer who was the subject of the story came forward, along with his wife, and explained that Sherrod had worked tirelessly to help the family. The farmer was Roger Spooner.

Sherrod's career as an activist, first in civil rights and then later in the world of small farmers like Roger Spooner, was not chosen so much as thrust upon her. Her cousin had been lynched in 1943. Her father was shot and killed by a white relative in a dispute over some cows. There were three witnesses, but the grand jury in her native Baker County did not indict the suspect. Sherrod became an activist with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, registering voters near her hometown. Her husband, Charles Sherrod, was instrumental in leading the Albany Movement, which attracted Martin Luther King Jr. to town. But when Stokely Carmichael rose to lead SNCC and took it in a black-nationalist direction, the Sherrods, committed to non-violence and integration, faced a weighty choice. Carmichael himself had been committed to nonviolence, until the killings and beatings he encountered as a civil-rights activist took their toll. Sherrod, with a past haunted by racist violence, would have seemed ripe for recruitment to the nationalist line. But she, along with her husband, declined, leaving SNCC in order to continue in the tradition of King and nonviolence.

Her achievements from then on are significant. She helped pioneer the farm--collective movement in America, and co-founded New Communities—a sprawling 6,000-acre collective that did everything from growing crops to canning sugar cane and sorghum. New Communities folded in 1985, largely because Ronald Reagan's USDA refused to sign off on a loan, even as it was signing off on money for smaller-scale white farmers. Sherrod went on to work with Farm Aid. She befriended Willie Nelson, held a fellowship with the Kellogg Foundation, and was

shortlisted for a job in President Clinton's Agriculture Department. Still, she remained relatively unknown except to students of the civil-rights movement and activists who promoted the rights of small farmers. And unknown she would have remained, had she not been very publicly forced out of her position by the administration of the country's first black president.

Through most of her career as an agriculture activist, Sherrod had found the USDA to be a barrier to the success of black farmers. What hurt black farms the most were the discriminatory practices of local officials in granting loans. Sherrod spent years protesting these practices. But then, after the election of Barack Obama, she was hired by the USDA, where she would be supervising the very people she'd once fought. Now she would have a chance to ensure fair and nondiscriminatory lending practices. Her appointment represented the kind of unnoticed but significant changes Obama's election brought.

But then the administration, intimidated by a resurgent right wing specializing in whipping up racial resentment, compelled Sherrod to resign on the basis of the misleading clips. When the full tape emerged, the administration was left looking ridiculous.

And cowardly. An e-mail chain later surfaced in which the White House congratulated Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack's staff for getting ahead of the news cycle. None of them had yet seen the full tape. That the Obama administration would fold so easily gives some sense of how frightened it was of a protracted fight with any kind of racial subtext, particularly one that had a subtext of black rage. Its enemies understood this, and when no black rage could be found, they concocted some. And the administration, in a panic, knuckled under.

Violence at the hands of whites robbed Shirley Sherrod of a cousin and a father. White rage outlined the substantive rules of her life: Don't quarrel with white people. Don't look them in the eye. Avoid Route 91 after dark. White racism destroyed New Communities, a fact validated by the nearly \$13 million the organization received in the class-action suit it joined alleging racial discrimination by the local USDA officials granting loan applications. (Which means that her being forced out by Vilsack was the second time the USDA had wronged her directly.) And yet through it all, Sherrod has hewed to the rule of "twice as good." She has preached nonviolence and integration. The very video that led to her dismissal was of a speech aimed at black people, warning them against the dangers of succumbing to rage.

Driving down a sparse country road, Sherrod and I pulled over to a grassy footpath and stepped out at the spot where her father had been shot and killed in 1965. We then drove a few miles into Newton, and stopped at a large brick building that used to be the courthouse where Sherrod had tried to register to vote a few months after her father's death but had been violently turned back by the sheriff; where a year later Sherrod's mother pursued a civil case against her husband's killer. (She lost.) For this, Sherrod's mother enjoyed routine visits from white terror-ists, which abated only after she, pregnant with her dead husband's son, appeared in the doorway with a gun and began calling out names of men in the mob.

When we got back into the car, I asked Sherrod why she hadn't given in to rage against her father's killers and sided with Stokely Car-michael. "It was simple for me," she said. "I really wanted to work. I wanted to win."

I asked Sherrod if she thought the president had a grasp of the specific history of the region and of the fights waged and the sacrifices made in order to make his political journey possible. “I don’t think he does,” Sherrod said. “When he called me [shortly after the incident], he kept saying he understood our struggle and all we’d fought for. He said, ‘Read my book and you’ll see.’ But I had read his book.”

In 2009, Sergeant James Crowley arrested Henry Louis Gates Jr., the eminent professor of African American studies at Harvard, at his front door in Cambridge, for, essentially, sassing him. When President Obama publicly asserted the stupidity of Crowley’s action, he was so besieged that the controversy threatened to derail what he hoped would be his signature achievement—health-care reform. Obama, an African American male who had risen through the ranks of the American elite, was no doubt sensitive to untoward treatment at the hands of the police. But his expounding upon it so provoked right-wing rage that he was forced away from doing the kind of truth-telling he’d once lauded. “I don’t know if you’ve noticed,” Obama said at the time, “but nobody’s been paying much attention to health care.”

Shirley Sherrod has worked all her life to make a world where the rise of a black president born of a biracial marriage is both conceivable and legal. She has endured the killing of relatives, the ruination of enterprises, and the defaming of her reputation. Crowley, for his actions, was feted in the halls of American power, honored by being invited to a “beer summit” with the man he had arrested and the leader of the free world. Shirley Sherrod, unjustly fired and defamed, was treated to a brief phone call from a man whose career, in some profound way, she had made possible. Sherrod herself is not immune to this point. She talked to me about crying with her husband while watching Obama’s Election Night speech. In her new memoir, *The Courage to Hope*, she writes about a different kind of tears: when she discussed her firing with her family, her mother, who’d spent her life facing down racism at its most lethal, simply wept. “What will my babies say?,” Sherrod cried to her husband, referring to their four small granddaughters. “How can I explain to my children that I got fired by the first black president?”

In 2000, an undercover police officer followed a young man named Prince Jones from suburban Maryland through Washington, D.C., into Northern Virginia and shot him dead, near the home of his girlfriend and 11-month-old daughter. Jones was a student at Howard University. His mother was a radiologist. He was also my friend. The officer tracking Prince thought he was on the trail of a drug dealer. But the dealer he was after was short and wore dreadlocks—Prince was tall and wore his hair cropped close. The officer was black. He wore dreadlocks and a T-shirt, in an attempt to look like a drug dealer. The ruse likely worked. He claimed that after Prince got out of his car and confronted him, he drew his gun and said “Police”; Prince returned to his car and repeatedly rammed the officer’s unmarked car with his own vehicle. The story sounded wildly at odds with the young man I knew. But even if it was accurate, I could easily see myself frightened by a strange car following me for miles, and then reacting wildly when a man in civilian clothes pulled out a gun and claimed to be a cop. (The officer never showed a badge.)

No criminal charges were ever brought against Carlton Jones, the officer who killed my friend and rendered a little girl fatherless. It was as if society barely blinked. A few months later, I moved to New York. When 9/11 happened, I wanted nothing to do with any kind of patriotism,

with the broad national ceremony of mourning. I had no sympathy for the fire-fighters, and something bordering on hatred for the police officers who had died. I lived in a country where my friend—twice as good—could be shot down mere footsteps from his family by agents of the state. God damn America, indeed.

I grew. I became a New Yorker. I came to understand the limits of anger. Watching Barack Obama crisscross the country to roaring white crowds, and then get elected president, I became convinced that the country really had changed—that time and events had altered the nation, and that progress had come in places I'd never imagined it could. When Osama bin Laden was killed, I cheered like everyone else. God damn al-Qaeda.

When trans-partisan mourning erupted around Trayvon Martin, it reinforced my conviction that the world had changed since the death of Prince Jones. Like Prince, Trayvon was suspected of being a criminal chiefly because of the color of his skin. Like Prince's, Trayvon's killer claimed self-defense. Again, with little effort, I could see myself in the shoes of the dead man. But this time, society's response seemed so very different, so much more heartening.

Then the first black president spoke, and the Internet bloomed. Young people began "Trayvoning"—mocking the death of a black boy by photographing themselves in hoodies, with Skittles and iced tea, in a death pose.

In a democracy, so the saying goes, the people get the government they deserve. Part of Obama's genius is a remarkable ability to soothe race consciousness among whites. Any black person who's worked in the professional world is well acquainted with this trick. But never has it been practiced at such a high level, and never have its limits been so obviously exposed. This need to talk in dulcet tones, to never be angry regardless of the offense, bespeaks a strange and compromised integration indeed, revealing a country so infantile that it can countenance white acceptance of blacks only when they meet an Al Roker standard.

And yet this is the uncertain foundation of Obama's historic victory—a victory that I, and my community, hold in the highest esteem. Who would truly deny the possibility of a black presidency in all its power and symbolism? Who would rob that little black boy of the right to feel himself affirmed by touching the kinky black hair of his president?

I think back to the first time I wrote Shirley Sherrod, requesting an interview. Here was a black woman with every reason in the world to bear considerable animosity toward Barack Obama. But she agreed to meet me only with great trepidation. She said she didn't "want to do anything to hurt" the president.

How the Obama Administration Talks to Black America

"Convenient race-talk" from a president who ought to know better

TA-NEHISI COATES MAY 20, 2013

The first lady went to Bowie State and addressed the graduating class. Her speech was a mix of black history and a salute to the graduates. There was also this:

But today, more than 150 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, more than 50 years after the end of "separate but equal," when it comes to getting an education, too many of our young people just can't be bothered. Today, instead of walking miles every day to school, they're sitting on couches for hours playing video games, watching TV. Instead of dreaming of being a teacher or a lawyer or a business leader, they're fantasizing about being a baller or a rapper.

And then this:

If the school in your neighborhood isn't any good, don't just accept it. Get in there, fix it. Talk to the parents. Talk to the teachers. Get business and community leaders involved as well, because we all have a stake in building schools worthy of our children's promise.

... And as my husband has said often, please stand up and reject the slander that says a black child with a book is trying to act white. Reject that.

There's a lot wrong here.

At the most basic level, there's nothing any more wrong with aspiring to be a rapper than there is with aspiring to be a painter, or an actor, or a sculptor. Hip-hop has produced some of the most penetrating art of our time, and inspired much more. My path to this space began with me aspiring to be a rapper. Hip-hop taught me to love literature. I am not alone. Perhaps you should not aspire to be a rapper because it generally does not provide a stable income. By that standard you should not aspire to be a writer, either.

At a higher level, there is the time-honored pattern of looking at the rather normal behaviors of black children and pathologizing them. My son wants to play for Bayern Munich. Failing that, he has assured me he will be Kendrick Lamar. When I was kid I wanted to be Tony Dorsett—or Rakim, whichever came first. Perhaps there is some corner of the world where white kids desire to be Timothy Geithner instead of Tom Brady. But I doubt it. What is specific to black kids is that their dreams often don't extend past entertainment and athletics. That is a direct result of the kind of limited cultural exposure you find in impoverished, segregated neighborhoods. Those neighborhoods are the direct result of American policy.

Enacting and enforcing policy is the job of the Obama White House. When asked about policy for African Americans, the president has said, "I'm not the president of black America. I'm the

president of all America." An examination of the Obama administration's policy record toward black people clearly bears this out. An examination of the Obama administration's rhetoric, as directed at black people, tells us something different.

Yesterday, the president addressed Morehouse College's graduating class, and said this:

We know that too many young men in our community continue to make bad choices. Growing up, I made a few myself. And I have to confess, sometimes I wrote off my own failings as just another example of the world trying to keep a black man down. But one of the things you've learned over the last four years is that there's no longer any room for excuses. I understand that there's a common fraternity creed here at Morehouse: "Excuses are tools of the incompetent, used to build bridges to nowhere and monuments of nothingness."

We've got no time for excuses—not because the bitter legacies of slavery and segregation have vanished entirely; they haven't. Not because racism and discrimination no longer exist; that's still out there. It's just that in today's hyper-connected, hyper-competitive world, with a billion young people from China and India and Brazil entering the global workforce alongside you, nobody is going to give you anything you haven't earned. And whatever hardships you may experience because of your race, they pale in comparison to the hardships previous generations endured—and overcame.

This clearly is a message that only a particular president can offer. Perhaps not the "president of black America," but certainly a president who sees holding African Americans to a standard of individual responsibility as part of his job. This is not a role Barack Obama undertakes with other communities.

Taking the full measure of the Obama presidency thus far, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that this White House has one way of addressing the social ills that afflict black people—and particularly black youth—and another way of addressing everyone else. I would have a hard time imagining the president telling the women of Barnard that "there's no longer room for any excuses"—as though they were in the business of making them. Barack Obama is, indeed, the president of "all America," but he also is singularly the scold of "black America."

It's worth revisiting the president's comments over the past year in reference to gun violence. Visiting his grieving adopted hometown of Chicago, in the wake of the murder of Hadiya Pendleton, the president said this:

For a lot of young boys and young men in particular, they don't see an example of fathers or grandfathers, uncles, who are in a position to support families and be held up in respect. And so that means that this is not just a gun issue; it's also an issue of the kinds of communities that we're building. When a child opens fire on another child, there is a hole in that child's heart that government can't fill. Only community and parents and teachers and clergy can fill that hole.

Two months earlier Obama visited Newtown. The killer, Adam Lanza, was estranged from his father and reportedly devastated by his parents' divorce. But Obama did not speak to Newtown about the kind of community they were building, or speculate on the hole in Adam Lanza's heart.

When Barack Obama says that he is "the president of all America," he is exactly right. When he visits black communities, he visits as the American president, bearing with him all our history, all our good works, and all our sins. Among recent sins, the creation of the ghettos of Chicago—accomplished by 20th-century American social policy—ranks relatively high. Leaving aside the vague connection between fatherhood and the murder of Hadiya Pendleton. Certainly the South Side could use more responsible fathers. Why aren't there more? Do those communities simply lack men of ambition or will? Are the men there genetically inferior?

No president has ever been better read on the intersection of racism and American history than our current one. I strongly suspect that he would point to policy. As the president of "all America," Barack Obama inherited that policy. I would not suggest that it is in his power to singlehandedly repair history. But I would say that, in his role as American president, it is wrong for him to handwave at history, to speak as though the government he represents is somehow only partly to blame. Moreover, I would say that to tout your ties to your community when it is convenient, and downplay them when it isn't, runs counter to any notion of individual responsibility.

I think the stature of the Obama family—the most visible black family in American history—is a great blow in the war against racism. I am filled with pride whenever I see them: There is simply no other way to say that. I think Barack Obama, specifically, is a remarkable human being—wise, self-aware, genuinely curious and patient. It takes a man of particular vision to know, as Obama did, that the country really was ready to send an African American to the White House.

But I also think that some day historians will pore over his many speeches to black audiences. They will see a president who sought to hold black people accountable for their communities, but was disdainful of those who looked at him and sought the same. They will match his rhetoric of individual responsibility with the aggression the administration showed to bail out the banks and the timidity it showed in addressing a foreclosure crisis, which devastated black America (again). They will weigh the rhetoric against an administration whose efforts against housing segregation have been run of the mill. And they will match the talk of the importance of black fathers with the paradox of a president who smoked marijuana in his youth but continued a drug war which daily wrecks the lives of black men and their families. In all of this, those historians will see a discomfiting pattern of convenient race-talk.

I think the president owes black people more than this. In the 2012 election, the black community voted at a higher rate than any other ethnic community in the country. Their votes went almost entirely to Barack Obama. They did this despite a concerted effort to keep them from voting, and they deserve more than a sermon. Perhaps they cannot practically receive targeted policy. But surely they have earned something more than targeted scorn.

Barack Obama, Ferguson, and the Evidence of Things Unsaid

Violence works. Nonviolence does too.

TA-NEHISI COATES MAY 20, 2013

In a recent dispatch from Ferguson, Missouri, Jelani Cobb noted that President Obama's responses to "unpunished racial injustices" constitute "a genre unto themselves." Monday night, when Barack Obama stood before the nation to interpret the non-indictment of Darren Wilson for the killing of Michael Brown, he offered a particularly tame specimen. The elements of "the genre" were all on display—an unmitigated optimism, an urge for calm, a fantastic faith in American institutions, an even-handedness exercised to a fault. But if all the limbs of the construct were accounted for, the soul of the thing was not.

There was none of the spontaneous annoyance at the arrest of Henry Louis Gates, and little of the sheer pain exhibited in the line, "If I had a son, he'd look like Trayvon." The deft hand Obama employed in explaining to Americans why the acquittal of George Zimmerman so rankled had gone arthritic. This was a perfunctory execution of "the genre," offered with all the energy of a man ticking items off a to-do list.

Barack Obama is an earnest moderate. His instincts seem to lead him to the middle ground. For instance, he genuinely believes that there is more overlap between liberals and conservatives than generally admitted. On Monday he nodded toward the "deep distrust" that divides black and brown people from the police, and then pointed out that this was tragic because these are the communities most in need of "good policing." Whatever one makes of this pat framing, it is not a cynical centrism—he believes in the old wisdom of traditional America. This is his strength. This is his weakness. But Obama's moderation is as sincere and real as his blackness, and the latter almost certainly has granted him more knowledge of his country than he generally chooses to share.

In the case of Michael Brown, this is more disappointing than enraging. The genre of Obama race speeches has always been bounded by the job he was hired to do. Specifically, Barack Obama is the president of the United States of America. More specifically, Barack Obama is the president of a congenitally racist country, erected upon the plunder of life, liberty, labor, and land. This plunder has not been exclusive to black people. But black people, the community to which both Michael Brown and Barack Obama belong, have the distinct fortune of having survived in significant numbers. For a creedal country like America, this poses a problem—in nearly every major American city one can find a population of people whose very existence, whose very history, whose very traditions, are an assault upon this country's nationalist instincts. Black people are the chastener of their own country. Their experience says to America, "You wear the mask."

In 2008, Barack Obama's task was to capture the presidency of a country which historically has despised the community from which he hails. This was no mean feat. But more importantly, it was not unprecedented. And just as Léon Blum's prime ministership did not lead to a post-anti-Semitic France, Barack Obama's presidency should never have been expected to lead to a post-

racist America. As it happens, there is nothing about a congenitally racist country that necessarily prevents an individual leader hailing from the pariah class. The office does not care where the leader originates, so long as the leader ultimately speaks for the state. On Monday night, watching Obama both be black and speak for the state was torturous. One got the sense of a man fatigued by people demanding he say something both eminently profound and only partially true. This must be tiring.

Black people know what cannot be said. What clearly cannot be said is that the events of Ferguson do not begin with Michael Brown lying dead in the street, but with policies set forth by government at every level. What clearly cannot be said is that the people of Ferguson are regularly plundered, as their grandparents were plundered, and generally regarded as a slush-fund for the government that has pledged to protect them. What clearly cannot be said is the idea of superhuman black men who "bulk up" to run through bullets is not an invention of Darren Wilson, but a staple of American racism.

What clearly cannot be said is that American society's affection for nonviolence is notional. What cannot be said is that American society's admiration for Martin Luther King Jr. increases with distance, that the movement he led was bugged, smeared, harassed, and attacked by the same country that now celebrates him. King had the courage to condemn not merely the violence of blacks, nor the violence of the Klan, but the violence of the American state itself.

What clearly cannot be said is that violence and nonviolence are tools, and that violence—like nonviolence—sometimes works. "Property damage and looting impede social progress," Jonathan Chait wrote Tuesday. He delivered this sentence with unearned authority. Taken together, property damage and looting have been the most effective tools of social progress for white people in America. They describe everything from enslavement to Jim Crow laws to lynching to red-lining.

"Property damage and looting"—perhaps more than nonviolence—has also been a significant tool in black "social progress." In 1851, when Shadrach Minkins was snatched off the streets of Boston under the authority of the Fugitive Slave Law, abolitionists "stormed the courtroom" and "overpowered the federal guards" to set Minkins free. That same year, when slaveholders came to Christiana, Pennsylvania, to reclaim their property under the same law, they were not greeted with prayer and hymnals but with gunfire.

"Property damage and looting" is a fairly accurate description of the emancipation of black people in 1865, who only five years earlier constituted some \$4 billion in property. The Civil Rights Bill of 1964 is inseparable from the threat of riots. The housing bill of 1968—the most proactive civil-rights legislation on the books—is a direct response to the riots that swept American cities after King was killed. Violence, lingering on the outside, often backed nonviolence during the civil-rights movement. "We could go into meetings and say, 'Well, either deal with us or you will have Malcolm X coming into here,'" said SNCC organizer Gloria Richardson. "They would get just hysterical. The police chief would say, 'Oh no!'"

What cannot be said is that America does not really believe in nonviolence—Barack Obama has said as much—so much as it believes in order. What cannot be said is that there are very

convincing reasons for black people in Ferguson to be nonviolent. But those reasons emanate from an intelligent fear of the law, not a benevolent respect for the law.

The fact is that when the president came to the podium on Monday night there actually was very little he could say. His mildest admonitions of racism had only earned him trouble. If the American public cannot stomach the idea that arresting a Harvard professor for breaking into his own home is "stupid," then there is virtually nothing worthwhile that Barack Obama can say about Michael Brown.

And that is because the death of all of our Michael Browns at the hands of people who are supposed to protect them originates in a force more powerful than any president: American society itself. This is the world our collective American ancestors wanted. This is the world our collective grandparents made. And this is the country that we, the people, now preserve in our fantastic dream. What can never be said is that the Fergusons of America can be changed—but, right now, we lack the will to do it.

Perhaps one day we won't, and maybe that is reason to hope. Hope is what Barack Obama promised to bring, but he was promising something he could never bring. Hope is not the naïveté that would change the face on a racist system and then wash its hands of its heritage. Hope is not feel-goodism built on the belief in unicorns. Martin Luther King had hope, but it was rooted in years of study and struggle, not in looking the other way. Hope is not magical. Hope is earned.

Nonviolence as Compliance

Officials calling for calm can offer no rational justification for Gray's death, and so they appeal for order.

TA-NEHISI COATES APRIL 27, 2015

Rioting broke out on Monday in Baltimore—an angry response to the death of Freddie Gray, a death my native city seems powerless to explain. Gray did not die mysteriously in some back alley but in the custody of the city's publicly appointed guardians of order. And yet the mayor of that city and the commissioner of that city's police still have no idea what happened. I suspect this is not because the mayor and police commissioner are bad people, but because the state of Maryland prioritizes the protection of police officers charged with abuse over the citizens who fall under its purview.

The citizens who live in West Baltimore, where the rioting began, intuitively understand this. I grew up across the street from Mondawmin Mall, where today's riots began. My mother was raised in the same housing project, Gilmore Homes, where Freddie Gray was killed. Everyone I knew who lived in that world regarded the police not with admiration and respect but with fear and caution. People write these feelings off as wholly irrational at their own peril, or their own leisure. The case against the Baltimore police, and the society that superintends them, is easily made:

Over the past four years, more than 100 people have won court judgments or settlements related to allegations of brutality and civil rights violations. Victims include a 15-year-old boy riding a dirt bike, a 26-year-old pregnant accountant who had witnessed a beating, a 50-year-old woman selling church raffle tickets, a 65-year-old church deacon rolling a cigarette and an 87-year-old grandmother aiding her wounded grandson

And in almost every case, prosecutors or judges dismissed the charges against the victims—if charges were filed at all. In an incident that drew headlines recently, charges against a South Baltimore man were dropped after a video showed an officer repeatedly punching him—a beating that led the police commissioner to say he was “shocked.”

The money paid out by the city to cover for the brutal acts of its police department would be enough to build "a state-of-the-art rec center or renovations at more than 30 playgrounds." Instead, the money was used to cover for the brutal acts of the city's police department and ensure they remained well beyond any semblance of justice.

Now, tonight, I turn on the news and I see politicians calling for young people in Baltimore to remain peaceful and "nonviolent." These well-intended pleas strike me as the right answer to the wrong question. To understand the question, it's worth remembering what, specifically, happened to Freddie Gray. An officer made eye contact with Gray. Gray, for unknown reasons, ran. The officer and his colleagues then detained Gray. They found him in possession of a switchblade. They arrested him while he yelled in pain. And then, within an hour, his spine was mostly severed. A week later, he was dead. What specifically was the crime here? What particular threat did Freddie Gray pose? Why is mere eye contact and then running worthy of detention at the hands of the state? Why is Freddie Gray dead?

The people now calling for nonviolence are not prepared to answer these questions. Many of them are charged with enforcing the very policies that led to Gray's death, and yet they can offer no rational justification for Gray's death and so they appeal for calm. But there was no official appeal for calm when Gray was being arrested. There was no appeal for calm when Jerriel Lyles was assaulted. (“The blow was so heavy. My eyes swelled up. Blood was dripping down my nose and out my eye.”) There was no claim for nonviolence on behalf of Venus Green. (“Bitch, you ain’t no better than any of the other old black bitches I have locked up.”) There was no plea for peace on behalf of Starr Brown. (“They slammed me down on my face,” Brown added, her voice cracking. “The skin was gone on my face.”)

When nonviolence is preached as an attempt to evade the repercussions of political brutality, it betrays itself. When nonviolence begins halfway through the war with the aggressor calling time out, it exposes itself as a ruse. When nonviolence is preached by the representatives of the state, while the state doles out heaps of violence to its citizens, it reveals itself to be a con. And none of this can mean that rioting or violence is "correct" or "wise," any more than a forest fire can be "correct" or "wise." Wisdom isn't the point tonight. Disrespect is. In this case, disrespect for the hollow law and failed order that so regularly disrespects the community.

The Near Certainty of Anti-Police Violence

By ignoring illegitimate policing, America has also failed to address the danger this illegitimacy poses to those who must do the policing.

TA-NEHISI COATES JULY 12, 2016

Last month, the Obama administration accused Donald Trump of undercutting American legitimacy in the eyes of the world. Trump's call to ban Muslims wasn't just morally wrong, according to Vice President Joe Biden, it called "into question America's status as the greatest democracy in the history of the world." President Obama followed Biden by asserting that Trump's rhetoric "doesn't reflect our democratic ideals," saying "it will make us less safe, fueling ISIL's notion that the West hates Muslims." His point was simple—wanton discrimination in policy and rhetoric undercuts American legitimacy and fuels political extremism. This lesson is not limited to Donald Trump, and it applies as well abroad as it does at home.

Last week, 25-year-old Micah Xavier Johnson murdered five police officers in Dallas. This abhorrent act of political extremism cannot be divorced from American history—recent or old. In black communities, the police departments have only enjoyed a kind of quasi-legitimacy. That is because wanton discrimination is definitional to the black experience, and very often it is law enforcement which implements that discrimination with violence. A community consistently subjected to violent discrimination under the law will lose respect for it, and act beyond it. When such actions stretch to mass murder it is horrific. But it is also predictable.

To understand the lack of police legitimacy in black communities, consider the contempt in which most white Americans hold O.J. Simpson. Consider their feelings toward the judge and jury in the case. And then consider that this is approximately how black people have felt every few months for generations. It's not just that the belief that Officer Timothy Loehmann got away with murdering a 12-year-old Tamir Rice, it is the reality that police officers have been getting away with murdering black people since the advent of American policing. The injustice compounds, congeals until there is an almost tangible sense of dread and grievance that compels a community to understand the police as objects of fear, not respect.

What does it mean, for instance, that black children are ritually told that any stray movement in the face of the police might result in their own legal killing? When Eric Holder spoke about getting "The Talk" from his father, and then giving it to his own son, many of us nodded our heads. But many more of us were terrified. When the nation's top cop must warn his children to be skeptical of his own troops, how legitimate can the police actually be?

And it is not as if Holder is imagining things. When the law shoots down 12-year-old children, or beats down old women on traffic islands, or chokes people to death over cigarettes; when the law shoots people over compact discs, traffic stops, drivers' licenses, loud conversation, or car trouble; when the law auctions off its monopoly on lethal violence to bemused civilians, when these civilians then kill, and when their victims are mocked in their death throes; when people stand up to defend police as officers of the state, and when these defenders are killed by these

very same officers; when much of this is recorded, uploaded, live-streamed, tweeted, and broadcast; and when government seems powerless, or unwilling, to stop any of it, then it ceases, in the eyes of citizens, to be any sort of respectable law at all. It simply becomes “force.”

In the black community, it’s the force they deploy, and not any higher American ideal, that gives police their power. This is obviously dangerous for those who are policed. Less appreciated is the danger illegitimacy ultimately poses to those who must do the policing. For if the law represents nothing but the greatest force, then it really is indistinguishable from any other street gang. And if the law is nothing but a gang, then it is certain that someone will resort to the kind of justice typically meted out to all other powers in the street.

The Talk is testament to something that went very wrong, long ago, with law enforcement, something that we are scared to see straight. That something has very little to do with the officer on the beat and everything to do with ourselves. There’s a sense that the police departments of America have somehow gone rogue. In fact, the police are one of the most trusted institutions in the country. This is not a paradox. The policies which the police carry out are not the edicts of a dictatorship but the work, as Biden put it, of “the greatest democracy in the history of the world.” Avoiding this fact is central to the current conversation around “police reform” which focuses solely on the actions of police officers and omits everything that precedes these actions. But analyzing the present crisis in law enforcement solely from the contested street, is like analyzing the Iraq War solely from the perspective of Abu Ghraib. And much like the Iraq War, there is a strong temptation to focus on the problems of “implementation,” as opposed to building the kind of equitable society in which police force is used as sparingly as possible.

There is no shortcut out. Sanctimonious cries of nonviolence will not help. “Retraining” can only do so much. Until we move to the broader question of policy, we can expect to see Walter Scotts and Freddie Grays with some regularity. And the extent to which we are tolerant of the possibility of more Walter Scotts and Freddie Grays is the extent to which we are tolerant of the possibility of more Micah Xavier Johnsons.

