

Romney Predictions Were Right!

By MacPundit



Obama's were wrong.

It seems like everyone is taking another look at Mitt Romney. His popularity is soaring even among many who voted for him only because they were more certain that Obama was the wrong guy than they were that Romney was the right guy.

So what is this all about? Well, it turns out that Mitt is something of a prophet while Barack still doesn't have a clue. You see, some important Romney predictions and recommendations that were roundly ridiculed by President Obama have since come true—and the recommendations turned out to be very good ones.

Obama's liberal supporters laughed at any and all Romney predictions and the so-called mainstream media joined in by derisively mocking Romney every chance they got. In case you're wondering, they are all stone-dead silent on Romney these days.

Here are some of the Romney predictions and recommendations and what has happened since then:

He said that the way Obamacare was designed it would have a negative impact on millions of Americans. Do we really need a detailed account of how destructive it has been so far? Millions have lost the healthcare plans they liked even though President Obama promised that they would be able to keep them.

He predicted that if we pulled all of our troops out of Iraq prematurely, the country would be taken over by terrorists. President Obama dismissed this idea and after he had removed every single one of our troops, he bragged that he had ended the war in Iraq. Incredibly, Vice-President Joe Biden claimed that the stability of Iraq would prove to be one of the Obama Administration's greatest accomplishments! As I write this, the Islamist terrorist organization, ISIS, has taken over the northern part of Syria and a third of Iraq and they have established a Caliphate—a new Islamic state.

He recommended that our veterans be given vouchers so they could have access to private healthcare. In light of the current VA scandal, his idea would most likely have saved some lives.

And then there was the infamous moment in one of the debates when Mr. Obama ridiculed Mitt Romney for saying that Russia was “our number one geopolitical foe.” Obama was harshly condescending toward Romney, speaking to Romney in a hurtful, personal tone. Obama's main point was that the Cold War was long over and that anyone who would think that Russia was still a geopolitical foe, is just about the dumbest, most naive human alive. Of course as I write this, Russia has long since annexed Crimea—simply taken it from Ukraine—and earlier this week it has once again invaded Ukraine with thousands of armed troops.

Many Americans now realize that when Mitt Romney lost the election to Obama in 2012, America was the big loser. By all rational standards, Mitt Romney would have made an outstanding President and Commander-in-Chief.

I voted for Mitt Romney because I thought he was the right choice in 2012. Unless something changes, I believe he is the right choice for 2016.

Have Democrats Forgotten JFK?

By MacPundit

Today's Democratic Party is not the party of JFK



There was a time not too long ago when President John F. Kennedy—JFK—was the Democrat's King Arthur of Camelot. Like Barack Obama, he was idolized by the party devotees. Like Barack Obama, he knew how to deliver a speech well. But that is where the similarities end. In almost all other respects, these men could not be more different.

By even the most rigid standards John F. Kennedy was a legitimate American war hero, and while Mr. Obama's lack of military service should not be held against him, JFK was also a self-avowed American patriot. His personal history, his

grasp of American History, his love of country, were all apparent and, often, eloquently expressed in his speeches and his writings. Additionally, Kennedy always sought to unite us.

Barack Obama cannot make such claims. After almost six years into his presidency, his words, his actions, and his general behavior and demeanor, continue to cause millions of Americans to question his intentions as well as his belief in American Exceptionalism. By the same ageless standards we and other nations have always used, our current president does not appear to be a patriot. Instead, his motives are all too often, suspect. At the very least, he does not rally or inspire the people to be proud of their American heritage and their citizenship. Studies by many credible, non-partisan organizations have declared him to be one of the most polarizing presidents in US History—if not the most. Of course many of us did not need the studies to know that.

Have Democrats forgotten JFK? Yes, I think they have, conveniently. President Obama as well as other current Democrat leaders are far to the left of President Kennedy. When compared to Obama, Kennedy would be a Republican. Did I just hear an outcry from some of you Democrats? If so, I'll bet it's from the far-left radicals who have taken control of the Democratic Party—a party that JFK would not recognize were he here today. But don't take my word for it, let's look at some things that JFK himself said.

"We must know all the facts and hear all the alternatives and listen to all the criticisms. Let us welcome controversial books and controversial authors. For the Bill of Rights is the guardian of our security as well as our liberty."

JFK welcomed and encouraged diverse views and debate. Obama seems to be forever annoyed by both. It has become a standard practice of his and his administration to denigrate and mock those with opposing views or anyone who criticizes Mr. Obama.

Beyond public denigration and mocking, Mr. Obama regularly attempts to suppress media access to his administration. These practices have become so persistent that even left-leaning media outlets are now voicing their disapproval. Pulitzer Prize-winning New York Times reporter James Risen had this to say:

“A lot of people still think this is some kind of game or signal or spin,” he told [Maureen] Dowd. “They don’t want to believe that Obama wants to crack down on the press and whistle-blowers. But he does. He’s the greatest enemy to press freedom in a generation.”

As to the Bill of Rights, unlike JFK who confirmed and protected it, Obama seems to view it as an impediment to his audacious intention to “... fundamentally transform the United States of America.” Thankfully, the Supreme Court has done its job by at least preventing him from becoming an absolute dictator. The top court has ruled against President Obama, unanimously, 20 times during the five and a half years of his presidency.

His own court appointees ruled against him in many cases, as well as in some non-unanimous decisions.

“I believe in an America where the free enterprise system flourishes for all other systems to see and admire – where no businessman lacks either competition or credit – and where no monopoly, no racketeer, no government bureaucracy can put him out of a business that he built up with his own initiative.”

Kennedy was a strong advocate of the free enterprise system. While he believed in common sense government regulation, he opposed big government overregulation that would put a business owner “... out of a business that he built up with his own initiative.” What did Obama have to say about American business and its entrepreneurs? “If you’ve got a business, you

didn't build that. Somebody else made that happen." (See more on that topic here.)

"Every dollar released from taxation that is spared or invested will help create a new job and a new salary."

That was President Kennedy's view on taxation and job creation, and his actions mirrored his rhetoric.

What about President Obama? Well on his very long list of broken promises is this rather infamous one:

"I can make a firm pledge. Under my plan, no family making less than \$250,000 a year will see any form of tax increase. Not your income tax, not your payroll tax, not your capital gains taxes, not any of your taxes."

Not only did he break that promise, he seems to have more new tax "tricks" up his sleeve than a professional magician has card tricks. Politicians are expert at disguising new taxes and Obama is a master at it. Kennedy's tax cuts helped to create jobs and grow the economy; Obama's tax increases and overbearing regulations on business have given us the slowest, weakest, and longest recovery from a recession in seventy years.

"The great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie – deliberate, contrived and dishonest – but the myth – persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic."

JFK was an honest man and he saw the world as it was, not as he wished it to be. He once remarked that "I'm an idealist without illusions." And unlike Obama, he didn't con us. By now, it is well known by all objective and informed people that Barack Obama is a very dishonest man. The well-documented list of his false statements is rather astonishing as is the list of his broken promises. Call them misstatements if you

are in denial, but I encourage you to visit PolitiFact.com as well as other non-partisan sources if you are actually unaware of the extent of Mr. Obama's dishonesty. Only 22% of the Obama statements rated by PolitiFact are considered to be true. Even when we add the mostly true statements the total is still only 47%.

If you haven't already, I also recommend that you read Saul Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals*. Barack Obama once taught the "Rules" to eager young students and he is a master practitioner of them.

"The rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God."

Kennedy said that the rights of man come from the hand of God. He was echoing the words of our founders. Yet Obama clearly believes that they come from the government. Frankly, I find it hard to understand why any free citizen would choose to give their government the power to choose which rights will be given to which citizens. In fact, our founding documents made it quite clear that our rights were bestowed on us at birth and that it was the job of government to make sure they were not taken away from us. Yet Mr. Obama and our liberal Democrat leaders think that they—hence the government—should be the ones to decide who has a right to what.

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Need I even begin to comment on that one? The world has become exponentially more dangerous under Barack Obama. His stated foreign policy principle is "Don't do stupid stuff." Yet given the state of the world, he has done nothing but stupid stuff. Even Hillary Clinton, his former secretary of state,

criticized him for this when she said that great nations need organizing principles and that “Don’t do stupid stuff.” is not an organizing principle. She also said that Obama’s failure to support the Syrian rebels led to the rise of ISIS. I rarely agree with Hillary Clinton, but I do this time. However, this is merely the tip of a very large and dangerous foreign-policy iceberg.

“And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you – ask what you can do for your country.”

Barack Obama’s beliefs and policies are antithetical to virtually everything that John F. Kennedy believed in and promoted. Obama is a hardcore, radical ideologue whose intention is to transform the United States of America into the kind of big government nation that our founders feared most. In little over five years, we have seen a massive transfer of power from the people to the federal government. It is no secret that Mr. Obama and his political machine buy votes through government handouts. As a result, he has successfully transformed America from a society based on individual self-reliance into an entitlement society. Instead of asking what they can do for their country, millions of Americans now ask what their country can do for them. In the process, Mr. Obama has added more debt in less than six years than all previous presidents combined. The results have been catastrophic.

Highly recommended: President Obama Tell All Videos.

A Response to Liberal Dishonesty

By MacPundit

This article addresses liberal dishonesty. It is my response to the author of an email that circulated throughout the Internet during the 2008 presidential campaign. It has never been posted here before. In light of what has happened since then, and considering the alarming state of our nation and the world at large, I think you will find it to be somewhat prophetic and, hopefully, instructive.

Please keep in mind that the original email did not have my comments in it. So as you read this, it will make more sense if you see it two ways: 1) With only the "Author" comments, and 2) with both "Author" and my (the "Me") comments. For example, the first two paragraphs of the original email looked like this:

I'm a little confused. Let me see if I have this straight....

If you grow up in Hawaii, raised by your grandparents, you're "exotic, different."

Author: I'm a little confused. Let me see if I have this straight....

Note: When you get to the end of this you will see that the author was never confused. It is clear that the author knew exactly what he or she wanted to say, and said it.

Author: If you grow up in Hawaii, raised by your grandparents, you're "exotic, different."

Me: Who described Obama as “exotic, different?” Not McCain, not Palin, so who? You didn’t say who because you wanted to imply or insinuate that McCain or Palin or some other Republican leader said these things, which of course they did not.

Author: Grow up in Alaska eating mooseburgers, a quintessential American story.

Me: You did exactly what you accused others of doing to Obama. You made it sound like growing up in Alaska and eating moose burgers was weird or “out there” but to many Alaskans it is quite normal. Anyway, what is the difference between eating beef burgers or moose burgers? Meat eaters are meat eaters and most Americans are meat eaters.

Author: If your name is Barack you’re a radical, unpatriotic Muslim.

Me: Again, who described Obama as “a radical, unpatriotic Muslim”? Not McCain, not Palin, so who? You did what Obama himself did when he said his opponents would say he was different, that he didn’t look like the pictures on our paper money and that he was black. But once again, I don’t know of a single Republican leader or anyone in the McCain camp that ever said any of those things. It’s another old dirty trick: Accuse your opponents of saying things they never said or predict that they will, thus planting the idea in people’s minds.

Author: Name your kids Willow, Trig and Track, you’re a maverick.

Me: You’re still doing what you accuse others of doing. Here, you are sarcastically denigrating Sarah Palin for how she named her children. And, by the way, that is not why she has the reputation of being a maverick. She is a maverick because she cleaned up Alaskan politics by getting rid of corrupt politicians in both parties.

Author: Graduate from Harvard law School and you are unstable.

Me: That's the first time I've heard that one! Apparently you just make this stuff up as you write. Again, you don't name names. So who said this?

Author: Attend 5 different small colleges before graduating, you're well grounded.

Me: Sarah Palin attended different colleges until she found what she wanted. As to being well grounded, I don't think anyone who knows anything about her would question that.

Author: If you spend 3 years as a brilliant community organizer, become the first black President of the Harvard Law Review, create a voter registration drive that registers 150,000 new voters, spend 12 years as a Constitutional Law professor, spend 8 years as a State Senator representing a district with over 750,000 people, become chairman of the state Senate's Health and Human Services committee, spend 4 years in the United States Senate representing a state of 13 million people while sponsoring 131 bills and serving on the Foreign Affairs, Environment and Public Works and Veteran's Affairs committees, you don't have any real leadership experience.

Me: You and your idol have a lot in common. You both say whatever you think is favorable whether or not it is true. I'll tackle these one at a time.

1. Let's start with your description of Obama as a "brilliant community organizer." By any objective appraisal his record as a community organizer was not "brilliant." In fact, after three years of less-than-satisfying results, he left his community organizer job to go to law school. During his three years in South Chicago, one project after another either faltered or failed. First, he got community members to demand a job center that would provide job referrals, but there were

few jobs to distribute and so it did not work out. Then, he tried to create what he called a “second-level consumer economy.” This went nowhere. Finally, an associate advised him to move elsewhere and said that if he stayed there, he was bound to fail. So Obama took the advice and went to law school. Brilliant? Not even close. Was he sincere? Only Obama himself knows that because it is well known that virtually everything he did was calculated to advance his political ambitions. It should also be mentioned that Obama’s relationships during this time were and remain very troubling. I will list only a few here but it is a simple matter for anyone who cares enough (and you should) to do some research if you want to know more. You can start by reading a June 8, 2008 article in the Washington Times. Here’s the link: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jun/08/obamas-a-ssociations-may-haunt-bid/>. You will learn about his associations with Antoin Rezko, William Ayers, Emil Jones Jr., Rashid Khalidi, Rev. Michael Pflieger, and Rev. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr. You can find more Obama associations here.

2. That Barack Obama was the first black president of The Harvard Law Review is certainly to his credit. However, in no way is it a qualification for the presidency of the United States. Do you not know that?
3. He ran a voter registration drive that registered 150,000 new voters. You’re correct on this one but those voters were registered in order to increase the power of Chicago’s Democratic political machine—not for the benefit of our country as a whole. Further, the country is full of people who register new voters but that has never qualified a single one of them to be president of the United States!
4. You said that Obama spent 12 years as a Constitutional Law professor. Untrue. He was never a Constitutional Law professor. In fact, he was never a professor, ever, even

though he and his supporters continue to refer to him as such. His official title was Senior Lecturer. But I'll let Hillary Clinton deal with this one. Here is what her campaign released on March 27, 2008:

"Sen. Obama has often referred to himself as 'a constitutional law professor' out on the campaign trail. He never held any such title. And I think anyone, if you ask anyone in academia the distinction between a professor who has tenure and an instructor that does not, you'll find that there is ... you'll get quite an emotional response.

5. Obama's 8 years as a state senator: Yes, but since when is that a qualification for president? Also, I urge you to check his attendance record and his voting record; they are both pathetic. He was notorious for simply not showing up and when he did, for voting "present" rather than committing himself to a yea or nay vote. Moreover, when he did vote, he took some very radical positions. For example, he voted against requiring medical care for fetuses (babies) who survived abortion procedures. Basically, he said "Let them die." And he did that three times! The fact is that Barack Obama was and still is extreme-left politically. He has never represented mainstream Americans.
6. He spent 4 years in the United States Senate. Again, you are incorrect. He has not yet finished his first 4 years. He is a freshman senator and he has missed 314 votes! Why? Well, one reason is that he has spent most of that time running for president instead of proving himself in the senate before running for president.
7. You said that Obama sponsored 131 bills. Actually, he sponsored 5 more than that—136. Of course, 122 never made it out of committee and only 2 were successfully enacted. And, again, let's not forget that he has missed 314 votes!

From Jan 2005 to Oct 2008, Obama missed 314 of 1,300 roll call votes, which is 24.2%. This is far worse than the median of 2.2% among the lifetime records of senators serving in Oct 2008. It should also be noted that in this short period of time Senator Obama has managed to establish himself as the most liberal member of the U.S. Senate. (According to the non-partisan National Journal) On the other hand, John McCain has sponsored 537 bills of which 31 were successfully enacted. McCain has also co-sponsored 1,232 bills. In addition, McCain has authored many bills and has reached across the aisle to work with Democrats many times. You can view the official records here: <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/person.xpd?id=400629>. Also, there is a big difference between sponsoring a bill, which means to simply sign-on to it, and authoring a bill, which means to actually be the author of it. Anyone can sponsor (sign-on) to a bill.

8. Finally, you keep comparing Obama to Palin. I realize that you want people to think that Obama is running against Sarah Palin. Sorry, he really is running against John McCain.

Author: If your total resume is: local weather girl, 4 years on the city council and 6 years as the mayor of a town with less than 7,000 people, 20 months as the governor of a state with only 650,000 people, then you're qualified to become the country's second highest ranking executive.

Me: Tsk, tsk. So she was just a little old weather girl. I'm sure you endeared yourself to a lot of American women with that remark. So, one might ask, why is she the most popular governor in the U.S.A.? (Her approval rating hovers between 80 – 90%) Just ask the people of Alaska. They will be happy to tell you why. In fact, they love to talk about her. But I have a feeling you won't bother to do that, so I'll tell you.

First, Sarah Palin is all about integrity and reform. Her

adherence to principle—especially to transparency and accountability in government is what has made her so politically successful. In one month alone, as governor, she vetoed 13 percent of the state's proposed budget for capital projects. The *Anchorage Daily News* said these, "may be the biggest single-year line-item veto total in state history."

In January 2004 she resigned as head of the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (Somehow, you failed to mention that she even had that job.) after complaining to the office of Governor Frank Murkowski and to state Attorney General Gregg Renkes about ethical violations by another commissioner, Randy Ruedrich, who was also Republican state chairman.

But there is a lot more. Beginning with her tenure as mayor of Wasilla, then as head of the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, and then as Governor of Alaska, Sarah Palin has done what no one else before her was able to do: Break up the "good old boys" political machines and clean up Alaskan politics. For anyone who is interested in a real-life story of a truly remarkable woman then do some honest research into Sarah Palin's life and accomplishments. Unlike Barack Obama, she has actually done what she promised to do. Barack Obama has no such history. He is all about making good speeches; even Hillary said so many times. But again, why do you constantly compare Palin to Obama? Palin is running for vice-president and Obama is running for president!

You say that Sarah Palin is governor of a state with only 650,000 citizens. Yes, that's true. But the problem is that Obama has never governed anyone—not a town or a village or even the neighborhood he failed to organize. He hasn't governed a single person, let alone 650,000 in the geographically largest and most complex state in the union. He has never had to make any of the decisions that mayors and governors make countless times every day. Obama is a blank slate. We don't know if he can govern anything because he has no record of ever having done so. So why would you even

mention that there are “only” 650,000 citizens of Alaska? All you proved is that Sarah Palin is more qualified than Barack Obama and she is running for vice-president!

Author: If you have been married to the same woman for 19 years while raising 2 daughters, all within Protestant churches, you’re not a real Christian.

Me: Who said he’s not a real Christian? Not John McCain. Not Sarah Palin. So why did you say it? Maybe to make people think they said it? No, you wouldn’t do such a thing.

Author: If you cheated on your first wife with a rich heiress, and left your disfigured wife and married the heiress the next month, you’re a Christian.

Me: That is just plain small, and nasty, and mean, and it tells more about you than John McCain. You should be ashamed of yourself. Listen, after 5½ years of unimaginable torture in a Vietnamese prison of war camp, John McCain came home a different man than when he left and to a different world and, frankly, people like you don’t have the credentials or the character to judge the likes of John McCain. Your remarks are deplorable.

Author: If you teach responsible, age-appropriate sex education, including the proper use of birth control, you are eroding the fiber of society.

Me: Once again, you are thoroughly misleading the reader. The objection to Obama’s support of “age-appropriate sex education” was that it included what many consider to be “age-inappropriate” sex education for kindergarten children. Well, at least you are consistently dishonest.

Author: If, while governor, you staunchly advocate abstinence only, with no other option in sex education in your state’s school system while your unwed teen daughter ends up pregnant, you’re very responsible.

Me: It is clear that you are either astonishingly ignorant or pathologically dishonest. I'm not sure which. First, while Governor Palin advocates abstinence, she did not (as you imply) mandate that it be the only option taught in Alaskan schools. As to "... while your unwed teen daughter ends up pregnant, you're very responsible" remark, you once again reveal your meanness and your ignorance. Sarah Palin is no different than any other parent in the world. Nor is her family any different. All good parents try their best to instill good values in their children but there are never any guarantees. And while you come across as a highly judgmental person, Sarah Palin is about as non-judgmental as one can get. In fact, that is one of many reasons why the people of Alaska feel so much affection for her.

Author: If your wife is a Harvard graduate lawyer who gave up a position in a prestigious law firm to work for the betterment of her inner city community, then gave that up to raise a family, your family's values don't represent America's.

Me: There you go again. Who said their values don't represent America's? Not John McCain. Not Sarah Palin.

Author: If you're husband is nicknamed "First Dude," has at least one DWI conviction and no college education, didn't register to vote until age 25, and once was a member of a group that advocated the secession of Alaska from the USA, your family is extremely admirable.

Me: So once more, it is you who are guilty of doing and saying what you accuse others of doing and saying. While I can't think of a single Republican leader that has said any of the things you imply they said, not a day goes by that either the media or bloggers or people like you say all kinds of nasty things about Sarah Palin or completely distort the truth about her. Yes, Todd Palin had a DWI but you failed to mention that it was 22 years ago! So what? Barack Obama in his own words

said that he used to do “a little blow” now and then. As to why Alaskans love their “First Family” and think they are so “admirable”, it is because they are caring and honest and loving people. What about that disturbs you so much? Why is that so threatening to you? Why do you have a compulsion to denigrate good people? Exactly what values do you hold over such values as theirs?

Author: OK, much clearer now.

Me: It was never unclear to you. You set out to write a sarcastic, nasty, dishonest trash-piece in order to turn people against Sarah Palin and John McCain. In short, you are as phony as the words in your email. On the other hand, what I wrote is as accurate as my research could possibly make it. But truth is not your thing. It means nothing to you, which tells me that this wonderful country of ours means nothing to you. If it did, you would never put your politics above the truth.

This, by the way, is what makes both John McCain and Sarah Palin so special: They have a long record of putting the welfare of the people above politics. Barack Obama’s record is one of narcissistic self-aggrandizement. He is the quintessential political ideologue—a Saul Alinsky far-left radical.

But why, throughout your whole piece, do you compare Barack Obama to Sarah Palin? Barack Obama is running against John McCain! Of course, I know why and so do you. John McCain is far more qualified to be president than is Barack Obama. But even worse, when there is an honest comparison of Barack Obama and Sarah Palin, it becomes clear that even Sarah Palin, a vice-presidential nominee, is more qualified than Barack Obama, a presidential nominee!

As even many prominent Democrats have said, if Barack Obama were white, Hillary Clinton would be the Democratic nominee.

Why? It is quite simple: A white man or woman as un-qualified as Obama is could not have won the nomination. It would never have happened—with or without the troubling associations attached to Obama. Even if a white candidate were as good a speaker as Obama, a lack of qualifications would have prevented his or her success. This is not a racist opinion. In fact, a truly non-racist society would not consider race at all when selecting political candidates. The point of course is that we should completely disregard race and judge the candidates on their track records and their proven ability to deliver over time. When viewed honestly and objectively, it is starkly clear that not only does Barack Obama have a very troubling political history but he has literally nothing in his record that demonstrates an ability to deliver on what he promises in his glowing speeches.

Listen, words are cheap, and it is beyond foolish to even vaguely consider electing a person to the presidency of the United States of America because he is an African American or because he delivers a good speech! This is not a Democrat or Republican matter. It is about the welfare and survival of our nation. It's time to forget about race and who delivers the better speech and to act like responsible citizens. This is a very complex and dangerous world and if we are not careful, we will destroy all the special things that make America the greatest nation in the history of the world—those things for which generations of men and woman before us have fought and died to defend and protect.

Finally, to the younger generation: This is not an American Idol contest. This is the real thing and it is a very serious matter. Find an honest, unbiased American history book somewhere (if you can) and educate yourselves. Your future depends on it.

Again, this was written in 2008 and is posted here now for instructive reasons, which should be obvious. It was typical of hundreds or more likely thousands of untruthful, ignorant, nasty emails, books, and other written material that prevailed during the 2008 campaign. And the 2012 campaign was no better.

Thus Spake Obama

The incompetence of our neo-monarchy

By Mark Steyn – a MacPundit favorite author.

It is a condition of my admission to this great land that I am not allowed to foment the overthrow of the United States government. Oh, I signed it airily enough, but you'd be surprised, as the years go by, how often the urge to foment starts to rise in one's gullet. Fortunately, at least as far as constitutional government goes, the president of the United States is doing a grand job of overthrowing it all by himself.

On Thursday, he passed a new law at a press conference. George III never did that. But, having ordered America's insurance companies to comply with Obamacare, the president announced that he is now ordering them not to comply with Obamacare. The legislative branch (as it's still quaintly known) passed a law purporting to grandfather your existing health plan. The regulatory bureaucracy then interpreted the law so as to un-grandfather your health plan. So His Most Excellent Majesty has commanded that your health plan be de-un-grandfathered. That seems likely to work. The insurance industry had three years to

prepare for the introduction of Obamacare. Now the King has given them six weeks to de-introduce Obamacare.

“I wonder if he has the legal authority to do this,” mused former Vermont governor Howard Dean. But he’s obviously some kind of right-wing wacko. Later that day, anxious to help him out, Congress offered to “pass” a “law” allowing people to keep their health plans. The same president who had unilaterally commanded that people be allowed to keep their health plans indignantly threatened to veto any such law to that effect: It only counts if he does it – geddit? As his court eunuchs at the Associated Press obligingly put it: “Obama Will Allow Old Plans.” It’s Barry’s world; we just live in it.

The reason for the benign Sovereign’s exercise of the Royal Prerogative is that millions of his subjects – or “folks,” as he prefers to call us, no fewer than 27 times during his press conference – have had their lives upended by Obamacare. Your traditional hardcore statist, surveying the mountain of human wreckage he has wrought, usually says, “Well, you can’t make an omelet without breaking a few eggs.” But Obama is the first to order that his omelet be unscrambled and the eggs put back in their original shells. Is this even doable? No. That’s the point. When it doesn’t work, he’ll be able to give another press conference blaming the insurance companies, or the state commissioners, or George W. Bush . . .

The most telling line, the one that encapsulates the gulf between the boundless fantasies of the faculty-lounge utopian and the messiness of reality, was this: “What we’re also discovering is that insurance is complicated to buy.” Gee, thanks for sharing, genius. Maybe you should have thought of that before you governmentalized one-sixth of the economy. By “we,” the president means “I.” Out here in the ruder provinces of his decrepit realm, we “folks” are well aware of how complicated insurance is. What isn’t complicated in the Sultanate of Sclerosis? But, as with so many other things, Obama always gives the vague impression that routine features of humdrum human existence are entirely alien to him. Marie Antoinette, informed that the peasantry could no longer afford bread, is alleged to have responded, “Let them eat cake.” There is no evidence these words ever passed her lips, but

certainly no one ever accused her of saying, "If you like your cake, you can keep your cake," and then having to walk it back with "What we're also discovering is that cake is complicated to buy." That contribution to the annals of monarchical unworldliness had to await the reign of Queen Barry Antoinette, whose powdered wig seems to have slipped over his eyes.

Still, as historian Michael Beschloss pronounced the day after his election, he's "probably the smartest guy ever to become president." Naturally, Obama shares this assessment. As he assured us five years ago, "I know more about policies on any particular issue than my policy directors." Well, apart from his signature health-care policy. That's a mystery to him. "I was not informed directly that the website would not be working," he told us. The buck stops with something called "the executive branch," which is apparently nothing to do with him. As evidence that he was entirely out of the loop, he offered this:

Had I been I informed, I wouldn't be going out saying, "Boy, this is going to be great." You know, I'm accused of a lot of things, but I don't think I'm stupid enough to go around saying, "This is going to be like shopping on Amazon or Travelocity," a week before the website opens, if I thought that it wasn't going to work.

Ooooo-kay. So, if I follow correctly, the smartest president ever is not smart enough to ensure that his website works; he's not smart enough to inquire of others as to whether his website works; he's not smart enough to check that his website works before he goes out and tells people what a great website experience they're in for. But he is smart enough to know that he's not stupid enough to go around bragging about how well it works if he'd already been informed that it doesn't work. So he's smart enough to know that if he'd known what he didn't know he'd know enough not to let it be known that he knew nothing. The country's in the very best of hands.

Michael Beschloss is right: This is what it means to be smart in a neo-monarchical America. Obama spake, and it shall be so. And, if it turns out not to be so, why pick on him? He talks a good Royal

Proclamation; why get hung up on details?

Until October 1, Obama had never done anything – not run a gas station, or a doughnut stand – other than let himself be wafted onward and upward to the next do-nothing gig. Even in his first term, he didn't really do: Starting with the 2009 trillion-dollar stimulus, he ran a money-no-object government that was all money and no objects; he spent and spent, and left no trace. Some things he massively expanded (food stamps, Social Security disability) and other things he massively diminished (effective foreign policy), but all were, so to speak, preexisting conditions. Obamacare is the first thing Obama has actually done, and, if you're the person it's being done to, it's not pretty.

The president promised to “fundamentally transform” America. Certainly, other men have succeeded in transforming settled, free societies: Pierre Trudeau did in Canada four decades ago, and so, in post-war Britain, did the less charismatic Clement Attlee. And, if you subscribe to their particular philosophy, their transformations were effected very efficiently. But Obama is an incompetent, so “fundamentally transformed” is a euphemism for “wrecked beyond repair.” As a socialist, he makes a good socialite.

But on he staggers, with a wave of his scepter, delaying this, staying that, exempting the other, according to his regal whim and internal polling. The omniscient beneficent Sovereign will now graciously “allow” us “folks” to keep all those junk plans from bad-apple insurers. Yet even the wisest King cannot reign forever, and what will happen decades down the road were someone less benign – perhaps even (shudder) a Republican – to ascend the throne and wield these mighty powers?

Hey, relax: If you like your constitution, you can keep your constitution. Period. And your existing amendments. Well, most of them – except for the junk ones . . .

– Mark Steyn, a National Review columnist, is the author of *After America: Get Ready for Armageddon*. © 2013 Mark Steyn