

Liberals are, well ... strange!

By MacPundit

Let's be honest, Liberals are not always rational



"Remember, democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide. *John Adams*"

If you ask a Conservative what Romney's plan is for the next four years, he or she might tell you about the Five Point Plan Romney laid out in his acceptance speech and suggest that you can read the details on Romney's website. However, liberals may give you a completely different response when you ask them a similar question.

For example, ask a Liberal what Obama's plan is for the next four years. He or she will most likely change the subject to Romney and tell you that Romney has no plan. If you tell him that Romney does have a plan, he will continue talking as though he didn't hear you—which could be true—and say something like "Obama's not going to take away a woman's right to vote, like Romney will." When you point out that what he just said is not true, he will—you guessed it—continue talking

as though he never heard you. Like a programmed talking doll, he may tell you things like Obama is for middle-class working people, which is a populist talking point designed to imply that Romney is against middle-class working people. But, once again, if you tell him that is just one more big liberal lie, he will either keep on talking, or maybe give you a blank stare—you know, the kind you see when someone's brain has just gone into standby mode.

In any case, he will not tell you what Obama's plan is for the next four years, because he can't. Not only does he not know, but he will probably be very annoyed with you for having asked the question in the first place. He may even act as though you just scuppered him with an unfair, trick question. Now remember, the question was, "What is Obama's plan?" If you could read his thoughts, you might get this: "I hate it when they ask questions like that! I just know that whatever Obama's plan is, it's better than Romney's—whatever his is."

Am I generalizing? Yes, but not by much. I have to look far and wide to find a liberal with real knowledge of the players and issues in this campaign. (I just paused to think about that last sentence and at the moment, I cannot think of a single conversation I've had recently with a liberal who knew the real facts about either candidate or the most important issues.)

Case in point

Just last week, I was talking to a liberal who began to opine on the class warfare "fairness" thing. He said rich people should pay their fair share. Naturally, I agreed and pointed out that they are, that the wealthiest top 10% already pay 71% of the entire federal income tax bill. I also mentioned that 47% of American wage earners don't pay any federal income tax at all. Not surprisingly, for a few seconds I saw that familiar, though strange, my-brain-is-on-standby, look in his eyes. Then his girlfriend handed him a laptop and suggested he

look it up.

Now before I continue, you need to know that this guy is an intelligent, articulate man who presents himself as being well versed in current political issues. Yet the stats I had just given him were, apparently, as foreign to him as $E=mc^2$ would be to an orangutan.

Anyway, he cranked up the laptop and when he appeared to be intently reading something on the screen, I asked what he found. He said, "It says 47% of wage earners do not pay any federal income tax." It was a revelation but, sadly, not an epiphany because shortly thereafter he told me that George W. Bush lied about Saddam Hussein having WMD. Imagine that! After all these years he was still repeating that raggedy old liberal myth. (See *Is Obama More Dishonest Than Nixon, Reagan, And G.W. Bush?*)

Millions have been stricken

This very strange behavior among liberals is widespread. Many books have been written on the topic and while it is tempting to dismiss liberals as plain, old-fashioned ignoramuses, the truth is more complex. For example, many—perhaps even most—liberals think of themselves as being more intelligent and knowledgeable than the general population. Yet their behavior belies that assessment. They express a firm belief in Darwinian evolution, yet their resistance to certain types of knowledge implies an inability to grow intellectually. (See *Liberal Ignorance – Economics*) Also, this oft displayed sense of superiority makes one suspect an overcompensation for a sense of inferiority.

Then there is the mob-think, adoration thing, which was on display once again at the 2012 Democratic National Convention. As the cameras panned the audience, I could not miss the worshipful looks on thousands of adoring faces as their leader, Barack Obama, spoke. It was truly disturbing. Mr.

Obama is my thirteenth president and until he arrived, I had never seen this kind of unsettling phenomenon before. If you understand the soul of America, you know that this kind of idolization is not a part of it.

What's with the initials?

It is an odd thing, really, that Democrats want us to believe they are the party of the people. It is they, not Conservatives, who transform their iconic figures into something akin to movie star status—or more. The Kennedy presidency became “Camelot” even though Jack Kennedy could, arguably, have been called the philanderer-in-chief. I liked the guy, but with the exception of his economic policies, he was not one of our best presidents. And Camelot? Anything but. And what is this thing they have with initials? FDR, JFK, LBJ? I remember some disappointment among Democrats when Kerry was running because JFK was already taken. They even gave Martin Luther King the MLK label even though he was a Republican and Kennedy had him wiretapped. (I bet some of you liberals just learned something in that last sentence you would rather not know.)

Dispelling some more Liberal myths

Democrats want you to believe that Conservatives and the Republican Party are a bunch of rich guys who only care about themselves. Once again, however, they are either ignorant of the facts or they are being intentionally dishonest. A few years ago, Professor Arthur C. Brooks of Syracuse University did a study on this very subject. He also wrote a book based on the study. Here is a brief summary of his findings:

After exhaustive nonpartisan research into the charitable behavior of liberals and conservatives he found that the average conservative-headed household gives 30% more to charity than the average liberal-headed household. He also learned that among the same households conservatives earn 6% less annually than do liberals. Simply put: Conservatives

earn less but give much more money to charity than do liberals. His study also revealed that of the 25 states where charitable giving was above average, George W. Bush won 24 of them in the 2004 presidential election. Yes, 24 of the 25 most charitable states were red states.

Let's wrap it up.

Most liberals I know will not allow you to engage them in a constructive, informed discussion. Why? Because they can't. They hate any facts that disturb their mindset. Hence, they are unable to mount a rational argument to support their opinions. They know this. They know if they debate you, you will produce real facts, which they will not be able to refute. They will avoid that any way they can.

On the out chance that a liberal is reading this, I must say that statements like the ones made by Kelly Washington and other Democrats at the Democratic National Convention—statements like, Republicans want to take away a woman's right to vote. – were simply made up by nasty, small-minded political hacks who obviously don't give a damn about our country. There is absolutely no basis in truth to support that statement or all the other similar ones made during the DNC. Yet speaker after speaker spit out grossly dishonest remarks over and over again. It was the most disgusting display of dishonesty, ignorance, and dirty politics I have ever witnessed in a major party convention. It also says a lot about the leader of the Democratic Party, Barack Obama. The other speakers simply followed the leader who is, himself, such a prolific liar that fact checkers, literally, have a hard time keeping up with him. (See Documented Obama Lies)

I have said it before: I am uncomfortable every time I connect the "liar" word with my president. But I sincerely believe that because of his ideology and his severe record of deceit and incompetence, our nation is in great danger. I also

believe that we may never recover from the consequences of another four year Obama presidency. So I will continue to call it like I see it as my small part in the effort to defeat Barack Obama in November.

We can easily forgive a child who is afraid of the dark; the real tragedy of life is when men are afraid of the light.

Plato

You Didn't Build That!

By MacPundit

Actually, we did, including the bridges and roads!

"You didn't build that." went around the world at light speed. I know, I know, he was talking about bridges and roads. Okay, I'll give him that. But he may be sorry I did.



You see, there's a little problem with Mr. Obama's

explanation—the one some of you doubled down on. Now pay attention. After he extolled the importance of bridges and roads, he said:

“If you’ve got a business, you didn’t build that. Somebody else made that happen.”

He said he meant that businesses can’t succeed without the bridges and roads that the government built. So he was telling us the government built the bridges and roads first and the businesses benefited from that. He said he was talking about the bridges and roads when he said, “You didn’t build that.” So to be absolutely clear, he said the businesses did not build the bridges and roads.

So there. I said I’d give it to him. Are you still with me? Good. Now I have a couple of inconvenient little questions.

1. Where did the government get the money to build the bridges and roads?
2. Who built them?

Do you see the problem with our leader’s explanation? Government does not create wealth. Government has no money until it takes it from the private sector, which, of course, is the only part of our economy that actually does create wealth. The fact is, it creates all the wealth! It also creates all the jobs, feeds all the people, builds all the houses, makes all the clothes—and, yes, it pays for and supplies all the workers to build all the bridges and roads.

How does the private sector do all those things? Well, it is made up of millions of organizations we call “businesses” and these businesses figure out what is needed and then they fill all the needs. They invest their money, their time, their talents, and they hire, train and pay people to do the work. (You did notice that they create jobs?)

Now this is important:

If the businesses did not do all of those things first—before the bridges and roads were built—there would be no money with which to build the bridges and roads.

Are you struggling with this? I realize how difficult it is for some of you to give credit to those awful business people, but unless you're living in the woods *au naturel*, those nasty businesses made everything you own. I know, it's a hard pill to swallow. But it's true. Go way back in history and you will see small shops in quaint little villages. There were shoemakers and bread makers and furniture makers, and the people walked on and drove their wagons on rutted, bumpy dirt roads. That is, until the villages and towns could get enough money from the businesses and the people who worked for the businesses in order to have proper roads built—and maybe a bridge here and there, too.

Hysteron proteron – Preposterous, absurd, ridiculous

So, you see, our leader has placed the famous cart before the horse. As a Harvard man, he may be familiar with a figure of speech known as hysteron proteron in which the thing that should come second is put first. This sort of misplacement is sometimes referred to as being preposterous, absurd, or ridiculous. Personally, I think any or all of them fit quite nicely.

To summarize: The private sector not only supplies the money to build the bridges and roads, with few exceptions, it also builds the bridges and roads. Typically, the government contracts with private sector companies to do the work. But even when government workers do the work, they are paid with taxpayer money, which has been created in the private sector.

So let's finish where we began: He was talking about bridges

and roads. Okay, I'll give him that.

Obama's Biggest Lie



It's Bush's Fault

Why do President Obama and the Democrats continue to blame “Bush’s failed economic policies” for the financial crisis even though it is not true? Because they can. You see, they know it is a complex subject and they know that the media have so far been unwilling to explain what really happened during Bush’s time in office. They also know that as long as most of the media remain in their camp, they will continue to protect the president. Yet, considering its reach and importance to the 2012 campaign, this may very well be Obama’s biggest lie.

A quick review

1. Did the Bush tax cuts cause the Recession? No, and if Obama really thought so, why does he want to keep most of them?
2. Did financial deregulation under Bush cause the Recession? No. Countless studies failed to find any evidence to support the charge that rule changes by the Bush SEC contributed to the financial crisis.

3. Did the Bush deficits cause the Recession? Obama can't possibly support that idea. After all, Obama has already added almost \$6 trillion to the national debt in just 3½ years. Plus, according to the CBO, under his most recent budget, he would add \$6.4 trillion more to the federal budget deficit over the next decade. Obama's deficit and debt figures are far greater than Bush's.
4. Did Bush housing policies cause the Recession? No again. As you will learn later, the financial meltdown was a direct result of government housing policy—most of which was implemented by the out-of-control, quasi-governmental agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

A note about the recovery before we get into the weeds

- Obama and his economists predicted that the stimulus would create a recovery rate of 4%+ annual growth. It has averaged a pathetically weak half that, and 2013 promises to be no better.
- They also predicted unemployment would be under 6%. It has been 8% or higher for 42 straight months. It now stands at 8.3% and shows no signs of moving down.

First, let's understand the back story

Bush inherited a recession from Clinton

Let's begin at the beginning of Bush's first term. As I said, it is relatively complex, so bear with me while I explain it to you. Within a couple of months of Bush taking office, the country went into a recession. The causes of the recession occurred during Clinton's tenure, and since there is a cause-and-effect lag, Bush inherited it from Clinton whose booming "Dotcom" economy had, predictably, collapsed. The collapse was predictable because the success of the dotcoms was to a great

extent an illusion. These companies had no “brick-and-mortar” foundations. They were built in and they ran in cyberspace and it was clear to experienced business professionals that the market could not continue to support most of them. Of course they were correct and most of them failed. So Bush began his first term with a recession not of his making.

The Terrorist Attacks of 9/11

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, were carried out by psychopathic, religious fanatics—cold-blooded murderers. For thousands of our fellow Americans, the personal loss of family members and friends created a void that will never be filled. We cannot begin to measure that kind of loss. What we can measure is the economic cost, which translates into a continuing burden, directly or indirectly, on all of us.

- Our economy was still in recession when the 9/11 attacks hit us. The attacks made a bad situation worse.
- The immediate impact of the attacks caused a dramatic drop in consumer confidence, and a significant fall in the stock market.
- Insurance cost – an estimated \$40 billion
- Cost of rebuilding the World Trade Center – about \$700 million
- Quarterly airline industry profits fell \$25 billion—about \$100 billion annually—in the years following the attacks. Several airlines went bankrupt, despite generous loans from the U.S. Government.
- The financial loss of gross New York City product was estimated at \$23.7 billion through the end of 2002. Tax losses added another \$2 billion.
- About 100,000 jobs were lost in Manhattan alone. 18,000 businesses were either destroyed, disrupted or forced to relocate.
- The economic consequences of the attacks reached every aspect of the U.S. economy.

- Because of the attacks, estimates of U.S. Job losses were as high as 1.8 million, which also reduced our gross domestic product by as much as 5 percent, or \$500 billion. While some other studies produced lower figures, the consensus was that the losses were huge. Also, security concerns raised the price of oil, which may have affected the flow of investment dollars into the U.S.
- The numbers reach staggering proportions when we add in indirect economic effects. As a consequence of the attacks, \$1 trillion was spent on national security, and even though Obama and the Democrats continue to blame Bush for the “unpaid for wars in Afghanistan and Iraq,” the above \$1 trillion does not include the cost of those wars.
- The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq added at least another \$1 trillion in costs. Even though Obama said the Afghanistan War was justified, he and other Democrats continue to attack Bush for the Iraq War. There are two main problems with this: 1) Virtually all congressional Democrats voted for the Iraq War. 2) Many Democrats continue to dishonestly accuse Bush of lying about Saddam Hussein having WMD even though they read the same intelligence reports that Bush read. (See “Is Obama More Dishonest Than Nixon, Reagan, and G.W. Bush?”)

This brief review of 9/11 economic costs does not consider countless other costs, such as government settlements to first responders, security and legal costs for terror trials, increased energy costs, time lost due to airport security, and much more. For example, it is hard to imagine the extent of “opportunity loss” – costs of things we were not able to spend money on because it was spent on 9/11-related items instead.

Finally, it is practically impossible to calculate a final, total cost of the economic impact of 9/11, but it is certainly in the trillions of dollars.

Considering the depth and pervasiveness the detrimental effects of the 9/11 attacks had on our economy, not only are Obama's criticisms of the Bush economy grossly dishonest on their face, they are even more misleading when we consider that the post 9/11 economy rebounded amazingly quickly due to the Bush fiscal and monetary policies, which were put in place in response to the attacks. So instead of being responsible for destroying our economy, I predict that honest historians will praise President Bush for his insightful and decisive leadership during and after the attacks.

President Clinton weakened our intelligence and military capabilities

Why did the CIA fail to anticipate the 9/11 attacks?

Bill Clinton is scheduled to make a key address at the Democratic National Convention. If you watch his speech, please keep in mind what I am about to tell you.

When George W. Bush took office in January 2001, he not only inherited a recession from Bill Clinton, he also inherited a dangerously weakened CIA. It seems that Clinton's CIA Director, James Woolsey, didn't have much time to keep track of Osama bin Laden because he was too busy fighting Clinton and other Democrats over cuts in CIA funding and resources. For example, the agency was in great need of translators who spoke Arabic, Farsi, Pashto, and other languages spoken in the broiling "terrorist belt."

But Clinton and congressional Democrats made it impossible for Director Woolsey to hire and train the people he needed. As a result, the CIA was functionally blind, deaf, and dumb in the world's most terror-prone region. To quote *The Washington Times*, "So, a bureaucratic feud and President Clinton's indifference kept America blind and deaf as bin Laden

plotted.” You can read the full story here: [The Washington Times–Bill Clinton’s Indifference](#). Overall, our intelligence capabilities were significantly weakened during Bill Clinton’s presidency.

But it got worse: Our military readiness was also dramatically reduced. Both President Clinton and Vice President Al Gore often bragged that they had reduced the size of the federal government. “The era of big government is over”, they said. But what they failed to mention was that 286,000 (90%) of the 305,000 federal employees removed from the payroll, were military jobs. The statistics for America’s defense sector during the Clinton years confirms the deep-seated animosity held by the Clinton administration toward the military. Clinton eliminated 6 entire divisions from the Army—from 18 to 12. He removed 166 ships from our Naval fleet—from 546 to 380. And he stripped 26 squadrons from our Air Force—from 76 to 50. So the idea that Clinton and Gore were big reformers because they had ended the era of big government, was nothing more than a con job. What they really did was to dramatically weaken our intelligence and military capabilities while the federal bureaucracy, essentially, remained intact.

There is also a great deal of evidence to support the claim that President Clinton failed more than once to take bin Laden when the Sudanese offered to turn him over. Clinton says he didn’t take him because he did not have enough evidence against bin Laden. But that is highly debatable.

What else could happen?

President Bush must have wondered what else could possibly go wrong when he considered the hand he had been dealt. He had inherited a recession and a weakened intelligence and military capability and we had been hit by the most devastating attack on our homeland, ever. It was rather amazing that he had been able to steer us through it all and had still managed to get our economy back on track.

And then Katrina—the most destructive natural disaster in our history!

On August 29, 2005, the worst natural disaster in U.S. History hit our Gulf Coast. It was Hurricane Katrina and it was a massive Category 5 monster before it even made landfall. The cost of damage was between \$96-\$125 billion, including \$40-\$66 billion in insured losses. Approximately 300,000 homes were either completely destroyed or made uninhabitable. About 118 million cubic yards of debris and devastation was left behind. The job of clean up was mind-boggling.

Reasonable estimates of the total economic loss from Katrina were as high as \$250 billion. The storm disrupted gas production and had a general negative effect on national economic growth. In 2005, economic growth as measured by Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was at 3.8% in the third quarter, but it dropped to 1.3% in the fourth quarter due to the loss of gas production caused by Katrina.

So once again, President Bush was faced with another crisis not of his own doing. However, his political opponents on the left were not about to miss an opportunity to dishonestly place blame where it did not belong.

Bush, himself, said later that he made mistakes. But what he did not say was that a lot of people made a lot of mistakes. For example, New Orleans Mayor Ray Nagin failed to implement his evacuation plan and ordered residents to a shelter without any provisions for food, water, security, or sanitary conditions. He also delayed his emergency evacuation order until less than a day before landfall, which led to hundreds of deaths because people could no longer find any way out of the city. And we all remember the pictures of school bus parking lots full of yellow school buses, which Mayor Nagin refused to use in the evacuation. Why? He said they weren't covered with insurance liability and there was a shortage of

bus drivers. Governor Blanco also was to blame for her mistakes. But in fairness to all, we must keep in mind that this was the worst natural disaster in U.S. History. It was also the first time in such a huge disaster that FEMA was operating under the newly created Department of Homeland Security.

And there was this: When Katrina hit, New Orleans was one of the poorest metropolitan areas in the United States. 27% of New Orleans households, about 120,000 people, were without private mobility. Yet despite the fact that so many people were not able to evacuate on their own, the mandatory evacuation called on August 28 by local authorities, made no provisions to evacuate homeless, low-income, car-less individuals, the sick, or the city's elderly or infirm. As a result, most of the stranded were the poor, the elderly, and the sick. As I said, a lot of people made a lot of mistakes.

But this article is about the claim by President Obama and the Democrats that Bush caused the financial crisis. Hence, Hurricane Katrina must be included because of its huge negative impact on our economy and the unassailable fact that, as with the other items discussed here, Bush did not cause Hurricane Katrina.

But Bush did not have time to linger on what was because he saw ominous, dark clouds forming on the national horizon. In fact, he had seen those clouds for awhile.

The Housing Market Collapse

Our financial crisis was triggered by one monster of a problem with many tentacles—the housing collapse. So how did it happen? For that answer, we need to know something about home ownership and mortgages. Most people can't afford to buy a house outright for cash. They need to borrow most of the purchase price. When they do this, they sign a legal document that spells out their responsibility to repay the loan as well

as other information. This document is called a "mortgage." For years, the primary source of home-purchase loans was a local savings and loan bank. These local banks knew the neighborhoods and the local house values. They also had certain credit requirements that a prospective home purchaser had to meet in order to get a loan. These requirements helped to protect the bank from loss and also helped purchasers from making a loan they might not be able to repay. It was a good system that served us well for over a hundred years.

But then some politicians decided that the system was unfair. They said that everyone should be able to own their own home—that it was their right. Of course they also knew that if they could put millions of people into their own homes, whether they could afford it or not, those people would surely vote for them. Yes, the politicians absolutely knew that. So these politicians, who were almost all Liberal Democrats, effectively, tempted and coerced banks to make loans to virtually anyone—whether they could afford it or not. Thus, the seeds of a financial crisis were planted.

The following is an excerpt from an AIE.org article

- Today, the United States has the most troubled housing market in the developed world. It's also the only developed country with a major government role in housing policy.
- In less than twenty-five years, "affordable housing" and other housing policies have turned a healthy market into a financial ruin. In 1989, for example, only 1 in 230 homebuyers made a down payment of 3 percent or less; by 2007, it was 1 in 3. Meanwhile, average home equity plunged from 45 percent to 7 percent.
- The policies that caused the financial crisis are still in force. Until they and the government's role in housing are eliminated, the U.S. housing market will not return to health.

Bush warned of financial collapse

President George W. Bush and members of his administration are on record warning, repeatedly, that if significant, meaningful reforms were not implemented at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, we were headed for a serious financial crisis. But congressional Democrats did not want to hear it. They blocked all attempts by the Bush administration and congressional Republicans to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, two of the key players in the housing market collapse. To be sure, many large banks and Wall Street firms were also guilty, but it is unlikely that they would have been as active as they were without political pressure from the left to “put everyone in home” and the millions of mortgage loan guarantees provided by Fannie and Freddie.

Was the housing market collapse Bush’s fault? Hardly. He tried to prevent it but the Democrats blocked him every time. (See [Bush Warned of A Potential Financial Crisis](#))

So those were the cards Bush was dealt. Now, let’s consider ...

Bush’s economic policies

Obama Claim: The Bush Tax Cuts didn’t work.

The Truth: Oh yes they did. They did exactly what they were meant to do. They stimulated the economy and led to millions of new jobs—over 8 million to be exact. Furthermore, unlike the failed Obama stimulus, which cost the taxpayers billions of dollars, instead of taking money from hard-working Americans, the Bush tax cuts put more money in their pockets.

Read more: [Why President Obama despises the Bush tax cuts | Washington Times Communities](#)

This is not even a Republican or Democrat issue. Democrat, President Kennedy enacted the same supply-side tax cuts that were later implemented by Ronald Reagan and then by George W. Bush—and they worked every time. Under Reagan, over 20 million new jobs were created and it started the longest peace-time continuous period of economic growth in U.S. History.

Obama's Class Warfare

So what's the deal? It's simple: Obama's presidency is collapsing and he is trying to save it by pitting one group of Americans against another. It is called "Class Warfare" and it's right out of tired, old Marxist strategy manuals. Obama and the Democrats demonize the "rich" by saying they should pay their fair share. But what he, purposely, does not tell you is that the top 10% of earners pay over 71% of all federal income taxes while nearly half of all Americans do not pay any federal income taxes at all!

Obama brags that his economy has added jobs for 29 consecutive months.

It's true. But once again, he is misleading us. He doesn't tell the whole story, and to be sure, a lie is not necessarily in the words, it's in the intent. In this case, he failed to include the job losses during his time in office. The number of jobs created under Obama have not even kept up with population growth. (See Obama Economic Record)

George W. Bush holds the record for consecutive months of positive GDP growth—52 months. The Democrat housing collapse triggered our financial crisis, not Bush's economic policies.

Bush's policies ended the recession, not Obama's.

You heard it right. You see, the recession officially ended in June, 2009—before the Obama stimulus had time to fully kick

in. But by then, policies put in place by Bush began to have an effect. Furthermore, large portions of the Obama stimulus bill were squandered on non-stimulative items. For example, millions were used to prop up liberal Democrat local and state governments that had been mismanaged for decades. Failed liberal policies similar to the ones Obama continues to use on a national level, had wreaked havoc on those local and state governments and Obama bailed them out, temporarily, with stimulus money. Then, of course, millions more were wasted on Obama's pet projects like Solyndra, which not only failed to create jobs, but went bankrupt a year after Obama touted it as the wave of the future. That foolish project alone wasted half a billion dollars of taxpayer's money.

Yet Obama still continues to take credit for "turning our economy around." It is truly astonishing. (See The Bush Failed Economic Policies)

A Letter To President Obama

Dear Mr. President,

You are my 13th president and even though too many of them turned out to be less than advertised, for the first time in my life, I am genuinely concerned for the future of our great country. You see, even our worst presidents did not divide our people as you do every day in speeches full of dishonest remarks about your opponents. Here are a few examples:

You said Republicans "... believe that prosperity comes from the top down, so that if we spend trillions more on tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, that that will somehow unleash jobs and economic growth." Let's break it down:

1. Republicans do not believe that prosperity comes from the top down. You simply made that up. In fact, they always say that our wealth comes from a strong, working middle class.
2. When you accused them of wanting to "... spend trillions more on tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans," you knew they never asked for tax cuts—that they actually oppose tax increases on anyone. You also know that to oppose a tax increase is not the same as giving someone a tax cut. You wanted to raise taxes and when you did not get your tax raise, you called it a tax cut. So if you don't raise my taxes, I am getting a tax cut? That's flimflam stuff and it only works on people who don't know any better. Of course you know that and, apparently, you don't want them to know any better.
3. But it gets worse. In the phrase, "... spend trillions more on tax cuts" you are saying that when the government actually does give someone a tax cut, the government is spending money. You used the word "spend" to describe a tax cut. How can the government spend money it never got in the first place? Or do you think the money people earn through their hard work really doesn't belong to them—that it all belongs to the government from the moment they get their paycheck? So any money Americans earn and don't hand over to the government, is a tax cut? You are confusing America with Communist China, Mr. President.

Remarkably, it gets even worse. When you actually do spend hard-working taxpayer's money to the benefit of your political supporters—like teacher's unions—you don't call it spending, you call it an "investment." To quote the great economist Thomas Sowell, "You can say anything if you have your own private language."

And you don't stop there. Another sleight-of-hand of yours is how you intentionally try to confuse us even further. I'll let

Thomas Sowell explain this part:

"... let's go back to the notion of "spending" money on 'the wealthiest Americans.' The people he is talking about are not the wealthiest Americans. Income is not wealth – and the whole tax controversy is about income taxes. Wealth is what you have accumulated, and wealth is not taxed, except when you die and the government collects an inheritance tax from your heirs.

"People over 65 years of age have far more wealth than people in their thirties and forties – but lower incomes. If Obama wants to talk about raising income taxes, let him talk about it, but claiming that he wants to tax "the wealthiest Americans" is a lie and an emotional distraction for propaganda purposes."

Your supporters like to tell us how smart you are. I agree with them; I think you were given a pretty good brain. But I have also noticed that they never try to tell us that you are an honest person—a man of high character. Yet I have no doubt they would tell us those things if they were true. After all, they tell us so many things that are not true. As Martin Luther King often said, character really does matter. Sadly, Mr. President, you don't seem to agree.

Respectfully,

MacPundit

www.barackobamafile.com

P.S. Due to the division in our country and the angry and vile speech coming from the Left, I feel it wise to use my pen name instead of my actual name. Sadly, you, our president, are responsible for much of that.

(emailed to the President on September 3, 2012)