

Who is this Obama?

The Architect of Destruction

By Maureen Scott

Obama comes from a community organizer background where it's us against them. But that's not who we are. And that's not the position the leader of our Nation should take." – Dr. Benjamin Carson



Obama community organizer

Obama appears to be a tormented man who is filled with resentment, anger, and disdain for anyone of an opinion or view other than his. He acts in the most hateful, spiteful, malevolent, vindictive ways in order to manipulate and maintain power and control over others. Perhaps because, as a child, he grew up around family members and mentors who instilled him with an abiding bitterness toward the U.S. That bitterness seems not to have left him.

It is not the color of his skin that is a problem – for anyone in America. Rather it is the blackness that fills his soul and

the hollowness in his heart where there should be abiding pride and love for this country.

Think: Have we ever heard Obama speak lovingly of the U.S. or its people, with deep appreciation and genuine respect for our history, our customs, our sufferings and our blessings? Has he ever revealed that, like most patriotic Americans, he gets “goose bumps” when a band plays “The Star Spangled Banner,” or sheds a tear when he hears a beautiful rendition of “America the Beautiful?” Does his heart burst with pride when millions of American flags wave on a National holiday – or is he moved to sadness and reflection when someone plays “taps” on a trumpet? Has he ever felt the depth of our admiration of the military, as lovers of those who keep America free feel when soldiers march by? It is doubtful – because Obama did not grow up sharing our experiences or our values. He did not sit at the knee of a grandfather or uncle who showed his medals and told of the bravery of his fellow troops as they fought and tramped through foreign lands sacrificing for a cause greater than their own lives. He didn’t have grandparents who told stories of suffering and then coming to America, penniless, and the opportunities they had for building a business and life for their children.

Away from this country as a young child, Obama didn’t delight in being part of America and its greatness. He wasn’t singing our patriotic songs in kindergarten, or standing on the roadside for a holiday parade and eating a hot dog, or lighting sparklers around a campfire on July 4th as fireworks exploded over head, or placing flags on the gravesites of fallen and beloved American heroes.

Rather Obama was separated from all of these experiences. He doesn’t really understand us and what it means to be an American. He is void of the basic emotions that most feel regarding this country and is insensitive to the instinctive pride we have in our national heritage. His opinions were formed by those who either envied us or wanted him to devalue

the United States and the traditions and patriotism that unite us.

Obama has never given a speech that is filled with calm, reassuring, complimentary, heartfelt statements about all the people in the U.S. Or one that inspires us to be better, grateful, and proud that, in a short time, our country became a leader, and a protector of so many. Quite the contrary, his speeches always degenerate into mocking, ridiculing tirades as he faults our achievements ,along with any of his critics, all for the sake of a laugh, or to bolster his ego. He uses his Office to threaten and create fear while demeaning and degrading anyone who opposes his policies and actions. Unlike a secure leader, who has noble self-esteem and not false confidence, Obama displays a cocky, haughty attitude and a dread of being critiqued.

Mostly, his time seems to be spent causing dissention, unrest, and anxiety among the people rather than uniting us (even though he was presented to us as the "Great Uniter"). He creates chaos for the sake of keeping citizens separated, envious, aggrieved and ready to argue. Under his leadership Americans have been kept on edge, rather than in a state of comfort and security. He incites people to be aggressive toward, disrespectful of, and retaliate against those of differing backgrounds and views. Through such behavior, Obama has lowered the standards for self-control and mature restraint to the level of rowdy, street-fighting gangs. When, instead, he should be raising the bar for people to strive toward becoming more considerate, tolerant, self-disciplined, self-sustaining, and self-assured.

Not a day goes by that he is not attempting to defy our laws, remove our rights, over-ride established procedures, install controversial appointees, enact divisive mandates, and assert a dictatorial form of power.

Never has there been a leader of this great land who used such

tactics to harm and hurt the people and this country.

Never have we had a President who spoke with a caustic, evil tongue against the citizenry rather than present himself as a soothing, calming, and trustworthy force.

Never, in this country, have we experienced how much stress one man can cause a nation of people – on a daily basis!

Obama has promoted the degeneration of peace, civility, and quality of cooperation between us. He thrives on tearing us down, rather than building us up. He is the Architect of the decline of America, and the epitome of a Demagogue.

© Maureen Scott

P. Maureen Scott is an ardent American patriot who was born in Pittsburgh, PA, and retired to Richmond, VA, in 2000. Free from the nine-to-five grind of writing for employers and clients, she began writing political commentary to please herself and express her convictions.

The accomplishment of which she is most proud is her volunteer work at an Army base where she looked into the eyes and hearts of the service members who protect our country.

Our Pledge of Allegiance, a military band playing the National Anthem, and the wisdom of our Founding Fathers, inspire her passion and views. And when she asks the question, "Who is this Obama?", she already has the answer.

Fact Checking The Bill Clinton DNC Speech

By MacPundit

“Slick Willy” Clinton Has Obama’s Back

You lie and I’ll swear to it.



The Bill Clinton DNC speech was exactly what one would expect from Slick Willy. Until the election of Barack Obama, Slick Willy Clinton was perhaps the most dishonest president in U.S. History. But with less than four years in office, Obama has managed to make Clinton look like Honest Abe. Okay, not quite. The point is, Obama holds the title but I wouldn't trust either one of them with a bowl of my favorite cereal. So who does Obama hire to

tell the world that his failed presidency is an illusion, that he is really a great president and deserves to be reelected? – Slick Willy Clinton of course—biggest liar number two! These guys are serial liars. And yes, I would say the same thing if it were true of a Republican. I've said it many times, I call them like I see them.

Here's the deal. At best, Obama's radical Liberal policies have resulted in the worst and longest "recovery" from a recession since the Great Depression. That is not only a fact, it is being kind. So there was Obama, in deep trouble with the smart voters who actually know his record, the Democratic

National Convention was around the corner, and he was desperately searching for a master political illusionist other than himself. He needed someone who could make the audience see success while they looked straight in the face of failure. He needed someone with no conscience who practiced the dark art of deceit as skillfully as he did. It was easy. So easy, I'd bet, that he had the answer before he had a chance to ask the question.

He gave Slick Willy a call and said something like, "Hey Bill, I know I lied a little about you and your wife Hillary during the '08 campaign, but hey man, politics is a ... well you know. Anyway, party comes first. Right? Oh, and I'm sorry I called you a racist, but you of all people know that winning is what it's all about. Anything else is for the suckers. Ya gotta do what ya gotta do. Come on man, you're King Truth Warper! Well, that is until I came along. Anyway, as you might have noticed, I kinda messed up the country a little bit and if that Romney guy gets elected he'll fix everything and that won't be good for either one of us. He'll get elected to a second term and there goes Hillary's shot at 2016. So what do you say? I'll give you top billing at the convention. You know how our people are, they believe anything we say. In fact they believe it before we say it. They love you, man. Just go out there and tell everyone how smart I am and how important it is to give me some more time. It's not for me, it's for the party and Hillary."

So Slick Willy did what Slick Willy does best. He stood up there in front of his loyal cult and tried to con the world into believing that Barack Obama was actually a pretty good president. Other than lying about Monica Lewinsky, it must have been his toughest con yet.

But just for the heck of it, let's peek

behind the curtain.

Slick Willy said: "... since 1961, for 52 years now, the Republicans have held the White House 28 years, the Democrats, 24. In those 52 years, our private economy has produced 66 million private sector jobs. So what's the job score? Republicans, 24 million; Democrats, 42 (million). (Cheers, applause.)

The inconvenient truth: Over half of the total jobs created under Democrats were from Clinton's own Presidency. They were produced during an internet dotcom boom that later collapsed. He also failed to mention that Republicans controlled Congress during 6 out of 8 years of his Presidency and that it was the Republicans under the leadership of Newt Gingrich that basically forced Clinton into balancing the budgets and other policies that led to job creation.

Slick Willy said: "It turns out that advancing equal opportunity and economic empowerment is both morally right and good economics, because discrimination, poverty and ignorance restrict growth, while investments in education, infrastructure and scientific and technological research increase it, creating more good jobs and new wealth for all of us."

The inconvenient truth: When Democrats use the word "investment" they are really talking about spending. They just don't want to tell you what they are actually doing. Even so, the balanced budgets Clinton signed cut the very "investments" he was talking about. Another thing he didn't mention was that he and the Republicans held spending down to about 18% of GDP, but under Obama it is now over 24% of GDP. That is a huge difference and a real problem for all of us.

Slick Willy said: "One of the main reasons we ought to re-elect President Obama is that he is still committed to constructive cooperation."

The inconvenient truth: WOW! I'm impressed! Even Slick Willy should have had a problem getting that one out. Maybe someone who had been on the planet for about five minutes could believe it, but certainly no one else. Any number of non-partisan studies have shown that Barack Obama is one of our most divisive presidents, ever. Not that anyone would need a study to know that. It's his way or the highway. Every one of Obama's major legislative initiatives passed on party lines. And even though he says he always sought Republican input, when he got it, he rejected it. Obamacare was shoved down our throats in one of the most politically corrupt displays of bullying in our history. Cooperation? Anything but. At one point he actually said this, "[Republicans] can come for the ride, but they gotta sit in back."

Slick Willy said: "... the Senate Republican leader said in a remarkable moment of candor two full years before the election, their number one priority was not to put America back to work; it was to put the president out of work."

The inconvenient truth: This is a classic lie-by-re-writing. He changed the meaning, which was that in order to get Americans back to work, we need to put President Obama out of work. But it gets worse: Obama himself had put many issues ahead of job creation. He spent his first two years jamming Obamacare through Congress while he should have been working to help Americans get back to work.

Slick Willy Said: "[Republicans] want to the same old policies that got us in trouble in the first place."

The inconvenient Truth: Like Obama and the Democrats, Clinton just made that one up. They keep saying it because they know it sounds good and that most Americans don't know the truth. But it is factually untrue. That is why they never back up the statement with examples. Romney's plan, which is on his website, lists policies that have worked time and again. They worked for Kennedy and Reagan and they would work again now.

It is the Liberal Obama policies—the very same ones that are in place right now—that never worked before and are not working now.

Slick Willy said: “They want to cut taxes for high-income Americans, even more than President Bush did.”

The inconvenient truth: First, Romney wants to get rid of many tax loopholes across the board, including those of high-income Americans and he wants to simplify the tax code and lower taxes on everyone.

Second, Democrats have been lying about the Bush tax cuts for years. Allow me to set the record straight: The Bush tax cuts helped virtually all Americans. In fact, to show how dishonest Clinton, Obama, and the Democrats are, think of this: When Bush was president they accused him of giving tax cuts to the wealthy only. They called them “The Bush Tax Cuts For The Wealthy.” They said they did not help the middle-class at all. But now that Obama is president and the Bush tax cuts will expire at the end of the year, Obama says he wants to get rid of the Bush tax cuts for upper-income people and keep the Bush tax cuts for the middle-class. Really? I thought there were no Bush tax cuts for the middle-class. How can you keep something you said was not there? But hey, they lie so often, you can’t really expect them to remember them all.

Slick Willy said: “They want to get rid of those pesky financial regulations designed to prevent another crash and prohibit future bailouts.”

The inconvenient truth: I challenge Clinton or Obama to point to any regulations that Romney wants to get rid of that would “... prevent another crash and prohibit future bailouts.” Again, Clinton and the others simply make things up that they know will sound good to Americans who don’t have the time to check on everything they say. Furthermore, it was a lack of regulations at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that triggered our

financial crisis, and it was the Republicans that tried to get new regulations put in place to prevent a financial crisis. And it was the Democrats that blocked any new regulations. (See Bush Failed Economic Policies and Obama Blames Bush For Our Financial Crisis)

Slick Willy said: “When President Barack Obama took office, the economy was in free fall. It had just shrunk 9 full percent of GDP. We were losing 750,000 jobs a month. Are we doing better than that today? The answer is yes.”

The inconvenient truth: It would be real nice if Slick Willy had experienced some kind of spiritual epiphany by now, but one can only dream of such things. Here again, he spins the numbers to make them look like something other than what they are. He compares the worst part of the recession to today and asks if we are better off instead of asking how the Obama “recovery” compares to other recoveries. In other words, if we ask if we are doing better now than we were doing when Obama took office, the answer is a resounding NO.

Since January 2009 when Obama took over, unemployment is up, annual household income is down by more than \$4000, the price of gas at the pump has more than doubled, food, clothing, etc. are more costly and still rising, the housing market is still in shambles, and Obama has added a frightening \$5.4 trillion to the national debt. It is a fact that Obama’s so-called recovery is the worst recovery from a recession in 83 years!

(I need a full-time fact-checker to keep up with Slick Willy and the Liar In Chief.)

Slick Willy said: “The president’s energy strategy, which he calls ‘all of the above,’ is helping too. The boom in oil and gas production, combined with greater energy efficiency, has driven oil imports to a near-20- year low and natural gas production to an all-time high. And renewable energy production has doubled.”

The inconvenient truth: Actually, Obama does not even have an “all of the above” energy strategy. It doesn’t exist! Slick Willy did the same sleight-of-hand trick that Obama does so often. (They’re both so darn good at it.)

Here’s how their trick works: First, they tell you there is a “boom in oil and gas production” so now you have in your mind this wonderful vision of oil and gas flowing out of pipes all over the country. Then they imply that Obama has caused the industry to create new efficiencies, which with all the new oil and gas, have “... driven oil imports to a near-20- year low and natural gas production to an all-time high.” Finally, they tell us that “... renewable energy production has doubled.”

Here’s the problem: While oil production has increased, the increase is far from a “boom.” And then there is this: The increase in production is on private land where Obama can’t stop it. They don’t mention that, nor do they mention that we could actually have a real boom but for the fact that Obama and his regulatory bullies have restricted production on public lands. In other words, the increase in oil and gas production that Obama and Slick Willy brag about is happening in spite of Obama, not because of him. As though that is not bad enough, Obama will not approve the construction of the Keystone Pipeline from Canada, which would increase the flow of friendly foreign oil, decrease our dependency on unfriendly foreign oil, and create tens of thousands of new jobs in the U.S. Finally, Obama by his own admission is literally destroying the U.S. coal industry.

Oh, and about the “... renewable energy production has doubled.” thing? It’s kind of doubled from miniscule to twice miniscule. It not only remains a very small part of our energy production, the Obama renewable energy program is riddled with cronyism and corruption and countless millions of taxpayer dollars have been squandered on failed projects that put a lot of money in the pockets of Obama supporters. That is how your president redistributes your money. Think Solyndra.

Slick Willy said: “Even more important, after a decade in which exploding college costs have increased the dropout rate so much that the percentage of our young people with four-year college degrees has gone down so much that we have dropped to 16th in the world in the percentage of young people with college degrees.

So the president’s student loan is more important than ever. Here’s what it does – (cheers, applause) – here’s what it does. You need to tell every voter where you live about this. It lowers the cost of federal student loans. And even more important, it give students the right to repay those loans as a clear, fixed, low percentage of their income for up to 20 years. (Cheers, applause.)

Now what does this mean? What does this mean? Think of it. It means no one will ever have to drop out of college again for fear they can’t repay their debt.”

The inconvenient truth: So first he implies that student loans are hard to get even though they may actually be too easy to get. They are so readily available that many studies claim that this contributes to the sky-rocketing cost of tuition. They say that the Obama policies make it too easy for students to take out ever more and bigger loans, which in turn encourages schools to raise their tuition. The result is that students end up with more debt and less relative value from their degrees. It’s a vicious cycle and one more example of unintended consequences from vote-getting, specious liberal policies.

A Moody’s analysis warned:

[u]nless students limit their debt burdens, choose fields of study that are in demand, and successfully complete their degrees on time, they will find themselves in worse financial positions and unable to earn the projected income that justified taking out their loans in the first place.”

So do you think for a minute that Obama or for that matter, Slick Willy, really care about what happens to these students later? I do not think so. It's all about power—getting the votes and winning an election. They are demagogues.

That's enough. I'll just wrap it up with one last big Slick Willy lie.

Out of all the incredibly dishonest claims made by Slick Willy at the Democratic National Convention, the one that seems to have stuck in the minds of the American people more than all the others was this: “No president could have “magically” fixed the economy in one term”. When I heard those words flow out Slick Willy's lying mouth, I thought “Oh boy, that's going to mean a lot to people who don't know any better.”

So if some of you who thought that might convince you to stick with Obama for another four years, listen to what I have to tell you. Not only could someone else fix the economy in four years, someone did. As Slick Willy would say, “Now listen to me.” Ronald Reagan faced a deep recession left over from Jimmy Carter. It was the worst recession since the Great Depression of the thirties. In many ways it was worse than Obama's. I remember it very clearly. Interest rates were sky high, people were literally fighting at gas stations because there was a shortage of gasoline, and—thanks to the policies of Jimmy Carter, which are eerily being mirrored by Obama—overall all, the economy was a monumental mess and Carter had lost control of the problems in the Middle East. Sound familiar?

But the policies Reagan implemented were very different than Obama's—and so were the results. Reagan claimed that fifty years of misguided liberal policies had over burdened the free market with taxes and regulations and that, along with government over spending, it had drained the free market of its natural vitality. (Exactly what Romney is saying now.) Reagan's plan: Get “the government off the backs of the

American people” by cutting taxes, slashing spending, and cutting back on counter productive regulations. Again, does this sound familiar? It should because that is where we are now.

Did Reagan’s plan work?

Real per capita GDP increased by nearly 23% and the stock market more than tripled in value. The Reagan recovery created almost 25 million net new jobs, or about 344,900 jobs per month. His policies ushered in the the longest peacetime period of unbroken economic expansion ever seen in American history. Remember, Mitt Romney is proposing the same kinds of Reagan policies. You know, the ones that work. On the other hand, President Obama is asking us to let him try his policies for another four years. You know, the ones that haven’t worked for him or anyone else who has tried them. So the choice should be obvious to anyone who is paying attention.

Really, this is not complicated

You don’t hire a college professor to fix your plumbing and you don’t hire a neighborhood organizer who has literally never managed or run anything to govern a nation—especially the most powerful and influential nation in the world. You don’t believe the words of the two most dishonest presidents in U.S. history. You just don’t.

Finally, you don’t hang on to ideas about someone that are factually untrue. Barack Obama’s record as president—as compared to all our other presidents—is at the very least one of the worst and is probably the worst. He may also be the most dishonest president in our history. To think otherwise is delusional because all of what I just said is well documented. It’s not personal. It’s not about race or anything other than what is real and true. I have fought against bigotry throughout my entire life. I despise it. So when I write these things I write them with a clear mind and heart. This is about

the survival and future of our country.

We are being asked to give up what has made us great.

This is very serious because this is one of the most important elections in history. We are being asked to choose between our traditional form of government and economic system—the one that has made us the most powerful, successful country in world history for a much different big government, nanny-state system, which has been tried without success many times before. Personally, I cannot think of one single sane reason to do that.

More than ever before, we need to be mature and wise when we go into the polling booth to choose who will lead us for the next four years. If you are not taking this seriously or you are not well informed, do yourself and your country a favor and please don't vote. You see, a dumb vote cancels out a smart vote and we need all the smart votes we can get right now.

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.