

# President Obama Tell All Videos



## The Great American Con Job!

Also starring Jon Stewart, CNN,  
Fox News, C-SPAN, and more.

You should have no further questions  
about Barack Obama after watching these  
videos!

PART I

PART II

If these *Obama Tell All Videos* didn't clear up any lingering questions you may have had, frankly, I hope you do our country a great service by not voting this year. Whether you can bring yourself to accept it or not, Barack Obama is a very dishonest man—probably the most dishonest president in U.S. history—and it is naive to think that our friends and enemies around the

world don't know this as well.

We not only deserve better, we have always had better. It is not about Democrat or Republican, it is about the survival of our nation.

---

## 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](#))

---

## **Obama Lied About Romney And Bain Capital**

### **The serial lying continues**

## **Obama Lie: Romney destroyed companies**

**The Truth: Romney's record at Bain is one of remarkable success. (Ask Bill Clinton, he'll vouch for it.)**

Despite investments in many companies that were failing, eighty percent of the companies Bain Capital invested in grew revenues. This meant they were able to hire more workers and that our economy grew as a result. It was common for Bain to hold companies for many years while investing a



large amount of human and financial capital in order to improve operations and revive struggling companies.

## **Obama attacks what has made us great**

Obama attacks on Romney and Bain are attacks on the private sector of our economy—the only sector able to create jobs and wealth for our citizens. Government does not create wealth. In fact, it is solely dependent on the private sector for its income. Without a healthy, wealth-producing private sector, the government would have no income at all. Our private sector—our free enterprise system—is what has made our nation the most successful in human history. So when President Obama attacks a company like Bain Capital, he attacks the very thing that has fed, clothed, housed, and cared for generations of Americans, plus millions of people in other countries for decades.

**Obama Lie: Bain Capital only profited rich businessmen.**

## **The Truth: Bain investors include pension funds, charities, and universities.**

Over half the money invested in private equity firms like Bain Capital comes from pension funds, charitable foundations, and universities. Successful investments made by these entities provides secure retirements for seniors, money for charities so they can better serve their communities, and money for resources universities need to educate our youth.

## **Obama attacks on Bain can actually hurt taxpayers!**

State and local governments actually depend on returns from private equity investments to fund employee retirements without having to cut into their operating budgets. For example, if an investment in a Bain project doesn't perform well, state and local governments must offset that by using tax dollars that could have been spent on local programs. So once again, when Obama attacks Bain, he is attacking an investment strategy that actually helps to reduce the burden on American taxpayers.

So when Bain and other private equity firms succeed, retirees, charities, local communities, and universities benefit the most. (That's a good thing, Mr. President.)

## **Obama Lie: Bain intentionally bankrupted a successful steel mill**

## **The Truth: Obama intentionally mischaracterized the real story**

Even though it was already scheduled to close, Mitt Romney and Bain Capital bought the GS Technologies steel plant and tried to help turn it around. Bain's investment plus \$170 million in

upgrades managed to keep the plant competitive in a bad international market and saved the steel workers' jobs for eight years.

Despite a valiant effort by Bain to save the company, two years after Romney left Bain, the plant was closed due to foreign steel dumping into the U.S. market. Of course Obama conveniently failed to mention that thirty-one other steel companies declared bankruptcy during the same period. Yet without Bain's intervention, the steel workers at GS Technologies would have lost their jobs eight years earlier.

## **President Obama perpetuates the problem**

After three and a half years in office, President Obama has still not taken the steps necessary to protect American manufacturing from unfairly-subsidized Chinese imports. If elected, President Romney will on day one designate China a currency manipulator and do what is necessary to make American manufacturing competitive again.

**Obama Lie: Romney is a "corporate raider."**

**The Truth: Even Obama's supporters say this is not true!**

- Steve Rattner, President Obama's former car czar: Governor Romney was the "furthest thing" from a corporate raider.
- Governor Deval Patrick: Bain was a "perfectly fine company" with "a role in the private economy."
- Former President Bill Clinton: "... [Romney] had a sterling business career..." and "I don't think that we ought to get into the position where we say this is bad work. This is good work."



Far from tearing down companies, Romney has a successful history of building up companies like Staples, Sports Authority, Steel Dynamics, and Bright Horizons, among others. Yet Obama continues to revert to dirty Chicago-style slash-and-burn politics in order to dishonestly destroy the character of Mitt Romney in an effort to persuade his uninformed followers to vote for him. In the process, he disgraces and diminishes the Office of the Presidency.

**Obama Lie: Romney is responsible for sending millions of jobs overseas.**

**The Truth: Obama's accusations involved events that happened well after Romney left Bain Capital.**

Bain Capital invested in over 100 companies. Of those, President Obama's campaign has accused three of shipping jobs overseas. In two of these cases, the accusations are related to events that occurred in 2000 and 2001, well after Governor Romney left Bain Capital in February 1999 to lead the Winter Olympics. In the third case, the share of domestic production actually increased, not decreased, during the time the Obama campaign points to. This attack is merely an attempt to distract voters from President Obama's failed economic record and his refusal to stand up to China's unfair trade practices.

**Obama Lie: Romney closed stores and laid off employees at Stage Stores.**

**The Truth: Under Bain Capital's ownership, Stage Stores doubled the number of employees and doubled the**

## **number of stores.**

During this time, Stage Stores added locations in Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Iowa. Bain Capital sold its controlling interest in the company in 1997. Years later, Stage Stores filed for bankruptcy, but today it is a healthy business with 14,000 employees and hundreds of new stores nationwide.

## **Dirty Chicago politics and Saul Alinsky**

So it is clear that Obama lied about Romney and Bain Capital. But don't simply chalk this off and expect President Obama to have a conversion and stop lying. It is what he does—who he is. He has been doing it for many years. Ask his opponents in Illinois. Ask Bill and Hillary Clinton. Well, you might have to look for videos from the 2008 Democrat primary race to hear them renounce Obama. They are loyal Democrats after all and would probably avoid the truth if you asked them now. But they were both quite upset with Obama back then. Barack Obama practices Chicago-style and Saul Alinsky politics. He used to teach Alinsky's *Rules For Radicals* and he follows those rules every day.

It is not an exaggeration to say that Barack Obama is the most radical and the most dishonest president in U.S. History.

---

## **Is Obama More Dishonest Than Nixon, Reagan, And G.W. Bush?**

# Presidential Dishonesty



My posting of the question, "Is Obama the most dishonest president in history?" on Facebook provoked the following question from someone I respect: "More dishonest than Richard Nixon? Ronald Reagan and his Iran-Contra debacle? George W, and the lies about WMDs?" After giving a necessarily short answer on Facebook due to space limitations, I am posting more information here.

**Nixon's** mistake was to stonewall an investigation of something he did not create, implement, or manage. Many books have been written on this so I would have to spend a considerable amount of time to explain fully Nixon's part in Watergate. For now, I will only say it is my understanding that there is no hard evidence to indicate that President Nixon had any prior knowledge of the break in. It seems he was not only surprised when he learned about it but that he wondered who could have been so stupid to have done such a foolish thing. Also it is clear that he was seriously misled by his Legal Counsel, John Dean, whose self-serving misdirection was instrumental in Nixon's ill-advised cover up. Then there were the infamous tapes. As one leading Democrat at the time said, "He should have destroyed the tapes." (paraphrased) However, unlike Obama, one cannot assemble a long list of Nixon lies because they, apparently, do not exist.

**Reagan** was troubled by one sticky incident. Most politicians would be thrilled with such scarcity. With that duly noted,

after multiple investigations, Reagan was essentially cleared of any foreknowledge of the Iran-Contra adventure. He also appeared at least twice on national TV to take full personal responsibility and to apologize for the operation—a rare event in U.S. Politics.

**George W,** and the lies about WMDs: That “W” lied about WMD is nothing more than a persistent Liberal myth. I can only think that some who perpetuated the myth are lying themselves while others are simply ignorant of the facts. There is a huge, highly credible amount of evidence to support this. There is also a simple explanation: All major intelligence agencies around the world, including our own CIA, believed that Saddam Hussein still had stockpiles of WMD and that he intended to use them against the U.S.A. Notice I said “still” because everyone knew he had them and used them on his own people. So Bush proceeded with the best intelligence available and with the approval of virtually all the Democrats in Congress. If he had not acted on the intelligence and Hussein did use them on us, Bush would most certainly have been widely condemned and, perhaps, even impeached.

With Iraq and other major military matters regarding war, Bush always took his case to the Congress for approval while Obama has repeatedly chosen to ignore Congress and proceed on his own. If Bush had done the same, he would have been crucified by the media and the Democrats. Hypocrisy is rampant on the Left.

## **For the record ...**

Please read the following quotes and then answer the question at the end:

# STATEMENTS ON IRAQ WMD – Part 1

## Bush and Republican statements on the existence of Iraq WMD

“One way or the other, we are determined to deny Iraq the capacity to develop weapons of mass destruction and the missiles to deliver them. That is our bottom line.”

“If Saddam rejects peace and we have to use force, our purpose is clear. We want to seriously diminish the threat posed by Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction program.”

“Iraq is a long way from [here], but what happens there matters a great deal here. For the risks that the leaders of a rogue state will use nuclear, chemical or biological weapons against us or our allies is the greatest security threat we face.”

“He will use those weapons of mass destruction again, as he has ten times since 1983.”

“We urge you, after consulting with Congress, and consistent with the U.S. Constitution and laws, to take necessary actions (including, if appropriate, air and missile strikes on suspect Iraqi sites) to respond effectively to the threat posed by Iraq’s refusal to end its weapons of mass destruction programs.”

“Saddam Hussein has been engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction technology which is a threat to countries in the region and he has made a mockery of the weapons inspection process.”

“Hussein has... chosen to spend his money on building weapons of

mass destruction and palaces for his cronies.”

“There is no doubt that... Saddam Hussein has invigorated his weapons programs. Reports indicate that biological, chemical and nuclear programs continue apace and may be back to pre-Gulf War status. In addition, Saddam continues to redefine delivery systems and is doubtless using the cover of a licit missile program to develop longer-range missiles that will threaten the United States and our allies.”

“We begin with the common belief that Saddam Hussein is a tyrant and a threat to the peace and stability of the region. He has ignored the mandated of the United Nations and is building weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them.”

“We know that he has stored secret supplies of biological and chemical weapons throughout his country.”

“Iraq’s search for weapons of mass destruction has proven impossible to deter and we should assume that it will continue for as long as Saddam is in power.”

“We have known for many years that Saddam Hussein is seeking and developing weapons of mass destruction.”

“The last UN weapons inspectors left Iraq in October of 1998. We are confident that Saddam Hussein retains some stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, and that he has since embarked on a crash course to build up his chemical and biological warfare capabilities. Intelligence reports indicate that he is seeking nuclear weapons...”

“I will be voting to give the President of the United States the authority to use force – if necessary – to disarm Saddam Hussein because I believe that a deadly arsenal of weapons of mass destruction in his hands is a real and grave threat to our security.”

"There is unmistakable evidence that Saddam Hussein is working aggressively to develop nuclear weapons and will likely have nuclear weapons within the next five years... We also should remember we have always underestimated the progress Saddam has made in development of weapons of mass destruction."

"He has systematically violated, over the course of the past 11 years, every significant UN resolution that has demanded that he disarm and destroy his chemical and biological weapons, and any nuclear capacity. This he has refused to do"

"In the four years since the inspectors left, intelligence reports show that Saddam Hussein has worked to rebuild his chemical and biological weapons stock, his missile delivery capability, and his nuclear program. He has also given aid, comfort, and sanctuary to terrorists, including al Qaeda members .. It is clear, however, that if left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will continue to increase his capacity to wage biological and chemical warfare, and will keep trying to develop nuclear weapons."

"We are in possession of what I think to be compelling evidence that Saddam Hussein has, and has had for a number of years, a developing capacity for the production and storage of weapons of mass destruction."

"Without question, we need to disarm Saddam Hussein. He is a brutal, murderous dictator, leading an oppressive regime. He presents a particularly grievous threat because he is so consistently prone to miscalculation. And now he is miscalculating America's response to his continued deceit and his consistent grasp for weapons of mass destruction. So the threat of Saddam Hussein with weapons of mass destruction is real."

**First, mentally, answer the question: "Do you believe the statements you just read were made to deceive people into thinking that Saddam Hussein had WMD when, in truth, he did**

not?"

And then [click here](#).