

Ignorant Americans

By MacPundit

It is like we are two nations—One is informed, the other ignorant



Your country, our country—the great United States of America—is in deep trouble. We are tottering on the brink of economic collapse while almost thirty Middle Eastern countries are literally on fire—fueled by a deep hatred for America. Yet

because there are far too many ignorant Americans among us, almost half of us act like everything is fine. Well, there is nothing fine about the current state of affairs in America. If you don't know how serious things are, you owe it to all of us to read this article.

An ignorant vote cancels out an informed vote. So please do your country a great service: If you are too lazy or too disinterested to become informed, please do not vote in this election.

But if you really do care about the future of our country, watch this video before you continue. It was made by John Zogby, a highly respected non-partisan pollster, just after Barack Obama was elected in 2008. Pay close attention and

replay it if you think you missed something important.

Let's review what we just saw and heard.

Remember, this was a typical sampling of the much larger Zogby study.

- They all said that Republicans controlled Congress and they were all wrong. The Democrats controlled Congress.
- Nancy Pelosi was the Speaker of the Democratically controlled House of Representatives. She was second in line to become president. They did not know who she was.
- Barney Frank was a powerful Congressman who with other Democrats blocked Republican efforts to reform Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two agencies some believe were responsible for the housing market collapse, which led to our financial crisis. They did not know who he was.
- Harry Reid was and still is the Majority Leader of the Democratically controlled Senate. He too helped to block reform at Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. They did not know who he was.
- They did know who Sarah Palin was. But because of politically biased media coverage and efforts by her Democrat opponents to belittle her, they knew only meaningless, superficial things about her. You can be sure they did not know anything important like the fact that she was the most highly rated governor in America at the time. (At one point Alaskans gave her a 90 percent approval rating.) Later in the interview, they all thought she said she could see Russia from her house, which she never said. She actually said you can see Russia from land in Alaska, which is true.
- When asked which candidate claimed to have campaigned in 57 states, they all named someone except Barack Obama, the one who actually said it. In fact, he said he had already campaigned in 57 states and still had one to go. (You do know that we have only 50 states, right?)

- When asked which candidate won their first election by getting all their opponents kicked off the ballot, once again, they named Palin or McCain but not Obama, the one who actually did it.
- When asked which candidate said their own policies would bankrupt the coal industry and send energy prices sky high, they either claimed to not know or named someone other than Obama, who was the one who said it.

Do you see the problem? We have become an ignorant nation—exactly what our founders worried most about. They predicted that if America failed, it would do so by committing suicide. They had given all the power to the people—to us—and they knew that slick politicians would steal it from us unless we were well informed. Only ignorant people can be manipulated.

Consider these words from our 3rd and 35th presidents

If a nation expects to be ignorant and free it expects what never was and never will be.

Thomas Jefferson

The ignorance of one voter in a democracy impairs the security of all.

John F. Kennedy

But there is another problem

Even if you want to be informed, you will need to know exactly where to get accurate, honest information. You see, much of our media—where we get our information—is corrupt. They do not give us all the facts. With few exceptions, most of them are liberal Democrats even though 80 percent of Americans are not. It was not always this way. Years ago, it didn't matter if a news reporter was a Democrat or Republican. They had an ethical code and most of them lived by it. So even if the news was not good for their candidate, they reported it accurately.

As a result, our ancestors were actually better informed than we are now. But today, about half of Americans are either uninformed or misinformed. That is why the people in the video were unable to correctly answer even the most basic questions.

In 2008 we really did not know who we were electing

By all fair standards, Barack Obama was the most unqualified presidential candidate ever. We knew less about him than any presidential candidate in history. The truth is, we still don't know much about him. That is because he and his political machine have worked very hard to keep important information from us, and our corrupt media don't ask them for it. For example, Barack Obama still refuses to release his school records from high school, Occidental College, Columbia University, and Harvard. Yet, again, the media never asks him about it, even though they pushed hard to get the same records from candidates in the past. (See Obama School Records)

But this time it is different. Now President Obama has a record for us to consider

Now that he has been our president for almost four years we can look at his record and decide whether it is good or bad. But, because we cannot trust the media to inform us honestly, many of you don't know his real record. In fact, you have been told so many conflicting things that you probably don't know what to believe anymore. So let's look at the facts—the real facts—the truth.

He is absolutely responsible for his own record

No matter what he or the media tell you, after almost four

years, President Obama is responsible for his record as president. Regardless of what he inherited—much of which was his and his fellow Democrat's fault—he is responsible for his own record as president. That is how we do it in America. It is his economy and his foreign policy. So let's take a look.

▪ **Our National Debt** – How much money we have borrowed and now owe to others

- When Obama took office it was \$10.626 trillion.
- It is now (September 24, 2012) \$16.053 trillion.
- Our debt has grown by \$5.427 trillion in less than four years under Obama. He has added more debt than any president in our history. In fact, he has added more debt than all presidents from George Washington to George H.W. Bush combined.
- Candidate Obama called President George W. Bush unpatriotic for adding \$4 trillion in eight years. But he, Obama, added \$4 trillion in two and a half years—less than 1/3 of the time!
- The National Debt now exceeds 100 percent of the nation's Gross Domestic Product, the total value of goods and services. This means that if we used everything we produced in our entire nation in a year to pay off our debt, it would not be enough.
- The federal budget sent to Congress by Mr. Obama, projects the National Debt will continue to rise as far as the eye can see. The budget shows the Debt hitting \$17.5 trillion in 2013 and \$25.9 trillion in 2022.
- As our share of the National Debt, every man, woman, and child now owes about \$51,000.
- For the first time in our history, we are leaving our children and grandchildren a burden of debt that will make their lives far more difficult than ours are.
- This debt problem is deadly serious and if it is

not dealt with, it could cause a worldwide financial collapse like the world has never seen. And not only have the Obama policies not slowed the increasing debt problem, the budget he submitted would increase our debt dramatically in the coming years.

- **Unemployment** – After 42 months, it remains over 8 percent
 - It is the longest period of unemployment over 8 percent since the Great Depression.
 - According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, just over 58 percent of the adult population does not have any kind of job at all (full or part time), the lowest figure in 30 years.
 - Obama predicted that his huge Stimulus Bill, which cost the taxpayers almost \$1 trillion, would keep unemployment under 8 percent and that it would be about 6 percent by now. It has not been below 8 percent since he took office.
 - Not only has it not gotten better, last month's job report showed that for every new job created, four people dropped out of the job market because after searching long and hard, they could not find work and they simply gave up.
 - Only 64 percent of adult men have a job of any kind, the lowest figure ever.
 - If we add the workers who can find only part-time work, or the discouraged dropouts who are no longer counted in the statistics, the real national jobless rate is about 15 percent.
 - Millions of Americans who have been out of work for a long time have been forced to use up their savings and are concerned that they won't be able to cover basic living expenses in retirement.

- **Poverty** – Under President Obama it is at record levels.
 - 15 percent of our population—more than 46 million

Americans are now living in poverty.

- The poverty rate for children remains more than 20 percent for the third year in a row. More than one-third of black children and Hispanic children live in poverty.
- The Department of Agriculture reported that Food Stamp usage is at an all-time high. 47 million Americans—about 1 in 5 adults—now depend on Food Stamps to feed themselves and their families. Under Obama policies, 15 million Americans have been added to the Food Stamp program. That is an alarming 49 percent increase since he took office.
- **The Middle-Class** – It is disappearing.
 - While President Obama continues to tell us he is for the middle-class, since he took office the average American annual household income has dropped by \$4,000.

The numbers don't lie. President Obama's policies are not working and in some key areas have made things worse. Consider this: The Obama "recovery" is the longest and worst recovery from a recession since the Great Depression. To be sure, there really is a point of no return and we are headed right for it. In other words, we are running out of time.

- **Foreign Affairs – National Security**

- By any fair measure " ... this president will leave his successor a country that is considerably less secure than it was when he took the oath of office." Since we do not have room here to adequately review President Obama's record on foreign affairs and national security, I have included the above link to an extensive *Washington Post* article, which you can read to learn more. You can tell by the link text that his record is not good.

- **Women's Issues**

- **Income Inequality** – It is hurting women. While

President Obama tells women they should vote for him, under his policies income inequality—as measured by the Gini index—has reached a new record high.

- **Women in the workplace** – While he tells women he is on their side, that he respects them, we get a completely different picture from women who work in the Obama White House. (See The Obama War On Women)

- **A Divisive President**

- In 2008 candidate Obama told us that he would unite the country. However, those who knew his record were skeptical because he had the most Liberal voting record in the Senate. In fact, he voted 97% of the time with Democrats only.
- As president, while he said he wanted to work with Republicans he has used every opportunity to criticize them and dishonestly accuse them of being uncooperative. Now, he creates false class warfare issues, which further divides our country. For example, “The Republican War On Women.” “The rich against the poor,” and others that in reality do not exist. The result? Instead of uniting us, he has divided us.

The list is long yet it would take another page or two to adequately review the horrendous state of our economy, overall. I didn't even mention the price of gas at the pump, which is around \$4.00 per gallon. It was \$1.83 when President Obama took office, so it has more than doubled. Food, clothing, housing—virtually everything we buy is far more expensive. As a result, the quality of our lives has been measurably diminished and millions of our fellow Americans continue to suffer.

If you are still reading, you deserve to be congratulated—even praised. It means you care about our country and that is what

this is all about. But I have left at least one important question unanswered:

Where can we get accurate information about the candidates and the issues?

Well, if you do not have the time to search out and verify every important piece of information—as I did for this article—I suggest you do the next best thing, which is to get your news from the most highly rated news channel on cable television. According to studies done by various independent research organizations, that would be Fox News Channel. Of course if you believe what the left-wing propaganda puts out, your blood pressure may spike at the mere mention of Fox. But if you are really sincere about wanting to be well informed, I suggest you rethink what you have heard and tune in to Fox for at least one entire week.

Here's why

There are good reasons that Fox gets a much larger share of the cable viewing audience than the others. Their news reporting really is fair and balanced. Notice I said “news reporting.” That’s important because we have to distinguish between news reporting and commentary. For example, one of Fox’s popular programs is *Hannity*, which is conservative commentary. The host, Sean Hannity, is a registered Conservative and he let’s his audience know that. He does not pretend to be a news reporter or journalist. But for honest, straight news you can’t do any better than Bret Bair or Sheppard Smith. Bret is on from 6 to 7 every weekday evening and Sheppard from 7 to 8. I recommend them highly.

On the other hand, the same independent research organizations have found news outlets like ABC, CBS, NBC, MSNBC, and CNN to be, well, rather biased to the left. Of all of them, MSNBC is the most biased—so much so that it is hard to tell at times whether they are a news network or a commercial for the Obama campaign. Enough said.

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)