



# Jonathan Gruber

Jonathan Gruber says they had to lie to the stupid American voters.



Jonathan Holmes Gruber is a professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). He is also the director of the Health Care Program at the National Bureau of Economic Research. Despite what some Democrats would now like you to believe, he was a key architect of the Affordable Care Act, also known as "Obamacare." But who he was and who he is now are two entirely different things. Now, because of his unprecedented revelations, he is persona non grata to the Obama Administration and the Democratic Party.

So what has he done to create such a furor? In video 1 we can watch Professor Gruber himself for that answer. Then be sure to watch what Charles Krauthammer had to say about it in video 2.



0/0

This is just one of many revealing Jonathan Gruber videos and, frankly, I can't think of any good reason to show anymore of them. Personally, I can hardly stomach this one. It's not that anything he said is new news; millions of Americans already know that the process to get Obamacare passed was perhaps the most corrupt of any major legislation in U.S. History. And let's not forget that President Obama's absolute promise that "If you like your healthcare plan you can keep it." – was a blatant lie, which he repeated almost 40 times!

But what *is* new is that Professor Gruber said it at all—and then repeated it multiple times while being videotaped. You know, I am tempted to say that he made an unforgivable political mistake by inadvertently telling the truth, but I think that is incorrect. I think he thinks he is the smartest head in the game and he simply loves to tell the world how he fleeced everyone for their own good. But then deception and arrogance are common traits among our current gang of Washington Liberals. And it all trickles down from the top—Mr. Hubris himself, Barack Obama.

President Obama, members of his administration, and his political operatives are a pack of shameful liars. That is not a matter of opinion, it is indeed a fact. It is well documented on this website and elsewhere. Jonathan Gruber's recently exposed revelations are simply one more confirmation of that fact. As Jonathan Gruber so brutally made clear, they had to lie to us about the true nature of Obamacare in order to get it passed because we the people are too stupid to understand what's good for us. As though that weren't enough, in one of his videos Professor Gruber also said that Americans are too dumb to understand economics. To that, I refer you to this article: Liberal Ignorance—Economics. Believe me, it's worth a read.

Listen, dear people, Obama and his legion of leftwing misfits

have failed. Please pardon my all too obvious cliché, but the fat lady has sung and they have not yet heard her. Indeed, they may never hear her because they seem to have three mouths, no ears, and pre-programmed brains.

A few weeks ago, on November 4, we the people—the very same people that the professor called stupid—made some very big political changes. We told liberal Democrats to get out of our capitols and go home—and we would have sent the president home too if we could have. We told our president, the majority leader of the Senate, state governors, and state legislatures all across the nation that we don't like their kind of big government. Who's stupid now?

---

# A Response to Liberal Dishonesty

*By MacPundit*

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

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

example, the first two paragraphs of the original email looked like this:

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Me:** Again, who described Obama as "a radical, unpatriotic

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Author:** If you spend 3 years as a brilliant community organizer, become the first black President of the Harvard Law Review, create a voter registration drive that registers 150,000 new voters, spend 12 years as a Constitutional Law professor, spend 8 years as a State Senator representing a district with over 750,000 people, become chairman of the

state Senate's Health and Human Services committee, spend 4 years in the United States Senate representing a state of 13 million people while sponsoring 131 bills and serving on the Foreign Affairs, Environment and Public Works and Veteran's Affairs committees, you don't have any real leadership experience.

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

1. Let's start with your description of Obama as a "brilliant community organizer." By any objective appraisal his record as a community organizer was not "brilliant." In fact, after three years of less-than-satisfying results, he left his community organizer job to go to law school. During his three years in South Chicago, one project after another either faltered or failed. First, he got community members to demand a job center that would provide job referrals, but there were few jobs to distribute and so it did not work out. Then, he tried to create what he called a "second-level consumer economy." This went nowhere. Finally, an associate advised him to move elsewhere and said that if he stayed there, he was bound to fail. So Obama took the advice and went to law school. Brilliant? Not even close. Was he sincere? Only Obama himself knows that because it is well known that virtually everything he did was calculated to advance his political ambitions. It should also be mentioned that Obama's relationships during this time were and remain very troubling. I will list only a few here but it is a simple matter for anyone who cares enough (and you should) to do some research if you want to know more. You can start by reading a June 8, 2008 article in the Washington Times. Here's the link:  
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jun/08/obamas-a>

ssociations-may-haunt-bid/. You will learn about his associations with Antoin Rezko, William Ayers, Emil Jones Jr., Rashid Khalidi, Rev. Michael Pfleger, and Rev. Jeremiah A. Wright Jr. You can find more Obama associations here.

2. That Barack Obama was the first black president of The Harvard Law Review is certainly to his credit. However, in no way is it a qualification for the presidency of the United States. Do you not know that?
3. He ran a voter registration drive that registered 150,000 new voters. You're correct on this one but those voters were registered in order to increase the power of Chicago's Democratic political machine—not for the benefit of our country as a whole. Further, the country is full of people who register new voters but that has never qualified a single one of them to be president of the United States!
4. You said that Obama spent 12 years as a Constitutional Law professor. Untrue. He was never a Constitutional Law professor. In fact, he was never a professor, ever, even though he and his supporters continue to refer to him as such. His official title was Senior Lecturer. But I'll let Hillary Clinton deal with this one. Here is what her campaign released on March 27, 2008:

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

5. Obama's 8 years as a state senator: Yes, but since when is that a qualification for president? Also, I urge you to check his attendance record and his voting record; they are both pathetic. He was notorious for simply not

showing up and when he did, for voting "present" rather than committing himself to a yea or nay vote. Moreover, when he did vote, he took some very radical positions. For example, he voted against requiring medical care for fetuses (babies) who survived abortion procedures. Basically, he said "Let them die." And he did that three times! The fact is that Barack Obama was and still is extreme-left politically. He has never represented mainstream Americans.

6. He spent 4 years in the United States Senate. Again, you are incorrect. He has not yet finished his first 4 years. He is a freshman senator and he has missed 314 votes! Why? Well, one reason is that he has spent most of that time running for president instead of proving himself in the senate before running for president.
7. You said that Obama sponsored 131 bills. Actually, he sponsored 5 more than that—136. Of course, 122 never made it out of committee and only 2 were successfully enacted. And, again, let's not forget that he has missed 314 votes!

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



a bill, which means to actually be the author of it. Anyone can sponsor (sign-on) to a bill.

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

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

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

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

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

But there is a lot more. Beginning with her tenure as mayor of Wasilla, then as head of the Alaska Oil and Gas Conservation

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

You say that Sarah Palin is governor of a state with only 650,000 citizens. Yes, that’s true. But the problem is that Obama has never governed anyone—not a town or a village or even the neighborhood he failed to organize. He hasn’t governed a single person, let alone 650,000 in the geographically largest and most complex state in the union. He has never had to make any of the decisions that mayors and governors make countless times every day. Obama is a blank slate. We don’t know if he can govern anything because he has no record of ever having done so. So why would you even mention that there are “only” 650,000 citizens of Alaska? All you proved is that Sarah Palin is more qualified than Barack Obama and she is running for vice-president!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Me:** So once more, it is you who are guilty of doing and saying what you accuse others of doing and saying. While I can't think of a single Republican leader that has said any of the things you imply they said, not a day goes by that either the media or bloggers or people like you say all kinds of nasty things about Sarah Palin or completely distort the truth about her. Yes, Todd Palin had a DWI but you failed to mention that it was 22 years ago! So what? Barack Obama in his own words said that he used to do "a little blow" now and then. As to why Alaskans love their "First Family" and think they are so "admirable", it is because they are caring and honest and loving people. What about that disturbs you so much? Why is that so threatening to you? Why do you have a compulsion to denigrate good people? Exactly what values do you hold over such values as theirs?

**Author:** OK, much clearer now.

**Me:** It was never unclear to you. You set out to write a sarcastic, nasty, dishonest trash-piece in order to turn people against Sarah Palin and John McCain. In short, you are as phony as the words in your email. On the other hand, what I wrote is as accurate as my research could possibly make it.

But truth is not your thing. It means nothing to you, which tells me that this wonderful country of ours means nothing to you. If it did, you would never put your politics above the truth.

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

---

# **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*