

Barack & Michelle

# Obama

---

## **What *DO* They Mean By *THAT* ?**

By Dan S. Kennedy

*I dare Obama supporters to  
read this book*

**THIS BOOK IS COPYRIGHT-FREE**  
IT MAY BE REPRODUCED AND DISSEMINATED  
IN ANY FORM, IN ANY QUANTITY  
PROVIDING NO ALTERATIONS, ADDITIONS OR  
OMISSIONS  
ARE MADE.

## Contents

- Chapter 1 How A Harvard Law Grad Plans To Destroy Harvard (Obama on Education)
- Chapter 2 Robin Hood To The Rescue (Obama on CEO Pay)
- Chapter 3 BS About Campaign Financing
- Chapter 4 Should She Be Off Limits?
- Chapter 5 Until Now, An American Hanging Her Head In Shame
- Chapter 6 The Second Coming
- Chapter 7 Hope – But For Whom?
- Chapter 8 Change!
- Chapter 9 President of the United Socialist States
- Chapter 10 How Much More Of Our Money Is Needed?
- Chapter 11 Obama & Oil Companies & Taxes
- Chapter 12 Matters of Inconvenience
- Chapter 13 Obama's Own Words Leave Clues
- Chapter 14 By The Company We Keep
- Chapter 15 Experience Isn't Sexy
- Chapter 16 Hillary And Obama Pick McCain
- Chapter 17 Obama's New World Order
- Chapter 18 Conspiracy Theories
- Chapter 19 Could America Give The World Its Next Hitler?

**Important Notices:** Contents are © 2008/DanKennedyPolitics, however anyone is free to virally transmit or distribute, copy and publish, or otherwise disseminate these materials as long as each each article, blog, e-book, etc. is disseminated intact and in full, including with this notice at its end.

This item reprinted from DanKennedyPolitics and that entire site is in no way whatsoever affiliated with or endorsed by Glazer-Kennedy Insider's Circle™, Entrepreneur Press, Adams Media, Lillo Publishing or any other business entities with which the author, Dan Kennedy, has connection. The opinions expressed here are those solely of the author. And, while every reasonable attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of the content on which the expressed opinions are based, no warranty of such accuracy is made nor liability for same accepted. The contents of this site are provided for entertainment purposes only.

THE AUTHOR, DAN KENNEDY is a serial entrepreneur, celebrated business author, sought after advisor to businesses worldwide, and an accomplished professional speaker - frequently appearing on public programs with four former U.S. Presidents, General

Norman Schwarzkopf, General Colin Powell; business leaders and super-entrepreneurs; and Hollywood and sports celebrities. Information about the author can be found at [www.NoBSBooks.com](http://www.NoBSBooks.com). He may be communicated with directly via fax @ 602-269-3113.

## Chapter One

### OBAMA - What Does He Mean By This?: How A Harvard Law Grad Plans To Destroy Harvard

Barack and Michelle have very UNEQUAL educations. She holds a degree in Sociology from Princeton and with it could have pursued the career in social work, fighting poverty, and otherwise saving humanity that she would have us believe has been hers and his life missions - but she went from there to Harvard to get a law degree too, and make some serious money. You don't get rich with a Sociology degree. Barack also went to Harvard and got his law degree. As Michelle points out, we should all applaud their academic achievements rather than using them to brand the two of them as elitists. Which I would be happy to do if it weren't for the fact that he now wants to deprive all other high achievers of the same very unequal advantage they got for themselves.

Here is his threat to Harvard and other top colleges, exceptional private academies, and individuals willing to strive for excellence and with it, advantage:

"It is our moral obligation to give an equal education, Pre-K through college, to every child born in America."

Obama is a very educated, articulate man. His running mate, Senator Biden even noted how articulate (and clean) he is. Obama is a wordsmith, just like me. I acknowledge and appreciate his thoughtfulness, care, precision and artistry in choosing the words he speaks. Others are clumsier and sloppier, Senator McCain included. But not Obama. He is *precise*. So I tend to accept that he says exactly what he means and means exactly what he says, especially when he says it with exactly the same words more than once. That's why his promise concerning the federal takeover and management of our educational system and curriculum, from kindergarten through college, is so terrifying.

**"Equal education" must mean "EQUAL", and delivering that requires iron-fisted control.**

This means, for example, you must have standardized curriculum taught in every college, so a Harvard education is no longer unequal to a Cleveland Community College education. This means that each educator must be paid exactly the same wage, to prevent one school securing teachers, professors or administrators of superior talent or experience vs. another. This means local control of all school systems' hiring, staffing, pay and curriculum must end. And this definitely prohibits private schools and academies as well as home-schooling.

Let's be very clear about this. He has *not* said "equal OPPORTUNITY to get an education." In fact, he rarely uses the word 'opportunity' at all, as it carries with it implication of personal responsibility and unequal outcomes, winners and losers, in conflict with his core philosophy and promise. No, he has firmly, repeatedly said "equal education."

This means no advantage can be given to students who study harder, work harder or secure better grades. That would lead to unequal education. We can scrap SAT's and college entrance exams, and I suppose, place students in colleges by random draw. And we can eliminate grades altogether from elementary school forward. This means no advantage can be given to families who work hard to live in neighborhoods and school districts of their choice and pay substantially higher property taxes for the express purpose of giving their sons and daughters a superior ie. unequal education. And this means there can be no assessment whatsoever of teacher competency or effectiveness, as any such measurement might expose unequal education, which no longer exists in Obamanation. This should make the teachers' union very happy.

Of course, no grades, and no possible advantages based on more study, better grades, living in better neighborhoods, or any other variable will quickly render all education virtually useless. No losers equals no winners. If there is no reason to work all weekend to write a superior paper for an unequal grade that might affect ability to get into a superior college, who will?

**What Obama proposes is institutionalized mediocrity.**

We already fail to get as many as half of all students through high school in a number of cities, have math and science deficiency making our nation a disgrace and forcing its employers to outsource jobs and import employees; yes, our public educational system is a mess. But if you think it's awful now, just remove all incentives and rewards, and dictate and impose the worst of it on everybody, equally. You'll soon see an entire generation walking on all fours and grunting.

Yes, the proposal is moronic.

So let's move to the other half of his equation: moral responsibility. As I will demonstrate throughout this book, Obama is a confirmed, devout socialist and/or communist. His so-called "common values" are not common at all; they are communist values. The idea that "we" owe an equal education all the way through and including college to every child born in America is equal to saying "we" owe a nice house, a good-running car, a good-paying job, a well-stocked refrigerator, and a secure retirement to every child born in America. **If "we" owe this complete education to every child, where does parental responsibility enter the picture? Apparently, not at all. Where does personal responsibility come in? Not at all. If everyone is entitled, no one needs earn. His insistence that, as moral obligation, "we" owe education and health care to all is revealing of his belief in entitlement not opportunity or responsibility, in state ownership and control not individual rights.** It is a very, very short walk from the place where it's okay to take your money away from you to buy someone else's kid's college diploma or some other family's insurance to taking more of your money away to buy someone else's house or car.

"We" is, of course, code for those of us who have worked extra hard in order to create exceptional success. Code for "the *filthy rich*". But that always expands definitionally, as it must to support grandiose schemes like his. It has to become code for "have's" from which enough must be stolen to equalize the "have not's."

As a *practical* matter, there is no doubt it is in our best interest as a society to provide equal OPPORTUNITY for young people to get an education sufficient to be gainfully employed and function as citizens, which we intend doing -

and pour gigantic sums of money into doing - through our public education system. There are also, in case anyone's forgotten, public libraries offering vast repositories of information on every imaginable subject and skill as well as internet access and use of computers - free. It's sound public policy, because it is less costly to equip people to be self-supporting than it is to support them. This very same thinking should have us investing better and working harder at rehabilitation and education for first-time offenders and petty criminals, and in supporting people who evidence willingness to transition from welfare to work...needs not nearly as popular to talk about as is "free education for all."

However, the obtaining of optional - not essential - higher education that then affords opportunity for the exceptional success Obama is so eager to vilify and tax ought not be the shared, general responsibility of taxpayers at all. There's no practical necessity to subsidize this. A sufficient number of ambitious young men and women will work their way through college, will get assistance from responsible parents who save money for this purpose, and will incur debt able to be repaid from the higher earnings that result. We will have enough people willing to become doctors (unless we socialize medicine) and we already have too damn many lawyers. This opportunity should certainly be available to any and all who choose to obtain it. But providing it as an entitlement is not good public policy at all.

The idea of converting options and even luxuries to entitlements, and negating need for initiative, work, frugality and personal responsibility with public gifts is a uniquely liberal one - and a proven failure everywhere it has taken root.

It is also, as a practical matter, impossible to actually *give* equality. Our present public school system is evidence. And so each new attempt to convert opportunity to gift winds up creating a new and different kind of inequality, just as immoral as its predecessor. "Thou shalt not steal" is a moral dictum almost everyone accepts conceptually, but is victim to parsing of the meaning of "steal" much like Bill Clinton's tortured twisting of the meaning of "is." People differ about the meaning. To me, the taking of money I've earned by force to gift a college education to someone

else's son or daughter is theft and is immoral. We have all tacitly agreed that a *minimum* level of such theft is necessary and acceptable to support civilized and organized society; some administrative body must take money disproportionately from people based on their ability to pay, to fund military defense, roads and bridges, police and fire departments, basic public educations, courts and prisons for benefit of all. But this agreed upon co-operation becomes outrageous and *extreme* theft when it keeps expanding, to take more and more and more away from some to gift more and more and more to others.

The 'moral responsibility' mandate is impossible for government to satisfy. After all, it's easy to argue that putting a safe roof over every head...a full refrigerator of food in every home...a working automobile in every garage are all moral responsibilities. And you can go farther, argue for equal housing for all as moral, and unequal housing for any as immoral. Are you ready to slash size of your home by half, give up your backyard deck and covered garage, and relocate to a more dangerous neighborhood so that you live on an exactly equal basis as the family already living there? If not, then shut up and don't try and force your idea of moral responsibility on me through the gun-barrel of government.

It's worth carefully considering how much public policy you want determined by someone else's defining of your *moral* responsibilities.

**Making it "moral obligation" may be the scariest part of Obama.** He is not discussing any of this in context of good public policy - and you could try mounting an argument that providing free and equal college to all is good for the minority of us paying all the bills because it reduces crime, makes America more competitive in the global marketplace and so forth. He does not bother with such an argument. Instead he anoints himself the all-knowing, holier-than-thou arbiter of *your* morality and moral obligations. This from a guy who believes killing via even late term abortions is moral. It's okay to murder 'em, but for the lucky ones who make it through, "we" have a moral obligation to give them all an equal education right through college. "We" have no right to argue that point. In Obamanation, he and he alone dictates to you what morality is and isn't, and what your

moral responsibilities are. Maybe you're just fine with that. I am not. I do not want a professional politician (and, incidentally, a lawyer) hired as an administrator to manage the government's business stepping into my home and telling me what my moral responsibilities are. I do not accept Obama as my conscience.

We are very confused and conflicted about this. We have banned display of the Bible's Ten Commandments from the same courthouses where we require witnesses to place hands on the Bible and swear to tell the truth. Obama can lecture us about our moral responsibilities while we must accept his advocacy and government funding for abortions or his punitive and regressive tax policies - whether we judge them immoral or not. The trouble with this morality thing is that it is not universally agreed on. Even something you might think easy to get unanimous support for - "thou shalt not kill" - disintegrates to debate over abortion, death penalty and assisted suicide.

It seems to me that the less meddling by government in morality, the better. **Make no mistake: Obama intends major meddling.** Expansive meddling. He and his wife view him as a moral and spiritual leader needed to impose THE Right Way Of Life on us all. No secret has been made of this. His proposed gift of college to all is but one of hundreds of examples. This is ultimately an election about how much meddling by those who would dictate your morality you want to invite.

Chapter Two

**OBAMA - What Does He Mean By *This?*:  
Robin Hood To The Rescue**

"There are CEO's making more in ten minutes than ordinary working people make all year."

This is an often used 'applause line' of Obama's. He goes on to say that such inequality is obscene and unconscionable, and that government must step in to force fairer and more just distribution of income and wealth.

The complaint is so ridiculous it should produce laughter and ridicule, but, because it doesn't, it and he are dangerous.

It's ridiculous because vast income differential exists in every field, and is related to marketplace valuation. The dean of Harvard - and Michelle, when associate dean of the University of Chicago - makes a lot more than the principal of a small town elementary school, and each makes more than the teachers employed there, but more significantly, former President Clinton, or a supposedly reformed 1960's radical or Black Panther, or Reverend Wright, or any number of outside speakers make more in an hour speaking at some universities and at corporate, association and even non-profit institutions' events than the college dean, school principal or school teacher makes in 6 months or all year - and so what?

Obama's buddy Oprah makes more in a week than any of those deans, principals, school teachers, policemen, firemen, rescue workers, or 'ordinary working people' make all year, yet I haven't heard him suggesting her income be cut to 1/4<sup>th</sup> its size by government mandate and re-distributed to the thousands of far less successful talk show hosts laboring in local market oblivion, or to waitresses at diners, or cab drivers. Barbara Streisand sold her last, last, last concert tour tickets for more per seat than most 'ordinary working people' make in a month. Now *that's* unconscionable.

ALL such comparisons are asinine.

**CEO pay is governed by stockholders' willingness to pay it, presumably representing their assessment of that CEO's worth to the enterprise, reflected in their investing in or disposing of the corporation's stock.** It is a free market function. Stockholders invest - or bail out - of their own free will. We can certainly argue stockholders have made some remarkably poor choices of late, been rewarding poor performance or even incompetence, late to punish it, and that corporate Boards have been derelict in oversight duty or *occasionally* even complicit in grossly over-compensating top executives. But the day we let Obama or anyone else not invested in those companies and chosen by the investors to manage them start determining, limiting or interfering with how much the companies pay their executives, we begin the end of all competition and reward for top talent, and replace it with socialist state. To make it somehow formulaic; executive pay a government determined multiple of broom-pusher pay and not a penny more is stupid and destructive, pure and simple. Obama's promise to slash these incomes as justice may sound appealing to you if you are an 'ordinary worker' and pay attention to Fortune 1000 corporations' CEO pay - until it extends to Obama deciding what you're worth too. (Which is exactly what he intends doing with surgeons, doctors, nurses, etc. via socialized medicine - yet have you noticed, no politician has ever suggested socialized *legal* services.)

Just for the record, *I* make more in two days than many 'ordinary working people' make working at their jobs all year long, I'm proud of it, and, bluntly, I don't want Obama telling me that I can't, or confiscating more of my gross income than the government already grabs. I also pay more taxes from every two days of my income than most ordinary working people pay for their entire year's use of the same streets, bridges, safety, national defense and government. **But why do I make so much more per minute than the guy driving the garbage truck in my neighborhood?** This Obama ignores in his demagogue appeal to the garbage truck drivers. I have made the "deliverables" provided by my minutes so much more valuable to somebody willing to buy them. In my case, know-how, expertise, advice and putting words on paper. In the CEO's case, much the same.

If the CEO develops strategy or makes a tough decision in ten minutes that creates, say, \$5-million for his company, how much are his ten minutes worth? They are worth

\$5-million, regardless of what my ten minutes or your ten minutes or the garbageman's ten minutes are worth. If I write an advertisement for a client in an hour that creates a new business, creates 50 new jobs, and fuels \$10-million in sales, what are my sixty minutes worth? Whatever they're worth, there's no rational relationship to whatever your sixty minutes are worth. Or anyone else's. Including all the ordinary working people employed by that company that I wrote the advertisement for.

But let's dig even deeper. I *could* be an ordinary working person. I have a high school degree; I did not attend Princeton or Harvard. I bought my homes fair 'n square, without \$300,000.00 slipped under the table by a slumlord and felon, too. Anyway, I *chose* not to be an ordinary working person. I *chose* to develop extraordinary know-how that can command very high compensation. I *choose* to keep that know-how up-to-date. I work at it. I struggled for years, I went broke, I ate beans from cans, I put in 12 to 16 hour days. To reach the point that I can command more for ten minutes' work than an ordinary working person who made none of those choices, none of those sacrifices now makes in a week or even a month. So I can make about \$2,000.00 per hour while he can only make \$10. So I can make TWO HUNDRED TIMES his hourly wage. But if you let Obama dictate that's too much of a spread, that it's unconscionable and obscene, and I will be permitted only to make, say five times as much as that ordinary working person, then guess what? I'm done with striving to be 200 times more valuable. Done studying my craft every single day. Done still working a lot of 12 hour days. Done creating all those jobs. I'll find something to do that's a lot less stressful and demanding and difficult. And instead of encouraging others to follow my example, I'll tell them to relax. Do not sacrifice. Do not struggle. Do not take risks. If the most Obama will let you have is five times the lowest worker's wage, there's no point whatsoever in making yourself any more than five times smarter or working any more than five times harder. Take it easy. Let somebody else write great ads that fuel monster business growth - you just write ads good enough to stay employed. Scientist? Let somebody else lose sleep over cracking the code of some disease. Start a business? Why? Take an ordinary job, do ordinary work.

Obama's buddy Oprah *chose* not to stay an ordinary working talk show host in a local market. Obama's buddy,

Reverend Wright, chose not to stay an ordinary pastor with a small church; he made himself famous or infamous as you prefer, built an 8,000 person congregation and got rich...just recently purchasing a palatial home in one of the toniest, nearly all white suburbs of Chicago for his retirement.

That high-paid CEO also made choices that have put him where he is, being paid what he is.

**Obama's proposal has already been tried and it has failed miserably. It's called: communism.** It says all farmers get the same wage even if one produces 100 turnips and another produces 2. The result is nobody producing more than 2, and massive food shortages and starving populations. Russia. North Korea. Etc. It says all doctors get the same wage regardless of how little or much they study, how expert or barely competent they are, how good or bad their reputation is. The result is they all learn little, study less, do only what they must do to avoid being sent to Siberia, and the rich of their nations come here for medical care. Obama's proposed communism has never worked anywhere, not even once. Everywhere it's tried, all those 'ordinary working people' suffer the most. They suffer bad housing, malnutrition, food shortages, poor and inadequate medical care. Their countries get "humanitarian aid" from us on a regular basis. Sadly, a lot of young people don't recognize communism when they see it or hear it, and don't recoil from it with alarm and disgust, because they no longer receive an education about the facts, failures, dangers and brutality of it at any point, not junior high, not high school, not college. People in their 20's and 30's, maybe even 40's, hear Obama promising to reduce the pay of those of us he deems paid too much and somehow gift that stolen money to those working for much lower wages have no frame of reference, to recognize his scheme for what it actually is - direct theft of the most flawed, most failed, most futile of economic policies favored only by fascists and dictators.

.....

"Poor people have been voting for  
Democrats

for fifty years. They're still  
poor."

- Charles Barkley

---

## *Chapter Three*

### **Barack's BS About Campaign Financing**

(Lies, Lies And Damnable Lies)

Obama is the first presidential candidate to refuse participation in public campaign financing - with its limits, since its inception in 1976.

While constantly insisting he is supported by small contributions from rank and file citizenry diligently sending in their dimes and dollars via the internet, and even laughably framing it as a new kind of public financing, Obama has matched McCain in creating a new kind of very-special-interest financing source. Theirs are the first presidential campaigns to move from "bundlers" to "mega-bundlers". The new mega-bundler is a single person who has assembled at least \$500,000.00 from himself, family, friends and associates.

Since Obama's is the first presidential campaign to reject the government provided campaign funding in three decades, these big money raisers are particularly important to him, yet he and the complicit media avoid acknowledging their existence as much as possible - perpetuating an illusion. The picture Obama paints for the masses is that he has had such a tidal wave of public support from all 'the little people' he has no reason to keep his made-in-writing commitment to limit his spending to the public financing, and would, in fact, be depriving all these committed, small, John and Mary supporters by not taking all the money they wish to contribute. Behind the scenes, he has built a monster-sized money-raising machine involving long-time political bigwigs and Washington insiders and Hollywood players that has more special interests' agendas represented than any previous candidate's. **In short, he is an owned**

**candidate no different than any other, arguably more owned than many others.**

Obama's mega-bundlers include Robert Mosbacher, a prominent **oil industry insider** and political wheeler-dealer, and former commerce secretary; William Kennard, chairman of the FCC under President Clinton - now a managing director of Carlyle Group, a **private equity and hedge fund firm**; Hollywood's David Geffen and Jeffrey Katzenberg. In total, Obama has 35 such mega-bundlers, directly responsible for millions of dollars of contributions from vast numbers of other large donors and bundlers, all obviously with agendas, as well as nearly 500 "ordinary" bundlers who have each assembled \$50,000.00 or more. According to a New York Times report (a liberal friendly newspaper), **most of these bundlers "come from industries with critical interests in Washington."** Further, the special campaign committees tied to the national and state parties can take as much as \$70,000.00 in one check from one donor, all to be spent on the candidate's behalf, so forget whatever you thought you knew about that \$2,300.00 per person limit. The same donors can also be directed to the "independent" political groups, like Soros' MoveOn.org, and there give unlimited sums - all spent on attack advertising.

In total, through June 08, 47% of the \$340-million raised by Obama has come in small amounts, reportedly averaging \$200.00, and that *is* impressive indication of widespread, grass roots support. But still, **the majority of that \$340-million has come from big donors, bundlers and mega-bundlers often brought to the table hand-in-hand with lobbyists.** And make no mistake, Obama quietly spends an enormous amount of time and energy courting them. Events featuring private,

small group sit-downs and meals at \$30,000.00 per person usually occur behind closed doors and unreported by the press in the same cities where the \$1,000.00 per plate functions also occur, and his giant public rallies are in the spotlight. And, despite Obama's supposed ban on taking money from lobbyists, his mega-bundlers do include both current, federally registered lobbyists - such as Alan Solomont, representing the health care industry, and quite a few "former" lobbyists.

From the New York Times: "While Obama's campaign has cited its volume of small donations as a rationale for his decision to opt out of public financing for the general election, Mr. Obama has worked to build a network of big dollar supporters..."

In other words, he's doing a cheap, common magician's act relying on distraction: look over here at the pretty girl so you don't notice me pulling the scarves from inside my sleeve.

There's nothing illegal, and arguably nothing "wrong" with any of this per se. If we insist on campaigns lasting years and, combined, costing a billion dollars plus, then selling the presidency to wealthy and powerful influencers seems logical and necessary. And, as I noted at top, McCain is in this game every bit as much as Obama. To-date, the two have disclosed 98 mega-bundlers. McCain has slightly more of them than does Obama, but Obama's are producing a bit more dough. The presidency, and with it, public policy, is again up for auction to a small, private group of bidders, the only difference this time around the ante required to be in the game.

My objection to Obama's auction is not the auction itself. You really can't fault a guy for

playing the game better than his opponents. My objection is the hubris and deception, not the reality. Obama's holier than thou pronouncements of being the first and only candidate with clean hands, free of, as he puts it, the domination of special interest money, while 53% of his financing is just such special interest, insider money from the same old suspects tells you something about him that is of far greater importance than who his mega-bundlers are, what bets they are placing on Wall Street or globally based on the policies he'll attempt implementing, or what favors they are being assured of: that **Obama is nothing more nobler or different than any other professional politician**; he has no halo; he will, in fact, look you straight in the eye with a charming smile and lie like a dog to get elected. And he will grab money in large sums from just about anybody including those with interests very contrary to yours and mine.

If you feel like voting for him for some collection of reasons, that's fine - as long as one of those reasons isn't this idea drawn from fraud and deception, that you are getting someone different from any other pol, free of insider influence and taint of big money. You are not.

(Sources: Wall Street Journal 8/8/08; New York Times; Federal Election Commission reporting.)

## Chapter Four

### Should She Be "Off Limits"?

Senator Obama has decried criticism of Michelle, and in one TV interview sternly warned Republicans against attacking her. But in his televised interview with Rev. Rick Warren at the Saddleback Church, Senator Obama listed Michelle as one of the three people who would be his closest advisors that he would rely on most when he became President. Surely that puts Michelle in play?

Michelle herself has said: "The way I look at it is, **WE'RE** running for President of the United States..."

If she is to be one of the top three advisors shaping domestic and foreign policy, weighing in on Supreme Court appointments, pushing her agenda...if she views herself as a Co-President...are we not to question, challenge and, as we may see fit, criticize her philosophy, her positions on issues, her publicly made statements and campaign speeches, her qualifications to be so influential?

In answer to the same question, incidentally, Barack also named his *grandmother* as one of the three top advisors. Apparently we are getting three Obamas for the price of one.

In answering the same question, two that McCain named were Meg Whitman, former CEO of eBay, and General David Petraeus, architect of the "surge". I'm certain that declares open season on critical examination of *their* every statement and association. As it should.

Given his wife's outrageous and often anti-American ideas, her expressed view of this country as mean-spirited and in desperate need of salvation only Barack might provide, were I Barack, I suppose I'd be arguing no one dare comment on her either. But if a candidate wants his spouse to be off limits, that spouse ought to go home and stay there. To paraphrase President Truman, if you can't stand the heat, stay in the kitchen and bake cookies and shut up.

If she's going to be out on the stump giving her own campaign speeches - *policy speeches* about what they will do as presidents, giving interviews to the press, and is going to be one of the three key advisors to the presumptive President, I'd say we have the perfect right to dissect her like a frog. And he's got some damn nerve warning us not to.



## Introduction To Chapters Five and Six

On February 19, Michele Obama made two of the most amazing and revealing statements *ever* made by any candidate or candidate's spouse:

**"This is the first time in my life I've been proud of my country."**

**"Only Barack Obama can heal the soul of America."**

In each of the next two chapters, I question the meaning of these statements...

## Chapter Five

### **Until Now, An American Hanging Her Head In Shame**

Michelle Obama said: "This is the first time in my life I've been proud of my country." She has since backtracked furiously from her statement, spinning its meaning - but never saying she mis-spoke. Were it an isolated mistake, apologized for as such, it could and should be overlooked. But it is part of a contextual pattern of expressed dislike and disrespect for America as we know it. It's fair to insist she meant what she said.

She attempted cleaning it up in her speech at the Democratic convention, stating "I love America", and the fawning pundit on MSNBC, Keith Ohlberman was quick to say "case closed." No, not so fast. You can "love America" while still being "ashamed of her" --- abused women insist they love husbands who are alcoholics, drug addicts and wife beaters. She did not get up there and say "I mis-spoke and want to emphatically make it clear that I have been proud of America so many, many times, for so many things, over so many years."

Apparently she could never before be proud of a nation that afforded her and her husband the opportunities to attend top universities and become millionaires. She was *not* proud of the country that elected her husband to its Senate. She was *not* proud of the country that came together after 9-11, of its firefighters and rescue workers. *Not* proud of the courageous men and women in our armed forces - at any time in her lifetime. *Not* proud of any previous President, that including Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter. *Not* proud of "Mr. Gorbachev, take down this wall." *Not* proud of African-American leaders like Condoleezza Rice or Colin Powell. *Not* even proud of Obama-fan Oprah's success. *Not* proud of the country affording more opportunity to all - including its minorities - is no source of pride. *Not* proud of the nation more charitable to the world than any other five countries added together...including President Bush's all-time record levels of contributions to fighting AIDS in Africa.

**By being "not proud", we must assume she means she has been embarrassed by and ashamed of her country.** She used the words "disappointed" and "frustrated" herself. Which

gets to the crux of the matter. **The Obamas are of the "it's all America's fault" philosophy.** He, eager to sit down personally and talk with terrorists, America-hating dictators, mid-eastern Hitlers vowing to exterminate first the Jews then all American infidels - a position ridiculed and criticized by Senator Joe Biden, before becoming Obama's V.P. pick. Obama, eager to "punish" successful companies and individuals - yes, he said "*we must punish Wall Street*" - not for any specific crimes or misdeeds, but purely for exceptional success and prosperity. Ignoring the fact (or maybe not) that Wall Street holds invested dollars from over 70% of all Americans.

**They believe America is a country to be "not proud of." And is that the belief system you want in your next leader?** Do you really want an 'American apologist' cowering before other nations' leaders? Do you want a leader who is guilt-burdened and apologetic for our nation's success and power, maybe guilt-ridden for his own wealth and success, determined to "right the injustice of unequal success"?

## Chapter Six

### ***The Second Coming***

**"Only Barack Obama can heal America's soul" said Michelle.**

Two key words: *Only. Soul.*

I am opposed to handing over the keys to the White House, the big red button, the military and the economy to any messianic figure. We need a President, not a Pope or Ayatollah.

Say what you will about George W. Bush, and I have both praise and criticism, the most disturbing thing to me - and the root cause of much of the trouble he has caused - is his co-mingling of personal spiritualism with his responsibilities. A loonier statement than claiming to look into Putin's eyes and see his soul; a good soul; hard to find. And dangerous to us all. Now, we have Obama, apparently viewed at least by his spouse, as someone of Divine Power, as a spiritual figure eager not just to deal with the many critical economic, political and geopolitical issues and responsibilities of office, but to save our souls. I object. Our Founding Fathers vehemently objected. So should you.

Then, to "Only." Even if you subscribe to the frightening idea that the person elected to run the country and do the peoples' business ought to be laying on hands to heal our very souls, don't you find it a tad troubling that these people believe he is the ONLY miracle-worker currently walking the earth able to do so? What happened to "humble servant"?

Can you honestly defend conferring power upon a person so certain he and *only he* can be right, he and *only he* knows The Way for all of us, he and *only he* possesses the power to heal? This is not confidence. It is not even arrogance. It is spiritualism or, more accurately, mysticism. The annointment of Obama as a spiritual or mystical figure with unique powers. Such belief *must* equal unassailable moral authority to act as he sees fit, to obey purposes and laws higher than our nation's, to impose whatever is needed on us to effect the miracle healing. To mix a metaphor, you can't heal a country's soul without breaking a few eggs, now, can you?

It is scary enough to have Hillary espousing the Socialist 'it takes a village' stuff and dumb enough to think the federal government can competently run health care for all, but it is worse to have Obama believing as personal religion that he should be Ordained Soul-Saver In Chief. He has, incidentally, proposed having the federal government control your child's education (ie. indoctrination) from pre-K right through college - given his interest in managing souls, this proposal should take on new meaning.

And, incidentally, should Governor Huckabee's wife or Mitt Romney's wife make the same grandiose claim for their husbands as the only possible healers of the nation's soul, the screaming protests from liberals and media would be deafening. Michelle's statements passed without critical comment by anyone. No warning from the ACLU, no ad from MoveOn.org showing the two with halos over their heads, in long flowing robes. After all, we never went a day during the primaries without hearing of Romney's Magic Mormon Underwear. Yet Michelle Obama's assertion her husband is the only mystic capable of soul-healing goes without challenge or comedic assault. The hypocrisy of the left is mind-boggling.

**The bottom-line is to be very careful of what you elect.** A chief executive. A commander in chief. Or a messiah. Or a deranged and dangerous messiah.

## Chapter Seven

### HOPE!

But hope for whom?

**Not hope for the unborn.** He offers no hope to them. He supports extreme pro-abortion rights, including third trimester and partial birth abortions. He is, to his credit, consistent about this, while very inconsistent about almost every other issue. He consistently states these decisions belong solely and exclusively to the woman, never mentioning any rights of the father or of parents of minors, let alone the life being ended. And he is for making federal funds from taxpayers available for this purpose. Obviously, any socialized health care program provided to all under an Obama rule will pay for abortions. Your tax dollars at work.

**Not hope for the ambitious, hard-working small business owner choosing to take risks, mortgage his home, work extra long hours and create jobs.** He offers no hope to them. His economic proposals, if enacted in toto, would kill off at least 20% of all small businesses within the first 12 months, subdue start-ups, and quite literally destroy the life's work of hundreds of thousands of small business owners. You may not understand that, but I do; I've worked intimately with small business owners in over 150 different categories in every part of the U.S., and have on-going dialogue with tens of thousands of them. Obama intends lifting the cap on Social Security taxes beyond the current \$95,000.00 and eliminating Bush tax cuts and further assessing added income taxes on married couples earning over \$250,000.00 (many small businesses are run by husband and wife teams), while also indexing

minimum wage to inflation - the most radical proposal ever made regarding minimum wage, and as much as doubling capital gains taxes on proceeds from eventual sale of these businesses (where most owners' wealth created from years of hard work and sacrifice lies) as well as on dividends owners may extract from their businesses and the capital they have tied up in them. The result I can promise you is row upon row of boarded up small shops and restaurants and service businesses all along the main streets and in the shopping centers of all American towns. American owned companies sold at rapid-fire pace, if need be at fire sale prices to foreign interests.

**Not hope for senior citizens or retirees.** Make no mistake, the hand promising to giveth unchanged social security and somehow improved health care is hiding the hand that will taketh away the retirement incomes and lifestyles responsible seniors have created for themselves. Under Obama, there is only penalty and punishment for your wise stewardship of the money you've earned and saved, with a stated goal of equality ie. equal poverty for all. While he has not made this promise, the Democrat party platform promises no income taxes on seniors earning less than \$50,000.00 a year. But if you depend on dividends for your retirement income, you're about to take no less than a 5% to a 20% cut in that pay via Obama's capital gains tax hike. You can also count on an ever growing list of companies cutting or eliminating dividends. If you own investment real estate or deferred-tax accounts like IRA's, SEP's, etc. that you intend taking money from soon, you'll be taxed more under Obama. If you plan on leaving assets to your children, he's raising estate taxes. In short, he will turn retirement into a welfare state, possibly a bit better for the poorest retirees with no appreciable savings, investments or assets at the expense of

financial terror waged against retirees who have taken care to accumulate assets and create a quality lifestyle without continuing to work. His benefits are for those who essentially don't retire and keep working. His penalties and punishments are for those who've planned, saved and invested for retirement.

Oh, and a note to the young marrieds with families of your own to raise but also two sets of parents you thought would be financially self-sufficient. If the combined Obama policies take a 20% or 30% bite out of their retirement incomes, who's going to chip in to make it up?

**Not hope for low wage workers.** The hope he holds out to them may be the cruelest Obama lie or stupidity (take your choice). His soak the rich and tax the crap out of business large and small plans can only produce three results: inflation from raised prices, which hurts the lowest earners first and worst; unemployment, as fewer people are asked to do more while jobs are cut in order to keep total payroll costs the same, and as the number of operating and starting small businesses shrink; more outsourcing and automation. His open borders ideas guarantee an ever increasing influx of unskilled workers, a force that suppresses all wages.

**Not hope for American security.** His naïve, appeasement approach to foreign policy guarantees a dramatic increase in aggression by non-democratic regimes against their neighbors all over the world. We are already seeing this tested, as Bush is viewed as a powerless lame duck no longer to be feared. Russia has begun its spitting in our face. Iran has its eye on ownership of Iraq and its oil resources and annihilation of Israel; China its eye on its neighbors; Al-Quada on reorganizing

Afghanistan. You can see them all gearing up for inauguration day. Obama has told them all he can be had; that he will, without pre-condition, sit down and negotiate with anybody and everybody including the worst terrorists and dictators on the planet. Russia has shown us how this sort of discussion works during August, 2008: they keep talking while their army keeps taking over territory. Like it or not, only fear of America and its leadership has successfully worked to keep the most dangerous aggressors in check. China was last under control during the Nixon Administration; they feared Nixon. The Soviet Union gave way to Reagan. Saddam was driven back from Kuwait by Bush I, eliminated by George W. Bush - and George W. Bush's administration has successfully gotten Khaddafi in Libya to end his militaristic threats, has once again put the North Korea threat back in its box. And knock on wood, there have been no further 9-11 like attacks on our soil or, for that matter, attacks on U.S. embassies and ships abroad as there were during the Clinton Administration.

All the enemies of the U.S. and its allies, the world's freelancing terrorists, the latent empiricists with ambition are patiently waiting for strength to be replaced by weakness in Washington D.C.

In truth, Obama and Hope are so far from synonymous they may be mutually exclusive.

## Chapter Eight

### **CHANGE!**

Obama is the candidate for CHANGE!

This is not a new message for Obama. In his first book, he acknowledges acquiring it while still in college, deciding he might work as a community organizer. His book reveals that he has basically never viewed *anything* about America as satisfactory, and that everything has been in dire need of change, always. He felt that way, he says, about the Reagan Administration. Now he feels that way about the current situation. It's an easy, popular mantra because, after all, who is ever satisfied?

It's also appropriate, given that he has changed his positions on virtually every significant issue except abortion rights at least once during the course of the campaign, in some cases several times. If you don't like his position, check in next week; it may have changed.

An insider I know, who has served in two Administrations, told me he very much wanted to support Obama but just couldn't bring himself to do it because of Obama's obviously unprincipled willingness to change like a chameleon depending on the audience he's speaking to or the state he is in, day to day to day. He said, if you charted all these changes, you'd be dizzy. He admitted all politicians do it, but he said McCain moves around within a small range of nuancing and modifying and occasionally flip-flopping then spinning, but Obama careens wildly from one extreme to another - and then he lies about having done so.

For example, The Los Angeles Times reported on July 16, 2008:

"A funny thing happened over on the Obama campaign website in the last few days. The parts that stressed his opposition to the 2007 troop surge and his statement that more troops would make no difference have somehow disappeared.."

This is classic Obama. Erase what you said. Claim you never said it. A cynical tactic born of liberal disdain for people; deep-down, they believe we are all idiots. Recall Obama's statement about the pathetic, bitter, bigoted voters in Pennsylvania "clinging to their guns and religion" as illustration of this attitude.

Well, let's try to decipher what - if anything - he actually means by CHANGE...

Obama has said we need to change the way business is done in Washington.

What does he mean by that?

*He does NOT mean putting an end to outrageous "earmarks" tagged onto legislation, pretty much in secret, for 'pork projects' and favors to influential constituents and donors back home. In 2007, he created \$91-MILLION of those little devils. (McCain: 0. He refuses to do so.)*

*He does NOT mean putting an end to back room deals. Leading up to his campaign, he funneled \$700,000.00 in campaign contributions to the very same 'super delegates' he needed to secure the nomination. (Hillary, a paltry \$200,000.00).*

*He does NOT mean putting an end to dealing with and depending on scumbags. (Yes, Hillary trumps him here. But.) What we know of, so far, is that his biggest benefactor during his rise from local Chicago pol to the Senate has been a known slumlord and shady real estate developer, recently convicted as a criminal. And while he was under federal investigation, Obama still welcomed his patronage,*

including his help in purchasing their luxury home for a mysterious \$300,000.00 discount from its known value.

*He does NOT mean enforcing the laws he would be sworn to uphold.* He has, for example, advocated issuing driver's licenses to illegal immigrants. Note the word: illegal.

As his V.P., he chose Joe Biden, a consummate Washington insider, entrenched in the U.S. Senate for longer than John McCain.

I'm having a lot of trouble figuring out exactly what he does really mean to change about the way business is done in Washington.

He originally promoted himself to the liberal Left as the ultimate anti-war candidate, opposed from the beginning (when he conveniently was not yet in the U.S. Senate and did not have to actually vote), and committed to immediate withdrawal of all troops. He has CHANGED that position to "responsible withdrawal"...fuzzifying from a certain 16 months to very uncertain language about conditions on the ground and keeping some peace-keeping forces there indefinitely, to respond as might be needed to new circumstances. In essence, he has changed to McCain's position. He did, as noted above, vehemently oppose 'the surge', predicting it would have no positive impact and might make things worse. He has since CHANGED the record of what he said, now insisting he merely said it would have no *political* impact. More recently, he has CHANGED his view of it as strategy, advocating duplicating it in Afghanistan. Maybe by 'change' he means changing not only his positions fluidly, as is politically convenient, but actually changing the historical record of what those positions were.

He *did* change his position on public campaign financing. And he *does* have big plans for changing America from a country he and Michelle are ashamed of to one they can be proud of, by taking prosperity away from those who earn it and giving it to those who haven't, with massive expansion of federally administered entitlement programs invading almost every aspect of life and creating the largest transfer of private business and private property to state control ever to be imagined, notably including both the health care and educational system.

His ideas for societal change are rooted in the radicalism of people like William Ayers and Reverend Wright, written about later in this book; driven by distaste for traditional American values; belief in international appeasement.



## Chapter Nine

### President of the United Socialist States

An Obama TV ad shows him speaking to a cheering crowd, saying:

**"It is the fundamental belief that I am my brother's keeper, that I am my sister's keeper, that makes this country work."**

Actually, it is the opposite fundamental belief that built this country and has always made it work: the spirit of self-reliance, independence; the celebration of achievement, the shame of need. American as ME - I - CAN, **not** as ME- I WANT TAKEN CARE OF. BY MY BROTHER, AT MY BROTHER'S EXPENSE.

So, what does he mean by *this*? Obama's pitch is implicitly communist. America's success has been capitalism. The two are at odds.

This is not to say that, as a whole, our nation has not been and is not generous and charitable. However, there is a huge difference between voluntary charity and government mandated wealth re-distribution, on the most massive and intrusive scale ever contemplated in this country, which accurately summarizes his proposals, just as the above statement accurately summarizes his view of how this country ought to be forced to operate.

Now we get to choose from fundamentally different directions: toward or away from communism.

As you make that choice, you might keep in mind that every single ounce of societal progress in this country has come about through free enterprise and personal freedom; most of the misery, poverty, disease, filth, terror and unrest found throughout much of the rest of the world including that threatening us has come about through communism, socialism and fascism. Obama's statement reveals an utter ignorance, misunderstanding or deliberate deception about what makes this country work. I would suggest he hasn't the faintest idea what makes this nation

work while most others fail. He has only grandiose theories based on already, historically discredited government experiments gone bad throughout the world.

Incidentally, to his credit, Obama's half-brother George, an obviously intelligent and articulate young man, living in a hut on \$1.00 a month has made it clear he does not expect Barack Obama to be HIS "keeper", and resents the media's reporting on him as abandoned or neglected by his wealthy relative. Still, perhaps Barack Obama could begin his massive, monstrous wealth re-distribution scheme with a tiny little bit of *personal* wealth re-distribution. A check for \$12 stuck in a birthday card would double George's standard of living.

## Chapter Ten

### How Much More Of Our Money Is Needed?

This is the follow-up question *not* asked by Rick Warren in the televised Saddleback interview - or anywhere else - about anything. Consider education. Warren stated that America now ranks 19<sup>th</sup> in the world for high school graduation. Our public education system failing. What would Obama do about it?

His answer was: spend more money - and he patiently lectured those of us watching that there is no free lunch, and if we want a working education system, we must pony up and pay *more* for it. What would be interesting would be to cite the billions of tax dollars already spent on education, the average spent on each kid, on each teacher, on each school, the dramatic increases in this spending that have occurred during the Clinton and Bush Administrations, **and then ask: since all this money is buying so little value...how much more do you need to fix it?** And what makes you think more money will make any difference, when more and more money has led to less and less value up until now?

Obama's answer to every other question is also: spend more money, so you greedy, slothful, lazy and unreasonable people trying to keep too much of what you earn better grow up and prepare to pony up - more. A lot more.

He would have people believe he is going to do all this spending only by confiscating money from The Rich. Believe it and you are a complete idiot. He could raise taxes on the rich to 99.9% and still not get even a smidgen of the money needed for his grandiose giveaway schemes and increased spending

proposed for everything: public education 'improvement', college for all, health care for all, Social Security made solvent, an energy initiative matching Kennedy's race to the moon, etc. - and that assuming that raising taxes to soak the rich will increase revenues to the government (even though history shows it never does, and always does the opposite).

Truth is, there is not a single problem on the laundry list of social ills and other problems Obama promises to fix, that can be fixed with more money. The taking of more money from citizens and concentrating in the hands of government only expands and increases the power of that government. There is, already, more than enough money flowing into Washington. The need is not for more money and certainly not for more taxation. The need is for a new kind of political will, to *actually* change the way business is done in Washington.

## Chapter Eleven

### Obama & Oil Companies & Taxes

While incessantly criticizing the oil companies for "excess profits" and claiming he'll re-jigger tax policy to penalize such corporations and rob the rich to gift the poor, Obama actually proposes tax changes that will do the exact opposite. It is up to you to decide if he is just stupid or a liar. For example, he has proposed decreasing the corporate income tax while lifting the cap on Social Security taxes on wages. This will give a new tax break to big oil, but impose a new tax on wage earners and on small business owners, operators of family farms and self-employed professionals. (Incidentally, Obama voted for the Bush-Cheney Energy Bill which gave the oil companies a number of tax breaks couched as R&D incentives that he now rails against. McCain defied President Bush and Wall Street and voted against it.)

To further clarify who Obama actually intends wounding, consider this: small business owners already pay double the Social Security taxes on themselves that wage earners pay, as the owner is taxed once as employer and again as employee. Lifting the \$95,000.00 wage cap, hits a business owner making, say, \$150,000.00 a year, with a new tax of about \$7,500.00 on top of all the taxes he already pays.

Next, let's look at the facts about these "outrageous" oil company profits. In percentage terms, the gas and oil industry has roughly an 8% profit. Pharmaceutical companies enjoy profits double that: 16%. Food and beverage companies about 15%. Many other industries from 12% to 21%. In dollars, the oil industry's profits are greater

because their overall size, investment and investment risk is greater. But in percentage terms, they make LESS than most other major industries. So why isn't Obama suggesting excess profit taxes imposed on the drug companies, beer and wine companies, tobacco companies, Hollywood entertainment companies?

On August 9, an Obama campaign spokesperson, Congressman Dick Durbin, leveled this incredible criticism against the oil companies: that, instead of re-investing in R&D, they pay dividends to their stockholders. And just who are the bastards who have put up the investment capital used by the oil industry for exploration and infrastructure, who are getting all those dividends? Union pension funds, wage-earners' 401K plans and pension funds, firemen and policemen, school teachers, retirees, and charities' investment funds. Further, again by percentage, big oil invests more in research, development, and exploration than the other industries named above, that all enjoy higher profits for invested dollars.

With regard to dividends, apparently Obama would like corporations to reduce or eliminate them, although he has also proposed doubling the capital gains tax on them purportedly as a means of fattening federal funds - which it never does - and of further punishing "the rich" - even though the vast majority of people dependent on dividends are not rich.

The demonization of the oil industry is easy at a time of high gas prices, soaring worldwide demand, and endangerment of supply from a number of sources. But Obama's case against the industry is completely dishonest.

As to his assertion of tax re-jiggering to benefit the struggling, working middle class at the expense of the rich, of corporations, of Wall Street, that is even more dishonest - if it is possible to be more than *completely* dishonest. The overwhelming majority of middle class jobs are provided by small business and mid-sized companies, not big business. The lifting of the Social Security cap, the indexing of minimum wage to inflation, the repeal of the Bush tax cuts, the increase in capital gains taxes ARE ALL NEW AND ADDITIONAL TAXES ON SMALL BUSINESS. The impact will be a rapid and dramatic leap in middle class job elimination.

**THE TRUTH ABOUT OBAMANATION TAX CHANGE**  
**"CHANGE YOU SHOULD FEAR!!!!"**

Obama has proposed lifting the tax cap on earnings subject to the 12.4% Social Security tax, which now covers only the first \$102,000.00. The Heritage Foundation analyzed the effect of eliminating the earnings cap.....the **take-home pay of 10.3-Million workers would be REDUCED** by an average of \$5,650.00 in the first year alone. **TAXES WOULD BE RAISED on 4-Million workers over age 50. TAXES WOULD ALSO BE RAISED on 3-Million small business owners** who file their taxes as individuals. By fiscal 2015, the number of **jobs lost would exceed 865,000**, and **personal savings would decline by more than \$55-Billion**. (This scheme transfers private money saved and invested to the government's black hole, supposedly into the social security system's mythical 'lockbox'. Much of this \$55-Billion will be denied to the stock market, potentially depressing stock values for all investors; another portion denied banks, drying up capital available for home mortgages and business lending.)

**And if you believe his lie of raising taxes only on The Rich, think again.** This plan would **RAISE TAXES FOR 97,065 carpenters; 110,908 police officers; 254,992 nurses; 208,562 teachers...**raise taxes for millions of middle class families, impose a huge burden on small business, slow the economy and cost jobs.

*- based on a report in Investor's Business Daily*

*Chapter Twelve*  
**Matters Of Inconvenience**

In his first book, Obama describes joining Rev. Wright's church only after being advised to do so by others in the 'organizing movement' as a necessary step in creating a power base. In short, as a political convenience and contrivance. There is nothing in his book about seeking a church for spiritual needs or reasons, nor is there even a suggestion of any commitment to Christian beliefs or worship driving his search for or selection of a church. All that came later and may or may not be sincere. By his own admission, Obama's choice of church and church-going that began at that point was all about political gain.

We now know he and Michelle then spent 20 years as members of this church, attended frequently, were married by Rev. Wright, and Obama ultimately referred to Wright as a friend and mentor. When it was convenient for Obama to link himself to Wright, he did so as thoroughly as possible. When learning about Obama's own beliefs and those of other close associates, you can easily conclude his long-time attachment to Wright, initially born of political contrivance, was sustained by shared political views rather than by religion.

After Rev. Wright's now famous "Goddamn America" speech was heard and seen by the public and weeks of controversy followed, Obama finally denounced Wright and resigned from the church. That was not a single, unique speech either; other recordings of equally radical, racist and anti-American speeches by Reverend Wright spanning years subsequently came to light. In explaining his reversal, Obama first insisted he'd been unaware of Wright's extreme, anti-American and racist views, although his first book (published in 1995) makes it clear he knew of Wright's extremely controversial and racist positions from the very beginning. In the book Obama describes getting and reading church literature at his first visit, including brochures titled 'A Black Value System' and 'A Disavowal of the Pursuit of Middleclassnesses', something of a race-based Communist Manifesto. He tells of Wright personally cautioning him about his radical agenda possibly being liability rather than asset. Obama *knew*.

When the public uproar split Wright and Obama, rather than backing down and avoiding further spotlight and scrutiny, Wright ignored the damage to Obama's campaign, and made new inflammatory speeches and gave provocative interviews day after day. Ultimately, Obama probably spoke truth when he said he had to sever himself from Wright because Wright had disrespected him. This truer than any real philosophical disagreements.

Obama now wears a flag pin on his lapel most of the time, and in his ridiculous TV commercial where he tries presenting himself as someone with heartland of America values because his mother was born in Kansas. But for quite some time, he did not - and refused to - wear the flag pin. While this may seem trivial judged separate and by itself, placed in contexts of his repeated willingness to do 180-degree turns as needed for political expediency, when he is found out, when pressure compels; and his and his wife's, his associates' and his friends' anti-American views, it is symbolically significant.

Making a decision about a presidential candidate requires piecing together as many clues as possible from as many sources as available, to judge differences between his packaged persona and present rhetoric versus his long-held beliefs, chosen associations, and activities. If you were hiring someone to run America, you would hopefully not do so merely based on his talent as a performer on stage or as salesman one-on-one, nor based solely on his current representations. If hiring for such an important job, you would check references - those provided and others, find and interview co-workers, pour through all his writings and speeches and erased or sanitized web sites before they were changed, and otherwise expansively search for clues offering insight to the person. If you do this with the Obamas as I have, you will not find what the TV pundits took to calling them during the Democratic Convention; the Huxtables - that all-American family portrayed in Bill Cosby's popular television show. You will find people far, far, far from "all-American."

## *Chapter Thirteen*

### **Obama's Own Words Leave Clues**

If you are intending to hand over enormous opportunity to exercise control over your life, your family's health, education and safety, your finances and your national security to somebody for at least four years, you might want to at least try understanding who he is as a person and what he is all about.

I've culled both of his books for his own words that are clues to his personality, true philosophy, and likely decisions and actions if given that power. Here they are, about many different subjects, with my comments and analysis..

"If I have been able to fight off cynicism, I nevertheless like to think of myself as wise to the world, careful not to expect too much."

This quote leapt off the page, because he is now over-promising to such a far-flung and outrageous degree, encouraging voters to expect much. One of the biggest factors in his primary election success was his firm and clear stance as the past and present anti-war candidate who promised to immediately withdraw the troops from Iraq...then moderated that position to a definite 16 month timetable...then, after besting Hillary, getting the nomination and finally, after goading from McCain, actually visiting Iraq and talking with the military leaders who know something about this, again changing his position, this time radically, to match McCain's. Simply put, staying until the security of a government in control we can trust is established, and then, permanent military bases - just as we've established everywhere else we've ever fought.

His other, almost countless changes on positions mirror this "dance" from left to middle, from clear and firm to clouded and nuanced, to facile. Most of his positions are fogged over with tortured parsing of language or outright denials of what he has promised before. In fact, he reminds of the old joke of the man caught in bed with another woman by his wife who leaps out and begins dressing, all the while loudly insisting he is not in bed with another woman; gets her dressed and out the door, then insisting he was never in that bed with another woman; and eventually convinces his wife she was seeing things. The motto is Deny and Lie.

It seems to me that the "if" in his sentence from the mid-1990's has been answered; not only has he failed to fight off cynicism, he has embraced it. He has given in to his expressed low expectations, and become the worst sort of professional politician.

"When people who don't know me well, black or white, discover my background (and it is usually a discovery, for I ceased to advertise my mother's race at age 12 or 13 when I began to suspect that by doing so, I was ingratiating myself to whites..."

He speaks of a divided soul and a troubled background. One thing is certain, he's given up any reservations about being deliberately and often deceptively ingratiating. Using the fact that a parent was born in Kansas - although he wasn't raised there, he starred in a TV commercial showing him in a 'typical' American home, talking about how he was ingrained with heartland of America values. To the black community, he speaks of Kenya and talks of Farrakahn in some circles while trying to sound like Bill Cosby in others. To a Jewish audience he presents himself as a staunch ally of

Israel, yet he counts among his friends and trusted advisors Rashid Khalidi who says he supports Obama because he is the only candidate on the side of the Palestinians. He sometimes presents his "worldly" background as an asset, enabling him to understand the other nations, and lead America to greater acceptance; at other times, he down-plays his background in favor of something like the 'boy from Smalltown, Kansas' idea. I doubt we'll like the price he's willing to have us pay for greater acceptance from Iran, Venezuela, France, Germany, etc. I'm quite certain he has no respect for the values of Kansans.

He has often introduced race into the campaign, at times and in ways it suits him - no less than Bill Clinton has remained enraged over Obama's campaign going into overdrive after a casual Clinton remark, to brand Bill a racist. It is a good shield from criticism - quickly accusing any critic of being racist. But racism runs both ways, and **his discussions of "typical white people", his description of white, middle class Pennsylvania voters as bitter people clinging to their guns and religion,** and countless other remarks in the same vein remind me of my grandmother's clichéd admonition: when you point your finger at someone, you have three pointing back at you. Do you have any doubt how he would respond to a white candidate using the term 'typical black people' and discussing their love of Rev. Wright-style anti-American, blame-America, blame the government for AIDS rhetoric, or penchant for organizing violent criminal gangs in every major city that put their own families and neighbors in constant risk?

The New York Times Book Review describes this first book of Obama's, a memoir presumptuously authored at a young age, as "describing **belonging to two different worlds and thus belonging to**

**neither."** I have read this book very carefully - something I find few Obama supporters or critics have bothered to do - and I find the New York Times' assessment accurate still; that in Obama we have a unique candidate without strong allegiances to heritage, particular religious faith, or even place; not even America.

Actually, a significant part of Obama's background, which he describes fairly in his first book but makes no mention of now for obvious reason, was hanging around with angry, bitter, societal drop-outs and drug users and dealers, and smoking pot and using cocaine himself. He called it "the club of disaffection", an escape from "cheap moralism." This time and these associations had significant impact on his thoughts, and led him to his fully formed dislike and disapproval for this country. Of course, many young people go through some version of "anti-Establishment" rebellion, and rather quickly outgrow it as they grow up. But Obama's infatuation with this culture continued for a long period of time and seems directly connected to his adult attractions to and involvements with far-left radicals like Weathermen-founder William Ayers and Reverend Wright. Obama may be our first grown-up, committed radical who would be President, who has maintained strong ties intellectually, philosophically, emotionally and through current associations with mentors, advisors and friends with a "America Is The Evil One" idea and a revolutionary's desire to "burn it down."

In his more recent book, *The Audacity Of Hope*, inspired, Obama says, by a Reverend Wright sermon title, he demonstrates his clever willingness and ability to parse words and language, and slip new meanings into just about anything - including the Declaration of Independence. He quotes it: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are

created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with **certain UNALIENABLE rights...**", but then he interprets this as a person being born "with a bundle of rights that **can't be taken away by any person or state WITHOUT JUST CAUSE.**" His caveat directly contradicts the point of rights being unalienable. In a single paragraph, he re-writes the Declaration, inserting someone's right - his? - to take away your rights if they judge doing so "just."

**This may be THE most significant passage in both books, as it reveals Obama's most dangerous core idea; his right and determination to forcibly create 'justice' as he sees it, domestically and globally, interfering with your rights as needed.**

In a limited sense, that is what we ask our government to do, risking excesses the more we ask; preserving liberty the less we ask. We and our government walk a tightrope between essential group-think, delegated leadership, manufacture of man-made law, interference in personal liberty and growth and expansion of government power to point it can no longer be controlled by the people. The FDA policing food safety is on one side of that line, the FDA's constant attempts to get vitamins and food supplements off the shelf, dispensed only by prescription through medical doctors, on the other side of that line. If you study all of Obama's writings, speeches, interviews, the pattern is visible and consistent; he believes the line is moveable if not a pleasant fiction, an opiate for the masses to cut and crossed at will by a more intelligent, more reasonable, more globally sensitive, more 'just' and benevolent dictator as need be - to correct economic, racial, and geo-political wrongs. He sees *WITH JUST CAUSE* as his personal exemption to the Constitution, the Declaration of

Independence, and countless rights you assume are yours - such as keeping money you earn or striving to get your son or daughter into superior schools or choosing superior health care for your family.

Incidentally, Obama says he sides with Supreme Court Justice Breyer, that **the Constitution "is not a static but rather a living document and must be read in the context of an ever-changing world."**

This an extension of his belief in permission to void your rights and American traditions as he and a cadre of his hand-picked fellow believers see fit. **This THE ONLY CLUE YOU NEED to predict the make-up and activism of a U.S. Supreme Court re-constituted by Obama if given that chance. He has made it clear he is not concerned with adherence to Constitution and favors "re-writing", legislating from the bench.**

Many people aren't totally aware that the Supreme Court has greater and deeper impact on how they are permitted to live their lives and on the culture of our country than does the President or Congress, so the belief system and goals of the next President certain to have opportunity to replace one to as many as three judges is very important. A far-to-the-left, radical Obama and a liberal leaning, rubber-stamp Congress are certain to stock the Court with activist liberals eager to have as much impact as possible. If people discover their mistake with Obama, after four years, they can send him packing and send in an adult to clean up his mess; the trauma and pain temporary. But his appointed judges are left in power for life. Supreme Court activism can extend from A to Z, from abortion rights to gay marriage to U.S. sovereignty vs. submission to world courts to property rights and confiscation of private property for 'the greater good' (eminent domain) to you-name-it. The safest place for new policy

creation is in Congress, where there is debate, contention, compromise, opportunity for public influence; the worst place is in a closed chamber of power with such a small, elite group appointed, not elected, with no accountability for their activism.

Next, in his second book - his disdain for achievers:

"...our mythology is steeped in stories of 'men on the make'..."

Note that word: **mythology**. Like most liberals, Obama is revealed by his writings as **a NON-believer** in the basic American concept of success through self-reliance, as opportunity available to all. He views such successes skeptically, as freakish, lucky or, worse, ill-gotten and unjust, and he views those of us who succeed as 'men on the make' as predators in need of reigning in or punishment. He says as much elsewhere, many times, in many ways, to the point of acknowledging that capital gains tax increases REDUCE revenue to government and harm the economy but are still required for fairness and justice, to punish rich investors.

This is one of the most fundamental of liberal beliefs that justify much of their most destructive actions; that success through opportunity in America is, in and of itself, fair and just is a myth and a lie. Michael Moore, the liberals' favorite mascot, makes this very, very clear in his writings and lectures. All liberals believe it. If you have, by choice, studied to master craft or skill, sacrificed to get foothold, worked hard to prosper and now feel justified in the benefits you've created, know that Obama views your path to your prosperity as a MYTH and views your earned success as UNFAIR.

Contrary to his assertions, this view is not just of The Really, Really Rich. He has drawn that line at different numerical places; at incomes as little as \$150,000.00 to more than \$250,000.00 - with no distinctions drawn for sources of that income, such as, say, politician vs. small business owner or farmer; for investment or risk; for years of sacrifice and struggle. But he actually views all above-average success or prosperity as myth for most and therefore unjust for *all*.

This is the guiding hand for economic policy and usurping of rights, confiscation of assets, and "leveling the field" only the poorest poor absent any ambition should desire.

Now, here's a very interesting admission from Obama:

"Forced to compromise with a Democrat-controlled Congress, Reagan would never achieve many of his most ambitious plans for reducing government."

President Reagan was the "cleaner" needed for Jimmy Carter's epic mess: a dissipated and impotent military in desperate and urgent need of costly strengthening; a near dead economy in urgent need of stimulus possible only by slashing income tax rates across the board, for everybody. To balance, President Reagan correctly sought to aggressively ferret out and actually cut fat, waste, graft and ludicrous over-spending in government. The blue-ribbon task force, The Grace Commission, led by industrialist W. R. Grace found billions to be axed; you can still get and read the old, original Grace Commission Report; its exposure of entrenched, intentional, deliberate waste of our tax dollars is mind-boggling. But, as Obama says, President Reagan was blocked at every attempt to

cut even a nickel from a budget by the Democrat-controlled Congress. Obama also bemoans the "ceiling on expansion of government" created by Reagan. The only stop-gap against that Congress' further expansion of government waste was President Reagan, his veto pen, his willingness to use it, and his enormous popularity with the public that made Democrats fearful of him.

For the next four years, there will be a Democrat-controlled Congress, with a substantial majority, a bitter after-taste from President Bush's blockage of their most mis-guided and dangerous initiatives and their failure to honor the promises they made in the most recent election, and a lustful eagerness to further any and all Obama ideas at fastest speed. Put Obama in the driver's seat and there'll be no brakes.

Oh, and if you've listened for any suggestions from Obama for reducing the size or spending of government, you haven't heard any.

His book is not without outright lies. In it he states:

"...the bulk of the debt is the direct result of the President's tax cuts, 47.4% of which went to the top 5% of the income bracket..."

Packed into just 26 words is one outright lie and one sneaky lie. It takes talent to lie so much while saying so little.

First of all, tax revenues collected by the government went up, not down, as a direct result of the tax cuts - just as they did as a result of every previous all-brackets tax cut in U.S. history, including Ronald Reagan's and John F.

Kennedy's. That is an indisputable fact. It has been acknowledged and verified by the Treasury Department, Government Accounting Office and mainstream media. It's so counter-intuitive to liberals I guess he just can't accept it, but when you cut taxes, tax revenues go up. Fact. So, not one penny of the increase in national debt that has occurred since those tax cuts can be truthfully attributed to the tax cuts. He lies. Because he is determined to erase those tax cuts and impose new, punitive taxes on the rich regardless of the detrimental impact, just to be punitive - his synonym is 'fair.'

The second lie is trickier. It is true that 47.4% of the benefit of those tax cuts went to the top 5%, but that factoid taken out of context is quite deceptive. It ignores the fact that the top 5% of taxpayers already bear a burden of more than 80% of all the taxes paid, and pay, of course, a higher percentage of every dollar they earn in taxes than anyone else does. The 47% of the total tax cuts they received was a small blip of relief. It wasn't a 47% tax cut - don't get confused; it was 47% of the total benefits of the tax cuts.

Further, who else *would* you give the biggest break to but the folks bearing the biggest burden? Assume there's a rooming house with four boarders, paying for room and meals based on a percentage of their income, thus based on ability to pay. You make the most money, so you pay \$1,000.00 a month. Bill and Susan both flunked out of college and work at Starbucks, so they each pay \$500.00 a month, and Carol doesn't work at all, so she pays \$100.00. You've each been doing this for 3 years. Now there's some big event in town, say something like the Democratic convention, not enough hotel rooms, and the rooming house can be rented out for \$20,000.00. Its owner says he's going to split the

money with you four, because you'll all be displaced for three days. How should the \$10,000.00 windfall be shared?

If you say equally, \$2,500.00 to each person, I'd call you a generous fellow. After all, you've paid in \$36,000.00, Bill's paid in \$18,000.00, Susan's paid \$18,000.00 and Carol's paid in \$3,600.00. If you subscribe to Obama's nutty concept of "fairness", Carol would get the most because she's poor, Bill and Susan next most, and you should get nothing. In fact, you ought to kick in an extra \$5,000.00 so Carol can be given more. If you're sane, then you'd be a conservative instead of a liberal, and you'd divide the windfall proportionately based on prior contributions.

Finally, switching back to taxes and tax cuts, let's remember that the purpose of tax cuts and, specifically of the Bush, Reagan and Kennedy tax cuts, was not to play Robin Hood or do social engineering, but to stimulate as much economic activity and growth, investment, job creation as possible for each dollar in the cut. If you re-jiggered the tax cuts Obama style, the top 5% contributing the most and most able and likely to recycle their money the cuts permitted them to keep into new purchases and new investments would get nothing. People contributing the least and least able and likely to make new purchases or any investments; most likely to either see the money absorbed by debt from past purchases or, worse, handed over to drug dealers, numbers runners and other assorted criminals would get most of the money. We already have one such asinine, criminally mis-labeled scheme, called the Earned Income Tax Credit which gives so-called tax rebates to people who pay no taxes in the first place. (Try getting a 'rebate' for a product you never bought.)

Obama's campaign rhetoric about the Bush tax cuts mirrors what he wrote in his book, and he continues lying about this day in and day out.

Oh, and by the way, were John F. Kennedy around today, he'd be classed by liberals as a conservative, and driven from the Democratic Party just as Joe Lieberman has been. Kennedy was a fiscal conservative, a low tax and tax cut champion, and a military hawk by comparison to Ted or other leftists in today's Democratic leadership. That's why you don't hear much said about JFK these days by Obama or other Democrats.

Let's move on to religion. Obama writes:

"My grandmother was *too rational* to accept anything she could not feel, touch or count...

"For my mother, organized religion too often dressed up close-mindedness in the garb of piety, cruelty and oppression in the cloak of righteousness."

"In our household, the Bible, the Koran, and the Bhagavad Gita sat on the shelf alongside books of Greek and Norse *mythology*."

"My father...*a confirmed atheist*, thinking religion to be so much like the mumbo-jumbo of witch doctors he had witnessed in the Kenyan villages..."

"When my mother remarried, it was to an Indonesian with an equally skeptical bent, a man who saw religion as not particularly useful...and who had grown up in a country that *easily blended its Islamic faith* with remnants of Hinduism, Buddhism and ancient animist traditions. During the five years that we would live with my stepfather in Indonesia, I was first sent to a neighborhood

Catholic school and then to a *predominately Muslim school.*"

Personally, I am not especially concerned with the nature or specifics of Obama's religious ties - or lack thereof - as long as they do not serve to weaken his resolve in standing up to Islamic terrorists, but I do think those people who are concerned with this have a right to accurate portrayal. The new, revised, polished Obama presents himself as a Bible-quoting, devout Christian who shares the same values as Christian church-goers throughout America. But whatever the truth is, this is probably not the case. In his book in which the above descriptions of his mothers' and father's and step-father's dis-belief and equating of one faith with another with mythology is described, he never voices disagreement with their positions. He says he would probably have traveled through life just as his mother did without a commitment to any particular faith, were it not for his involvement with the black Christian church - which he acknowledges he came to first merely as a political convenience, only years later supposedly accepting Christ through the influence of Reverend Wright. But the church he was a member of for twenty years is, itself, not just a black church, but a black church with a militant and radical philosophy, apparently more a political entity than a house of worship. And, given that Obama admits choosing it and involving himself with it solely as access to a political powerbase; as an insincere contrivance, why shouldn't we question the sincerity of his present insistence he is a devout, committed Christian, made when such insistence seems essential to counter voters' doubts about him, his background, his allegiances?

It's entirely up to you, to take the time to read everything Obama has written on this matter, compare it to his current, sanitized, made more mainstream acceptable presentation of his faith, and decide if it matters to you or how much. But even if it is of little consequence to you in relationship to issues you consider more critical, it is worthy of consideration as yet another opportunity to discern his truthfulness vs. his deception.

How about race and economic justice? Here's something from his book you won't hear him speaking about to any audience but especially a black audience during the campaign:

"It is through this quintessentially American path of upward mobility that the black middle class has grown fourfold in a generation, and that the black poverty level was cut in half."

This is the same "quintessentially American path of upward mobility" he is quick to attack as unfair and unjust, and eager to tax into the stone age. But **it is a rare burst of honesty; some would say 'brutal honesty' about poverty.** What he chose not to say here is more important than what he did. He does not say, in this sentence, or anywhere in the pages from which I took it, that the 400% growth in middle class status or 50% cut in poverty has come about through government interference or forced redistribution of wealth or hand-outs, nor by punishing the achievers with extra taxes. I imagine this a slip-up he'd now correct if he could, as the truth is not at all compatible with his arguments for the need for his 'economic justice policies'. The truth is that the overall economic boom fueled by policies opposite his own have created the proverbial "rising tide that lifts all boats" and that a very significant percentage

of the black community has built boats for themselves and gotten busy rowing.

He does go on to say, however, that "for all the progress that's been made, a stubborn gap remains between the living standards of black, Latino and white workers" evidenced, for example, by **his fact that Black median net worth is only \$6,000.00 while white median net worth is \$88,000.00. He then says: "How WE close this persistent gap** - and how much of a role government should play in achieving that goal - remains one of the central controversies of American politics."

His view is that the government needs to have a **major, pervasive, intrusive role** in trying to close that gap, featuring manipulation of the tax code to take more money away from those with good and high incomes and net worths in the ignorant belief that doing so will magically increase the incomes and net worths of others. This assumes money is a zero sum game, where a \$1 in my hand deprives a different hand of \$1. Anyone who honestly believes this desperately needs to read my book, "No B.S. Wealth Attraction" - for their own good, all politics aside.

If you want someone at the helm who is committed to closing this gap through the force of government, breaking whatever eggs that get broken in attempts at the perfect omelette, that's your right. History tells us, without exception, you won't like the result.

The causes of the difference in net worth he cites ought to be identified, examined and frankly and openly discussed by all of us, before we embark on a government-run wealth redistribution scheme. Diagnosis before prescription. Perhaps, just perhaps, there are behavioral differences; savings,

investing and spending differences. **Elsewhere he says that blacks' incomes average 75% of whites. If that were the reason for the net worth gap, we could simply forcibly close the income gap. But their net worth isn't 75% of whites. According to him, it is 7%. Hmmm. A 25% income gap but a 93% net worth gap.**

Apparently - even while presumably taxed at lower rates - blacks are managing to spend and make 93% of their money disappear while whites are keeping and preserving and accumulating a much larger amount of wealth, disproportionate to their income. *Maybe* this is an "inequity" that Obama can step in and fix, but it sounds more like choice than injustice to me. And to be totally fair about this, Obama does go on to put some of the blame on the collapse of the two-parent household in the black community, on blacks smoking more than whites, eating fast food more than whites, watching too much TV, and so on, and says that, taken together, these factors do impede progress. But he still promises massive government Robin Hood-ing as a major piece of the puzzle. He still insists the gap can be closed *for* people rather than *by* people. I do not. I've seen no evidence of it from any and all prior attempts. And there's no reason to believe that the fundamental behaviors now largely creating this net worth gap will change one whit if each of the people on the wrong side of the gap are somehow given some money taken at government gunpoint from others. In fact, the self-sabotage will likely worsen.

Of course, government does have an appropriate and *limited* role. Enforcing reasonable anti-discrimination laws so the same job, career and business opportunities are available to best candidates regardless of race...so real estate can be purchased without racial discrimination...and so

forth. Enforcing the rule of law more successfully in low-income neighborhoods, so the drug dealers and pimps are not persons of influence, so gangs don't trap young people before they get a chance in life. Delivering public education that actually works - and putting in a 'how money works, 101' curriculum would be a good improvement. But none of this requires more theft of wealth from those now earning it and wisely stewarding it. Plenty of tax dollars are already being spent; they need spent more wisely; something he makes scant mention of. Like all liberals he wants more and more and more to spend, not the tough challenge of getting more value by spending less. And incidentally, a government guilty of faulty thinking about money and dysfunctional handling of it is hardly the solution to a population's problems with faulty thinking about money and dysfunctional handling of it.

Obama has never heard of a tax he doesn't like and want to increase. He falsely thinks all these tax increases will provide him with more money to spend fixing the economic gap he finds so offensive. Actually, the opposite will occur. As his tax policies are guaranteed to send unemployment and inflation soaring, fuel offshore outsourcing and offshore investment, remove capital from both the business and home mortgage markets, all tax revenues will fall: at the local and state level, sales, income and property tax revenues will fall; at the national level, income and capital gains revenues will fall. Worse, his plans for forcing the gap closed with government money that won't exist are fatally flawed to begin with.

Obama also neglects placing any emphasis on illegal immigration as a wage suppressing force - as well as a national security problem. Instead, in his book he suggests unconditional surrender:

“(Illegal) immigrants are entering as a result of a porous border; Mexico’s proximity, as well as the desperate poverty of so many of its people, suggest the possibility that border crossing cannot even be slowed, much less stopped.”

His policies, such as favoring the issuing of drivers licenses to illegal aliens, his ‘willingness to consider’ Social Security benefits for illegals, reflect his lack of interest in doing anything about our open borders crisis. The chief claim about this is that illegals do the jobs Americans won’t - but we’ll never know the truth of that, nor have employers re-constitute those jobs to be higher paying ones that Americans will do and use to lift themselves from poverty, as long as we flood the workplace with illegal workers who will do anything for any price. On top of that, the criminals invading already troubled neighborhoods, the cross-border crime plaguing every border state and community, the easy flow of drugs that poison neighborhoods and doom young people, and the oppressive weight of providing medical services, law enforcement, public education, etc. to illegals added together is a major contributing factor to legal U.S. citizens’ (notably including blacks and Latinos) insufficient opportunity to lift themselves up to middle class and beyond. It’s my theory that the 400% increase in middle-class status for blacks over one generation might well be double or triple that and faster were we to remove all the negative influences of unchecked illegal immigration.

Every poll and survey shows that the American public understands this Mexico-sanctioned and facilitated invasion and transfer of its poverty and social ills to us is a danger that must be aggressively addressed. We are fed up with it, and

our own government's inaction. If we might finally demand action, we have a chance of getting somewhere with McCain, but no chance at all with Obama.

## *Chapter Fourteen*

### **By The Company We Keep**

You can't be in politics - or business - very long without accumulating some associations with people of questionable merit. If you are smart and ethical, you disassociate as quickly as you can each time you discover toxicity that was not at first apparent. When this becomes telling about a person is when he does not disassociate and accumulates a collection of friends and associates that fit the same mold, be that criminal or merely unethical, violent, anti-American, etc. Also, when there is a philosophical pattern to these chosen and continued associations.

In Obama's case, how can you not consider the company he has chosen to keep, assist, praise, and only very, very reluctantly let go of, only after extreme political and media pressure made defending the relationships untenable.

**William Ayers and Bernandine Dohrn have been friends for years. Ayers is the Founder of the Weathermen, a violent protest organization (that we would now call domestic terrorists), responsible for dozens of 1970's bombings, including the Pentagon and the U.S. Capitol.** He and wife Bernadine were fugitives for years, but ultimately migrated back into society, as leftist celebrities. He a professor of education (and anti-American philosophy) at the University of Chicago, same faculty as Obama as law professor, Michelle Obama -

associate dean with influence over Ayers' employment there, and Rashid Khalidi, who we'll get to in a moment. Ayers is not just a liberal with typical youthful involvements, such as protest marches. He incited violence, conspired, organized and carried out bombings with no regard for risk or loss of life, and to this day, is unapologetic about doing so. Dohrn, the same. After serving only seven months in prison, after years on the lam, she landed as a law professor (!) at Northwestern.

**Obama tries passing his association with Ayers and Dohrn off as casual acquaintanceship born of serving on the board of The Woods Foundation (a non-profit you might also find troubling if you investigated it)...but that's a lie.** Ayers and Dohrn have regularly socialized with the Obamas, and Dohrn co-hosted Obama's political "coming out party." The Obamas are very much aware not just of Ayers' and Dohrn's past beliefs and activities but of their present, virtually unaltered beliefs. And, while Barack has been more circumspect, Michelle has voiced sentiments in perfect harmony with those of Ayers and Dohrn and their crowd, in calling America mean-spirited nation, one she has never been proud of.

Rather than a repudiation of such 'America as evil' positions, it is my conclusion that the Obama presidency will be a validation, determined to radically re-make the country and in doing so, punish all those who contribute to its evil nature.

**Rashid Khalidi** is another University of Chicago colleague, who has called Israel "a racist state", is co-founder of the Arab-American Action Network, and records indicate that for seven years he was the director of the official PLO press agency although he denies working for the PLO. For years, the Obamas have been regular dinner guests at his

Hyde Park home, Khalidi has hosted at least one fundraiser for Obama, and while Obama served on the Board of The Woods Foundation, it gave tens of thousands of dollars of grant money to the AAAN. If you trace Khalidi's association, which the mainstream media has refused to do, you'll find he is closely associated with "anti-Israel" causes and individuals.

**One well-known associate of Obama's is the flamboyant Reverend Jeremiah Wright.** Obama praised him as his spiritual mentor and trusted advisor and had him officially involved with his campaign until Wright's rage-filled, racist and anti-American sermons blaming the U.S. for causing and deserving the 9-11 attacks, calling our country "the U.S. of KKK-A" and cursing us: "Goddamn America! Goddamn America!" became public. Even then, Obama first spun the outrageous defense that - after being a member of the church presided over by Wright for 20 years and having Wright as his personal mentor - he was blissfully unaware of these kinds of beliefs and remarks. Next Obama tried defending Wright as merely 'misunderstood.' Only after weeks of dodging and dissembling did Obama - who publicly said he could no more cast aside Wright than his own grandmother - cast him aside and untangle himself from Wright.

Incidentally, in response to the media's frantic attempts to equate the Obama-Rev. Wright marriage to Republican politician-religious leader relationships, The Wall Street Journal's editorial page 3/21/08 correctly reminds that **"Republicans have never been as close to a controversial religious figure as Sen. Obama is to Pastor Wright.** President Bush didn't give Bob Jones any money; Sen. McCain doesn't attend John Hagee's church; Rudy Giuliani was not married by Pat Robertson."

Another defense of Obama's embrace of Wright is that it was simply political convenience; a path to the votes of the 8,000 members of Wright's church; a political foothold for an ambitious, young politician with no religious beliefs of his own. Obama says as much in his own book. If so, it reveals something else about Obama's character. Again quoting The Wall Street Journal's Naomi Riley: "If you join a *church*, it should have *something* to do with your faith."

But Obama's choice of religious leaders suggests something more than callous opportunism. Another Obama spiritual advisor of 20 years is Michael Pflieger, the pastor of the St. Sabina Roman Catholic Church, now known to the public for his vitriolic attacks on Hillary in a "sermon" delivered at Wright's church. Pflieger is also a defender of Farrakhan. James Meeks, an Illinois state senator and pastor of the Salem Baptist Church in Chicago, who the Chicago Sun-Times reports that Obama also values as a spiritual advisor, compares white politicians to "slave masters." The consistent theme in the philosophies and "sermons" of these men is that America is a brutal, vicious sinner of epic proportions, inflicting evil on its own people - such as the theory that the U.S. government deliberately brought AIDS to the black community - and against the world, thus 9-11 "our own chickens come home to roost." If these beliefs are shared by Obama, as logical assessment of these long-held associations say they must be, how could they not affect Obama foreign policy? Affect domestic policy?

It appears that *all* of Obama's "spiritual advisors" are white-hating, America-hating nut jobs. Quite a contrast to the very gentle, reasoned presentation Obama made of himself at Rev. Rick Warren's televised candidate forum at the

Saddleback mega-church. Too bad Obama didn't invite all his spiritual advisors to come with him and join him on stage. When Michelle speaks of the "spiritual healing" so desperately needed by America, is this the nature of the healing she hopes for?



## A Brief History of the Obamas and Rev. Wright

**1984:** Wright accompanies Louis Farrakahn to Libya to meet with our avowed enemy, Khaddafi. (Wright was already well-recognized and celebrated as a critic of America, regularly sermonizing about the nation as racist and oppressive at home and abroad.)

**1988:** Obama is baptized by Wright

**1991: Obama formally joins Wright's church**

**1992:** Wright conducts Michelle and Barack's marriage ceremony.

**1995:** Wright works closely with Farrakahn in organizing 'the million man march.'

**1999:** Obama daughter Malia baptized by Wright

**2001:** Obama daughter Natasha baptized by Wright

**2001: - on September 16, the Sunday after 9/11, Wright calls the attacks a result of America's own violent policies. (Obama is silent.)**

**2004:** Obama *still* a church member, and according to the Chicago Sun-Times, names Wright as "a close confidant."

**2006:** Obama, Farrakahn and Wright together on the front cover of Wright's church's magazine.

**2007:** Obama announces presidential campaign. According to the New York Times, Obama tells Wright: "You can get kind of rough in your sermons, so we've decided it's best for you not to be out there in public." – this belying Obama's later insistence he knew nothing of Wright's radical positions and statements and revealing a conscious determination on Obama's part to conceal Wright's positions and his own long, close association with him.

**2008:** The evolving Wright controversy boils over with ABC's airing of the "Goddamn America!" 'sermon', after cable news networks, online media and some newspapers had been reporting on that sermon and others for weeks. Obama subsequently kicks Wright off his presidential campaign's Religious Leadership Committee. **After this, Wright gives National Press Club speech standing pat on his positions; calling America an imperialist nation, reiterating his theory that our government created AIDS to destroy blacks, and stating that Obama has only distanced himself out of necessary political expediency.** (If Wright is truthful about that, we can expect a welcome for Wright and others of his sympathies to Washington and to positions of influence once Obama has secured the presidency.)



*Chapter Fifteen*  
**Experience Isn't Sexy**

Hillary said "I have a lifetime of experience, Senator McCain has a lifetime of experience...Obama has a speech."

Obama is what I've always thought of as "an empty suit." He dresses the part and he has mastered the art of the presentation, but inside, there's little substance to be found. There is intellectual thought and academic theory derived from an elitist, liberal university. But his lack of experience and maturity is stunning if you are considering hiring him to run the largest and most complicated economy in the world, the largest and most relied on military in the world, the busiest ports in the world, the largest government workforce in the world; to take over decisions affecting millions of peoples' lives, futures, and security. No honest person could defend such a hiring, if in charge of it themselves.

If you read both his books, and study his actual legislative record in Illinois and during the scant two years he has been in the U.S. Senate, you will find he has done virtually nothing...except vote for tax increases. Even his constantly pointed to "community organizing on the streets of Chicago to help displaced workers" is a gigantic sham - go and read his own lengthy and in-depth description of this work and his attitude toward it, in his first book and judge for yourself.

Most people don't even know what a "community organizer" is. Some quick perspective. Rev. Al Sharpton was and is a 'community organizer.' Rev. Jesse Jackson, who has famously said he would like to cut Obama's nuts off, a community organizer.

In his first book, Obama describes his entry to this activity this way:

"In 1983, I decided to become a community organizer. There wasn't much detail to the idea....when classmates in college asked what a community organizer did, I couldn't answer them directly - instead I'd pronounce on the need for change.....change will come from a mobilized grass roots. That's what I'll do, I'll organize black folks. For change."

At one point, when finally getting hired to work for an organizer, he was counseled that "anger is a requirement for the job". His first real job as an organizer paid \$10,000.00 plus a \$2,000.00 car allowance, and landed Obama in Chicago.

According to his own book, Obama was an abject failure at this activity. He escaped and left his failure behind, his so-called mission unaccomplished, his commitments broken, hurrying off to Harvard Law School the instant he was accepted.

He has since re-written this piece of his history, romanticizing the activity, and conveniently avoiding any mention of his disappointment and disgrace. Now, he raves about his "community organizing on the streets of Chicago" as if it were the functional equivalent of Senator McCain's military service and POW heroism. Further, he only speaks of work with displaced steel-workers, which was not at all the focus of his organizing work - most was with black churches.

**The spin on his background is exactly what Bill Clinton called it: "a fairy tale."**

The Democratic Party should be ashamed of itself for pushing such an utterly unqualified person toward the presidency. There are any number of capable, knowledgeable, experienced Democratic senators and governors who, even though we might still disagree with their politics, we could view as less dangerous and infinitely more qualified than Obama. And anyone who votes to put Obama in charge must be willing to *totally* discount the need for maturity or experience or relevant qualifications. Most of the people I know who are Obama supporters are young, married people who scrutinize the qualifications of those they hire to babysit their kids much more critically than they are considering Obama's lack of credentials. In fact, in four televised focus groups of gushingly enthusiastic Obama supporters as well as my own informal survey, not a single supporter could describe a single accomplishment of Obama's that would qualify him to be handed the keys of a Dairy Queen let alone the keys to the White House. Their support is irresponsible and reckless.

Ross Perot famously described the idea of putting a governor from a dinky southern state in charge of the

country as the practical equivalent of plucking the owner of the Ace Hardware Store in Little Rock out of his store and making him CEO of Home Depot overnight. But at least Bill Clinton was a governor, with experience managing budgets, staffs, legislative relationships. He had been elected, been booted out and humbled, run and been elected again in his home state. And he proved smart and pragmatic enough to leave the Reagan-Bush economic policies largely untouched, although his foreign policy foolishness has left a lasting legacy we've yet found impossible to rectify. It's at least fair to say that Bill Clinton knows a 'fairy tale' when he sees one.

The *idea* of Obama is "sexy." He is young, thin, articulate, polished. To some, supporting him is the proper thing to do because he is black. To some, he reminds of young Jack Kennedy. Thanks to his thoroughly practiced, Neuro-Linguistic Programming based speaking techniques, he even induces faintings at his rallies. Swooning for Obama is far more akin to young ladies' reactions to the Beatles or Elvis, than to the thoughtful selection of the person best qualified to run the country - and at least not get us all killed or drive us into bankruptcy.

**Support for Obama is reckless at a time we can least afford it.**

The chief argument voiced by reckless supporters, *against* experience, is that having experienced leaders in charge hasn't gotten them the results they'd like - so why not try somebody "fresh"? This is like arguing that eating clean, safe food hasn't led to the weight loss you'd like, so why not try eating food imported from unsafe sources, with no FDA oversight at all, harvested and processed in unclean conditions?

The propping up of the zero-resume Obama with Joe Biden is scant comfort. Biden was one of Obama's harshest and most disdainful and derisive critics, marking Obama's foreign policy ideas as foolish and dangerous, and flatly stating Obama lacked adequate experience to be trusted with the presidency. Biden's acceptance of the V.P. job simply reveals lack of principle and unfulfilled desire for the Oval Office, not a change of heart about Obama's readiness. Biden, a two time loser in his own presidential bids, has grabbed at the only chance he might have to ultimately wind up with the presidency, succeeding Obama after eight years

and running as an incumbent. For Obama, Biden is a useful stage-prop, and a surrogate who can be sent to campaign in places Obama has found himself unwelcome. This does not mean Biden will have any influence over policy once Barack and Michelle assume power.

## Chapter Sixteen

### **Hillary And Obama Pick McCain**

Hillary famously said that she had a lifetime of experience to bring to the presidency and that Senator McCain had a lifetime of experience to bring to the presidency - and Obama had a good speech.

But Obama's V.P. choice says it even better.

And whether he bowed to pressure from powers within his own party's elder ranks or financiers or finally faced his own inadequacies in the mirror or merely, callously changed to accommodate the polls, we should *congratulate* Obama on choosing experience.

Of course, his choice is a total reversal from his big "CHANGE" promise...turning the page on the politics of the past, changing the way business is done in Washington. He chose a senator - not a governor; a senator of 30 years; a consummate Washington insider and career, professional politician; a senator with the foreign policy experience Obama sorely lacks...in short, he chose the Democrat carbon-copy of Senator McCain. McCain would have been the better choice of the two in my opinion, but he was already taken.

This is one more of nearly a hundred reversals of position for Obama, behavior that should trouble his supporters. I suppose to his credit from my perspective, Obama has made many of those reversals in changing to support McCain's positions. His once vehement opposition to the "surge" in Iraq has been replaced with admission it has worked to such a degree he is advocating replicating it in

Afghanistan. His one time insistence that we pull all troops from Iraq immediately then moderated to 16 months has arrived at the gradual withdrawal over two years (approximately) in agreement with the Iraq government, modified as conditions on the ground warrant, with some 'peacekeeping forces' left indefinitely. His total opposition to offshore drilling switched, to follow McCain's decision to advocate drilling. It appears that, glorious rhetoric and bold promise-making as performance art aside, Obama may be willing to follow more experienced and capable leadership, and so we can only hope should he gain the presidency, that Biden will run the show. Given the arrogant certainty Obama exhibits even while flip-flopping at warp speed and the messiah concept his wife has about him, I doubt he'll be influenced that much by Biden, but if you get any comfort from it, you can hope. Although on economics, Biden only slightly better: Obama has THE most liberal voting record, Biden the third most liberal. But in foreign affairs, Biden is much more informed and experienced hand.

Anyway, the selection of Biden over many other choices of true change reinforces several important things about Obama:

One, he will not only do a 180 on any position, he'll throw aside his entire thematic premise of change if need be to get elected. The Biden choice is one of cold political calculation, a fear of doing anything but shoring up his weak resume with an elder of experience.

Two, he can be pushed around. As noted above, he's bowed to pressure from McCain and support for McCain's success reflected in polls and changed many of his positions to equate to rather than stand in contrast with McCain. He was clearly ready

to let foreign dictators bully him - and, incidentally, Biden has opposed and strongly criticized Obama for his naïve willingness to meet and negotiate with these thugs without pre-condition, another position Obama stated, changed under pressure, and now lies about. Biden is not a natural choice for Obama, and Biden was a harsher critic of him than Hillary. Biden has revealed the same disdain for his empty-suitedness as Hillary; Biden's comments about Obama as "articulate and clean".

So Biden has been foisted on Obama, not preferred by him.

Three, Obama is a died-in-wool, unwavering liberal, evidenced now not only by his voting record but also that of his V.P., so you can forget all his posturing about non-partisan politics, building coalitions across aisles and so forth. There is no compromise to be found with these two. No sensible middle ground at all. While conservatives worry over McCain's tendency to be too willing to compromise with Democrats, radical liberals on the far left can take comfort that Obama-Biden won't budge an inch toward the middle on anything. This is a socialist ticket. Choosing a more moderate Senator Bayh, Governor Tim Keane, Hillary Clinton, Michael Bloomberg would have sent a very different message.

Four, Obama is all about politics as usual. Biden is the Washington establishment and the Democratic Party old guard. Far from turning a page on the past, this is turning a dozen pages backward to the past.

It's also worthy speculation that Obama may have wound up with Biden, to some extent, by default. We can never know who or how many others turned him down, but we can question putting such a

repetitive loser on the ticket. Biden has twice run for the presidency himself and never gotten any traction. His campaign this time around was nearly dead-on-arrival. He ended with a paltry number of votes and no delegates - while Hillary ended with 18-million votes and nearly enough delegates to be the nominee. The last time around, Biden exited the race in scandal and humiliation over ripping off his speech material verbatim from the British. On the surface, Biden's foreign policy experience seem to fill the worst and most glaring gap in Obama's qualifications. But you needn't dig very deep to see that Biden is a flawed and serially unsuccessful candidate, unable to interest or persuade voters that he belongs in the White House.

At the very least, we have in Biden an open admission from Obama that he, himself, is not qualified and ready to lead. With Obama-Biden, you can have the only experienced driver in the backseat, yelling warnings to the novice behind the wheel as the car we're all riding in careens from cliff edge and back again. With McCain, you can have an experienced pilot. The answer to which is safest seems pretty clear. To put it in simple terms, if you were to climb aboard a small plane, with your family in tow, to fly across country in stormy weather, would you prefer a student pilot with an experienced pro in the co-pilot's seat, or vice versa?

## Chapter Seventeen

### Obama's New World Order

Speaking to 200,000 people in Germany, Obama pronounced:

**"People of Berlin, people of the world - this is our moment."**

**"OUR** moment."

What does he mean by *this*? Any reference to the United States of America to which he is supposed to have allegiance conspicuous in its absence. For good reason. His allegiance is not to the United States, at least not as you and I know it. This explains his lifelong attachment to radical revolutionaries, his willingness to spend 20 years in close association with, support of, and being mentored by the pastor you've seen screaming "Goddamn America" - only reluctantly casting him aside after weeks of pounding by media and his own financial backers. This explains his status as favored pawn of globalist George Soros.

Obama has a view of America, expressed clearly in his own writings, statements, and those of his wife, as a nation in need of massive and comprehensive reorganization, healing of its soul, dictating of equality, and subservience in the world. Although he has frequently backed away from stated positions resisted by voters - often also denying he ever had them in the first place- he has been, firmly and clearly, for open borders and a myriad of rights and benefits for illegal immigrants; international appeasement; nationalization of health, education and finance; price and wage controls; abortion on demand; massive, forced re-distribution of wealth via a

more complex and punitive tax code; and - contrary to his protests - energy and tax policies that can only increase dependence on foreign oil. Many of these positions represent an overall belief that America must subjugate its own interests in order to be a 'better and more cooperative world citizen.'

The American people are about to make a fundamental decision about their future: will this be *our* time? Or *theirs*?

## Chapter Eighteen

### Conspiracy Theories

Different newspapers' editorial boards have described Obama's plans for the economy as: reckless. Regressive. Dangerous. Naive. The Las Vegas Review-Journal said he offers "**a recipe for economic disaster**". I believe it is all these things. The only real question has to do with his motives.

Nancy Pelosi owns about \$250,000.00 worth of stock in T. Boone Pickens wind/green energy company, a business put together by oil man Pickens as a hedge, so he can profit from decreased oil consumption just as he profits in his oil businesses from high consumption. For it to be a good investment for Pelosi, prices at the pump must stay high, offshore or Anwar drilling prevented. You *might* call that a conflict of interest. And a cynic *might* attribute some of her resistance to even permitting a clean vote in Congress on such drilling to her investment. Seems she has made a wager on no drilling. Maybe there's some hidden benefit to Obama or his backers in his planned rapid demolition of the American economy. George Soros, the money man behind MoveOn.org, who has held Obama fundraisers in his office, has made a lot of money before "shorting" currencies including the American dollar. I don't know of any serious journalists looking in this direction. Yet. Personally, I'm not much of a conspiracy buff and usually think the Washington bunch too dumb to conspire successfully. But when a presidential candidate is espousing a collection of policies certain to create economic chaos, you have to wonder.

There are some who believe in a darker, more insidious motive and conspiracy; that Obama is some sort of "mole", an agent of one or more of our enemies. This has pretty much been the fodder of extreme right wing groups and I've given it no attention or credence. I'm aware it's out there and being talked about, much like the linking of the Clinton's to the suspicious death of Vince Foster. That seemed ridiculous, until observation of the Clintons over time proved they were capable of stealing government documents (twice), conspiring to cover up Bill's pre and during presidency sexual adventures while virtually destroying the lives of a series of women, selling presidential pardons to criminals, and, well, the list is long. Still, thinking Obama as new-world-order agent out to undermine our national economy and sovereignty has always seemed to me more appropriate for a spy novel than serious discussion. So, imagine my surprise when, very recently, a senior partner in a very large, respected C.P.A. firm with offices in dozens of cities and I were discussing the likely depth and extent of ruin to be expected from Obama's economic policies and she asked me: **"What do you think about the idea that Obama is in place to deliberately cause another Great Depression for the benefit of the globalists and foreign governments like China or Russia or terrorist groups or sympathizers?"** The person asking this is no red-flannel-cap-wearing, gun toting, Bible thumping redneck with a G.E.D. living in a trailer park somewhere - the sort of person Obama thinks inhabits Pennsylvania. (*You might be a redneck if - you don't love Obama!*) This is a highly educated, trusted advisor to countless wealthy individuals and mid-sized business owners. When I indicated I put little stock in such sensational ideas and asked her what she thought, she said "We" - presumably meaning her firm's leadership - "have serious concerns about it."

We both agreed that Senator McCain is sadly ignorant about economics and capable of quite a bit of damage as a bumbler and as an across-the-aisle appeaser of liberal Democrats. But she said she's convinced Obama's plans are not born of similar ignorance, so there must be other explanation, and that the place to look is in his lifelong, accumulated and continuing anti-American, globalist statements, his brief voting record as *the* most liberal Senator in Congress, his associations with the very-far-Left and stubborn refusal to sever any, his backing by Soros, the suspicious flood of money that came his way throughout the primaries as well as Left insiders' turning on Hillary, all the way to his statements made on his European victory tour apologizing for America rather than standing up for us. She believes he reveals himself as someone ready and willing to serve what he would consider higher and greater objectives than the best interests of America and its preservation as the number one military and economic super-power.

I have, as I said, heard and read similar suggestions from kooks and professional political provocateurs, but this was the first time I got them from a serious person. Since then, I've used this story as excuse to bring these seemingly far-out ideas up to a handful of other serious, educated, reasoned people in business and in politics and have been surprised to get their "off the record" responses...all beginning with "I don't like saying anything like this and sounding like a conspiracy nut, *but...*" To my surprise, there is an under-current of suspicion about Obama's allegiances shared by smart, successful, relentlessly rational people not typically receptive to gossip, rumor or conspiracy theory.

I am still inclined to chalk Obama's stated economic plans up to a more innocent combination of ignorance, stupidity, liberal/socialist philosophy, arrogance, lust for power and simple political pandering from the Huey Long school of "a chicken in every pot, a car in every garage" favored by every demagogue and dictator seeking power in troubled economic circumstances throughout history, here and abroad. I'm disinclined to attribute any of it to truly sinister motives. And I'm concerned that too much talk about such motives in public forums may help rather than hurt Obama's chances, and seriously considered omitting this entire piece from my book here. But whatever his motivations or influences, one thing is certain: an Obama presidency will - if even half its promises kept - wreak economic havoc for all. It is "a recipe for economic disaster" regardless of the motives of the cook.

## Chapter Nineteen

### **Could America Give The World Its Next Hitler?**

How *could* a man like Hitler and a movement like Nazism come to power, in of all places, 20<sup>th</sup> Century Germany, a highly developed country with a well-educated and sophisticated population?

This is the question asked and answered by Dr. Thomas Childers, a Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania, with his Ph.D. from Harvard, in his 'History Of Hitler's Empire' lectures available from The Teaching Company, [www.Teach12.com](http://www.Teach12.com) - lectures everyone should hear.

And my question is: could America be the provider of the next Hitler?

On its surface, mine seems a preposterous question.

But in actuality, only we, Russia and China offer the military and economic might necessary, for a new Hitler to use first against its own people, then against the world. There are plenty of tinpots who'd like to be the next Hitler. The fruitcake in North Korea, the sworn enemy of Israel in Iran, Chavez in Venezuela. But they haven't got the right base. Precisely because Germany was so industrialized and had such an educated population, it was the ideal breeding ground for Hitler and Nazism. When you understand that, you see that the United States is the best place to birth the next Hitler.

The factors that help explain Hitler's rapid rise to power include the catastrophic impact of

World War I on Germany, its humiliation on the world stage, and Hitler's providing of a new nationalism. Its post-war hyperinflation and the Great Depression left its educated citizenry desperate for a return to a more orderly, prosperous life, eager for an expanded government role in providing it, and willing to trade away many freedoms for the promise of economic salvation. They were also very ready to have the blame for their circumstances placed somewhere, on some enemy within - in this case, the impure, money-grabbing Jews. Hitler was the first leader ever to use modern campaign techniques and media, including polling and surveys, and radio addresses. He developed a powerful, charismatic style and presented himself in a messianic manner, as the only person able to bring salvation to Germany. Using huge public rallies he created a unique sense of unstoppable momentum. He made himself a celebrity. And he apparently devoutly believed much of his stated philosophy, to point of blindness to atrocities, a willingness to utilize any means for his objectives, a deluded certainty.

Once he gained power, he systematically and ruthlessly focused the population on its enemy within, and created a totalitarian system of propaganda and terror. New political crimes were created, one atop another, so that Hitler could crush dissent. Organizing or supporting any political party other than the Nazi party was treason, and treason was punishable by death. Even making a statement contrary that could harm the Nazi party was a crime. All peaceful means of challenging Hitler's authority were outlawed.

He took control of the nation's industries to support his military control of the country and his war on Europe. From 1919 to 1933, the entire industrial might of this modern Western-style

nation was subverted and harnessed to create an industry of genocide and death. German companies bid to win the lucrative contracts to build the ovens in which to burn the Jews, the chambers in which to gas the Jews, as well as the contracts to operate slave labor camps and factories. After peace finally came in 1945, and the total could be tallied, it topped 30-million dead: Jews killed purely because they were Jews, other civilians, Allied prisoners of war. Thirty million.

If it had not happened, and were proposed as something that could happen, it would be accepted only as horror-fiction, which is exactly how we all view the possibility of it happening again.

Yet the comparisons are obvious.

Consider a scenario...

**“The United States is mired in a seemingly endless ‘war on terror’** being fought on multiple fronts, draining our resources, dividing the population, and fueling record high levels of dissatisfaction with both the executive and legislative branches of government. We have been discredited and “dissed” on the world stage. We desire international redemption and acceptance. The promise of a new way; a newer new world order that relieves America of its onerous responsibilities and gains approval rather than criticism has great appeal.

**Our economy is in recession** with its major institutions such as banking and transportation seemingly on edge of disaster day to day, and easily thrown over that edge by government meddling. Inflation, driven by gas prices born of excess dependence on foreign oil, and food prices driven up by transport costs, is eating away at the masses’ standard of living. There’s a great and growing hunger for an enemy within to blame, demonize and, with the right provocation, attack, and there is a presidential candidate laying that foundation, with Big Business and The Rich as that enemy.

**A candidate is presenting himself as a messiah** and savior, with charismatic style, with an exceptionally effective media campaign funded to an unprecedented level, succeeding at utilizing giant public rallies to make himself a ‘rock star’. Like Hitler,

he has no significant qualifications for leadership, so his sudden emergence as leader of the Democratic Party and presumptive next President is somewhat mysterious. But a true demagogue needs no qualifications or experience; in fact, such things get in the way. This is about arriving as savior, not applying for the job. And his opponent's selling of self by resume is a dull substitute for promising miracles.

**Once in power, The Messiah has made it clear that he will mount a massive assault on The Evil Rich**, and it will be easy for Him to “nationalize” the health care system as promised, the oil industry as hinted at, the airline industry by created necessity, and the banking industry put into collapse. With a rubber-stamp Democrat Congress at His control and legislative resistance impossible, He can act quickly to create a socialist State in control of all major industries and institutions.

**If a student of history, it is not at all difficult to envision oil executives forcibly deposed and driven into hiding, Rich Business Leaders rounded up and put on trial for public spectacle, all manner of assets confiscated.....** just as has happened in Russia more than once, and is now, under Putin. Ultimately, The Messiah's populist redistribution of wealth scheme will morph, as they all have and do, into all wealth owned by The State and thus controlled by Him; all citizens totally dependent on Him; all power removed from citizens, cities, states, and concentrated with Him; all resistance and dissent crushed.

**Where difference lies is in approach to the world. Unlike Hitler, this Messiah has no interest in waging war or expanding the empire. Instead, He views his path to permanent power as appeasement and cooperation with globalism.** He has no ambition beyond re-making of America to his vision with Himself as purportedly benevolent dictator and is quite willing to take a second seat internationally, letting the Soros'es of the world control it.

**His genocide will not be by direct action as was Hitler's, but by inaction**, as Israel is wiped off the map, as Russia reconstitutes as a new Soviet Union superpower in control of Europe, as China takes control of its Asian neighbors. But He will not be troubled by the genocide, exterminations, and death necessary for the world map to be re-made. His radical pro-abortion position speaks to His attitudes about the value of life. His now abandoned but once serious promise to immediately upon election withdraw all troops from Iraq, guaranteeing mass genocide, tells of us His disinterest in life. His expressed willingness to sit and negotiate, without pre-conditions, without condemnation, with the most vile dictators of the moment, who themselves threaten extinction of entire populations, reveals His true self. And

when forced to take sides, He will choose his counterparts not any upstarts, and when need be, the U.S. military might will be used to consolidate the power of other socialist mega-states.”

The comparing of anyone to Hitler should not be done lightly. It is a vile comparison. In her pro-Obama video used in her shows, Madonna has compared McCain to Hitler, Obama to Ghandi. There was an outcry about the comparison from the McCain camp - no denouncement from Obama's. It is not my intent here to directly cast Obama as a Hitler. Instead, I only wish to illustrate comparable circumstances. My point might be better made by using the above scenario for a novel, a work of fiction.

Is it a plausible scenario? Or warped, sensationalist fantasy? Is it a legitimate cautionary tale or an outrageous nightmare? I'm quite certain most will insist such a thing could not happen in *our* industrialized 21<sup>st</sup> century America, with *our* educated, sophisticated population.

But if it has piqued your interest, may I suggest reading or re-reading three relevant books. Two are fiction as is, at this point, the above scenario, the third non-fiction, a how-to manual of sorts. In order: Ayn Rand's ATLAS SHRUGGED; George Orwell's 1984; and THE TRUE BELIEVER.

**Important Notices:** Contents are © 2008/DanKennedyPolitics, however anyone is free to virally transmit or distribute, copy and publish, or otherwise disseminate these materials as long as each each article, blog, e-book, etc. is disseminated intact and in full, including with this notice at its end.

This item reprinted from DanKennedyPolitics and that entire site is in no way whatsoever affiliated with or endorsed by Glazer-Kennedy Insider's Circle™, Entrepreneur Press, Adams Media, Lillo Publishing or any other business entities with which the author, Dan Kennedy, has connection. The opinions expressed here are those solely of the author. And, while every reasonable attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of the content on which the expressed opinions are based, no warranty of such accuracy is made nor liability for same accepted. The contents of this site are provided for entertainment purposes only.

THE AUTHOR, DAN KENNEDY is a serial entrepreneur, celebrated business author, sought after advisor to businesses worldwide, and an accomplished professional speaker - frequently appearing on public programs with four former U.S. Presidents, General Norman Schwarzkopf, General Colin Powell; business leaders and super-entrepreneurs; and Hollywood and sports celebrities. Information about the author can be found at [www.NoBSBooks.com](http://www.NoBSBooks.com). He may be communicated with directly via fax @ 602-269-3113.