



Support Our Troops
They're still fighting for us.
Soldiers' Angels
Wounded Warrior Project
Fisher House: help military families
Our Military



Iran and Honduras: some credible 'alternative' sources of news

StopFundamentalism.com

Iranian.com

[Sayeh Hassan](#) (young Iranian expatriate lawyer in Toronto)

HondurasNews.com

The Day ObamaCare Died - Sung by Barack Obama

by Paul Shanklin, 16 Sept 2009

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D3KDmEvNmJ0>

ACORN's Man in the White House

by Matthew Vadum, 28 Sept 2009

Newly discovered evidence shows the radical advocacy group ACORN has a man in the Obama White House.

This power behind the throne is longtime ACORN operative Patrick Gaspard. He holds the title of White House political affairs director, the same title Karl Rove held in President Bush's White House.

Evidence shows that years before he joined the Obama administration, Gaspard was ACORN boss Bertha Lewis's political director in New York.

Lewis, the current "chief organizer" or CEO of ACORN, was head of New York ACORN from at least 1994 through 2008, when she took over as national leader of ACORN. With Gaspard at work in the White House, Lewis might as well be speaking to President Obama through an earpiece as he goes about his daily business ruining the country...

Just incredible: <http://spectator.org/archives/2009/09/28/acorns-man-in-the-white-house>

Why We Can't Go Small in Afghanistan

by Bruce Riedel and Michael O'Hanlon, 24 Sept 2009

As the Afghanistan mission has encountered growing troubles this summer, the debate about whether to lower U.S. goals and focus more narrowly on counterterrorism has again re-emerged. Such a shift sounds appealing. If advocates are right, we could protect the United States against terrorism while lowering costs, casualties and commitment in Afghanistan — a war that by some measures is about to become the longest in U.S. history.

Those who favor the counterterrorism option — as opposed to deeper engagement — imply that we can destroy al-Qaeda's core with a few U.S. special forces teams, modern intelligence fusion centers, cruise-missile-carrying ships and unmanned aerial vehicles of the type that recently killed Pakistani extremist leader Baitullah Mehsud. Some advocates of

this kind of plan would continue our intense efforts to train Afghan security forces. Others would not. But all envision a dramatically reduced U.S. role.

Pretty good — if it would work. Alas, it would not. In fact, we have seen this movie before...

More: <http://blogs.usatoday.com/oped/2009/09/column-why-we-cant-go-small-in-afghanistan.html>

Just listen to this self-important moron. He drips condescension, and leftist assumptions that are wrong, wrong, wrong.

Stuck in the shallows

by Garrison Keillor, 30 Sept 2009

...The so-called cultural wars over abortion and prayer in the schools and pornography and gays did nothing about anything, except elect dullards to office who brought a certain nihilistic approach to governance that helped bring about the disaster in the banking industry...The anti-regulation conservatives enabled those people. We're still waiting for an apology...

...When an entire major party has excused itself from meaningful debate and a thoughtful U.S. senator like Orrin Hatch no longer finds it important to make sense and an up-and-comer like Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty attacks the president for giving a speech telling schoolchildren to work hard in school and get good grades, one starts to wonder if the country wouldn't be better off without them and if Republicans should be cut out of the health-care system entirely and simply provided with aspirin and hand sanitizer. Thirty-two percent of the population identifies with the GOP, and if we cut off health care to them, we could probably pay off the deficit in short order.

It's time to dump the dead-end issues that have wasted too much time already. Old men shouldn't be allowed to doze off at the switch and muck up the works for the young who will have to repair the damage. Get over yourselves. Your replacements have arrived, and you should think about them now and then. Enough with the shrieking. Pass health-care reform.

What an asshole! <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/columnists/chi-oped0930keillorsep30,0,1198390.column>

False Prophet

A poem on the death of Susan Atkins, who murdered Sharon Tate.

by Jamh, 28 Sept 2009

<http://www.iranian.com/main/2009/sep/false-prophet>

A Pragmatic Look at Obama's Pragmatism

Is reality prying him from his ideological cocoon?

by Jonah Goldberg, 30 Sept 2009

'When John McCain said we could just 'muddle through' in Afghanistan, I argued for more resources and more troops to finish the fight against the terrorists who actually attacked us on 9/11, and made clear that we must take out Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants if we have them in our sights," Barack Obama thundered as he accepted the Democratic nomination for president in Denver last year. "John McCain likes to say that he'll follow bin Laden to the gates of Hell. But he won't even go to the cave where he lives."

It was a shabby bit of rhetoric, even for a campaign. Insinuating that McCain, of all people, didn't have the intestinal fortitude to take the fight to bin Laden was not only absurd on its face, it smacked of overcompensation coming from the former community organizer whose greatest foreign-policy passion prior to his presidential bid had been nuclear disarmament.

But the line did what it needed to do...

Read on: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=OTM2NjBhODNmYWRIYmQzMWU3N2MzM2M4YjU1YWWM1NDk=>

'Reform' horrors: O's Total Disconnect

by Sally Pipes, 30 Sept 2009

The disconnect is just about perfect: President Obama's utopian promises for what his health-care agenda would bring

are the opposite of what the plans on the table would produce...

Continue: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/reform_horrors_total_disconnect_Lzm6BGLIAy26L78eGaFP0L

Claiming Success No Matter What

by John Stossel, 30 Sept 2009

This Friday, September's job-loss total will be announced. Whatever the numbers, administration officials surely will tell us that life is better—because of them. "We brought the global economy back from the brink," President Obama said at the close of the G-20 meeting last week. "(B)ecause of the bold and coordinated action that we took, millions of jobs have been saved or created; the decline in output has been stopped; financial markets have come back to life".

This has been the president's theme: His so-called stimulus package, bailouts for politically connected banks and industries, ludicrously wasteful programs like Cash for Clunkers, etc. have saved America from the greatest disaster since the Great Depression.

But this theme runs up against some rather unfortunate facts...

Those facts: <http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=111472>

Dear Senator: Why you should vote against cap-and-trade

by James Manzi, 30 Sept 2009

...For one thing, it would be a terrible deal for American taxpayers. According to the Environmental Protection Agency's own projections, Waxman-Markey would impose annual costs of about \$1,100 per household (a little less than 1 percent of total consumption) by 2050.

The benefits we will get in return? If the law works precisely as intended, in about 100 years we should expect surface temperatures to be a about one-tenth of one degree Celsius lower than they otherwise would be. The expected costs are at least 10 times the expected benefits, even using the EPA's cost estimates and assuming achievement of the primary goal of the legislation.

There are other reasons to be wary of Waxman-Markey as well. Contrary to early expectations that auctioning cap-and-trade permits would generate \$80 billion per year of government revenue, it would not contribute materially to deficit reduction....

More: http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columns/Manhattan-Moment/Dear-Senator_-Why-you-should-vote-against-cap-and-trade-8315351-62718987.html

The threat of 'stealth jihad'

by Frank J. Gaffney Jr., 29 Sept 2009

...Even more insidious, though, is what Robert Spencer calls "stealth jihad." This practice involves using myriad nonviolent measures to insinuate Shariah into non-Muslim societies. Adherents demand such concessions as special treatment for them and their faith in public spaces, private corporations, schools, communities and government at every level.

The prime mover behind these demands is the Muslim Brotherhood, an organization that shares the violent jihadists' commitment to advance Shariah's end state of a global caliphate, but seek (for the moment, at least) to do so nonviolently. The successful prosecution last year of one Brotherhood front, the Holy Land Foundation, established that the organization's mission is "to destroy Western civilization from within ... by its own miserable hand."

What happens as tolerant democratic societies try to accommodate themselves to the stealthy form of jihad, backed by the persistent threat of the violent form—if not its actual occurrence, can be seen in much of Western Europe. For example, France now has 751 zones urbaines sensibles—Muslim-only areas that amount to "no-go" zones for French authorities. In these zones, Shariah rules instead of the laws of the host government, at the expense most notably of women's rights, due process and public order (especially for Jews, Christians and other non-Muslims).

To be sure, accommodations to date to Shariah have not metastasized in the United States to nearly this extent. There are, however, numerous worrisome examples of concessions that have been made here, too.

To cite a few: Taxpayer-financed foot baths for Muslims installed at state universities; corporations providing Muslim-only prayer rooms and time off for prayers; government-sanctioned discrimination by taxi drivers against passengers deemed "impure" (haram) because they have alcohol or dogs; unhygienic practices in food plants to

accommodate the preferences of Muslim workers; government-offered Shariah-compliant mortgages; Islamic proselytizing in public school curricula, etc.

The failure by U.S. and other governments' officials to recognize the connection between Shariah and jihad (of either the violent or stealthy kind) is like a refusal to acknowledge that there is a common virus causing an outbreak of swine flu...

Read it all: <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/sep/29/the-threat-of-stealth-jihad/>

Welcome to 1995: Sean Hannity Discovers Law and Order is "Politicized"

by David Forsmark, 28 Sept 2009

...HANNITY: "NBC, the Obama network, they've even found a way to politicize *Law and Order*! Never thought I'd see the day."

Gee, Sean, welcome to 1995. While it's true that last Friday's show crossed a Rubicon of sorts, since at least the departure of Michael Moriarty and the arrival of Sam Waterston, *Law and Order* has steadily become the most reliably PC show on television.

Whether it's the steady parade of white male corporate criminals, or the show's jaundiced view of pro-lifers, Christians, crazed war veterans, or conservative media personalities, *Law and Order* has had a distinctly liberal perspective in what is an instinctively conservative genre—and it's become such an old joke among conservative-minded viewers that it's hardly remarked on anymore.

But Sean is right on one point, as has been pointed out by many voices this weekend and today, the September 25 episode, *Memo from the Dark Side*, was as egregious as it was unrealistic: Here's a pretentious example:

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k49zRr8K6xI>

The rest of the column:

<http://newsrealblog.com/2009/09/28/welcome-to-1995-sean-hannity-discovers-law-and-order-is-%e2%80%9cpoliticized%e2%80%9d/>

Marc Lamont Hill is a Columbia professor whose expertise is hip-hop culture. O'Reilly's elevation of this *poseur* is an insult to genuine experts of all races.

Fox's Affirmative Action Baby Whines

by David Horowitz, 27 Sept 2009

<http://newsrealblog.com/2009/09/27/foxs-affirmative-action-baby-whines/>

Still more debunking of the claims made by Virginia professor Michael Mann, who used tree-ring records to concoct alleged evidence of accelerated warming during the 20th century. He's the one who constructed that notorious "hockey stick" graph that showed an alarming spike in warming. But then researchers took the computer program that produced the hockey stick graph and fed it random data: **hockey stick shapes appeared every time.**

Quote of the week #20 – ding dong the stick is dead

by Anthony Watts, 27 Sept 2009

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/09/27/quote-of-the-week-20-ding-dong-the-stick-is-dead/>

Obama's Too-Big-to-Fail Plan Is Too Dumb to Pass

by Kevin A. Hassett, 28 Sept 2009

The administration's financial reform proposal is back in the news after Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's testimony on Capitol Hill last week. A closer look at Geithner's proposal and the perspective of Barney Frank's amended plan reveals how inept Obama's economic policy has become.

Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner's appearance in Congress last week to explain how President Barack Obama would overhaul financial regulation elicited the most striking sign yet that the wheels have come off the administration's economic-policy team.

The White House had proposed, and Geithner was ready to defend, such a radical expansion of government power

that even Barney Frank, the ultra-liberal congressman from Massachusetts, felt compelled to object that it went too far.

When Barney Frank thinks that you are too liberal, you better check your medications...

It's really stupid: <http://www.aei.org/article/101075>

Wall Street money rains on Schumer

by Victoria McGrane and Lisa Lerer, 28 Sept 2009

Wall Street has showered nearly \$11 million on the Senate since the beginning of the year, and more than 15 percent of it has gone to a single senator: Democrat Chuck Schumer of New York.

Schumer's \$1.65 million take from the financial services industry is nearly twice that of any other senator's — and more than five times what the industry gave to any single Republican senator...

Shameful: <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0909/27643.html>

Within those categories, there are a couple of sub-choices. Mr. Cohen's conclusion *may* (or may not) surprise you.

There are only two choices left on Iran

An Israeli or U.S. military strike now, or a nuclear Tehran soon.

by Eliot A. Cohen, 28 Sept 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204518504574420641457091318.html>

Democrats Try to Pack the Courts –

Washington Times editorial, 28 Sept 2009

...A subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing Wednesday on the proposed Federal Judgeship Act of 2009 (S. 1653), which would create positions for 63 new federal judges—51 in federal district courts and 12 in appeals courts. This proposal is nothing less than a sneaky equivalent of what President Franklin D. Roosevelt tried with his infamous court-packing power grab on the Supreme Court in 1937. The only slight difference is that this attempt is more under the radar.

The Supreme Court has been choosing to consider fewer cases each year. This means the lower courts provide the final disposition for a larger percentage of controversies than ever before. Packing those courts with new, loyal liberals can thus have a huge effect on legal issues without the high profile—and public backlash—of unpopular Supreme Court decisions and fringe appointments to the high court...

Full story: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/sep/28/democrats-try-to-pack-the-courts/>

Stop Allowing The Left To Set The Rules

by Lloyd Marcus, 28 Sept 2009

...Imagine the absurdity of a competition in which one side is allowed to set the rules against their opponent. The Left tells us what is racist. The Left tells us what we can and cannot say. The Left published a cartoon depicting former black Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice as an Aunt Jemima; another depicted Rice as a huge-lipped parrot for her Massa Bush. Neither were considered racist by their creators or publishers, or even widely condemned on the Left.

In opposition to black Republican Michael Steele's campaign to run for U.S. Senate, a liberal blogger published a doctored photo of Steele in black face and big red lips made to look like a minstrel. The caption read, "*Simple Sambo wants to move to the big house*". Not one Democrat denounced these racist portrayals of black conservatives.

And yet, a sign seen at a tea party depicting Obama as a witch doctor is considered by the Left to be beyond the pale and obviously racist. Why is the Left, given their track record of bias, granted final authority to determine the intent of the sign? Why do we conservatives so quickly and easily allow ourselves to be put on the defensive?

The rules set by the Left are extremely clear. Racist images of black conservatives and negative images of Bush are fair game. Even a play about murdering President Bush was called "*harmless art*." Meanwhile, *all* unflattering images of Obama are racist, and constitute dangerous, potentially violent hate speech...

Read on: http://www.americanthinker.com/printpage/?url=http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/09/stop_allowing_the_left_to_set.html

Chickens Roosting

by Victor Davis Hanson, 25 Sept 2009

Where to begin with the "surprise" announcement of a second, previously undisclosed "nuclear facility"? Some thoughts... We have no reliable intelligence agencies — none at all. For partisan purposes, they have leaked false information about both Iran and Iraq for years. During the political wars of the Bush era, they claimed that Iran was "years away" from obtaining the bomb — and anyone who doubted that dubious assessment was either unhinged or of questionable character. Do we remember the much-welcomed 2007 conclusion from the National Intelligence Estimate on Iran: "We judge with high confidence that in fall 2003, Tehran halted its nuclear weapons program"?

That bombshell was cited for months as "proof" of neoconservative paranoia and warmongering over Iraq. In fact, over the last decade, we have seen a long series of politicized leaks from the CIA and politicized memoirs from former operatives designed to undermine the case against Iran. The result is that after endless assurances that there was no Iranian effort to get a bomb, it turns out that there has been one all the time, and it is now on the eve of coming to fruition. We should have an investigation to determine what, if anything, the authors of the 2007 assessment knew about the recently disclosed "second" facility...

...Some look at our president and see a messiah; these two see a rookie in charge of a now-bankrupt country with \$2-trillion-a-year deficits that is unsure what to do in two wars and in dire need of both imported oil and trillions in cash.

We can imagine that Europeans' "concern" will translate into something analogous to their effort in Afghanistan. Britain's past appeasement of the sailor-kidnapping Iranians, and its recent oil-prompted release to Libya of the Lockerbie murderer, will not create much worry in Tehran about British sanctions.

In short, there is nothing the international community can or will do about Iran's road to a small arsenal of nukes. What would work — an ironclad international boycott and embargo of Iran's oil exports and gasoline imports — is beyond Western statecraft. In this new Obama era of morally equivalent multiculturalism, we have no desire to stand for human rights and support the Iranian opposition in any meaningful way...

More: <http://corner.nationalreview.com/post/?q=NTc4Y2U5MTIxNjlkOWI5Y2VmMDkwYTJhYzhiOTdlMjE=>

The Pledge of Allegiance

explained by Red Skelton, 14 Jan 1969

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LpBlls0iOnI>

(Hat tip: MM)

"World government" would never work, and should never be tried. How would you like to be ruled by a scumbag like Kofi Annan or Ban Ki-Moon—and not even get to vote against him?

Thinking global brings a world of problems

by Janet Daley, 26 Sept 2009

...The idea of global governance is meaningless without mechanisms to enforce it, so what are we talking about here? World government? A system of laws and policing which would be beyond the reach of the electorates of individual countries, and therefore have no direct democratic accountability to the peoples of those nations?...

...Mr Obama has actually contended that, in the newly interconnected world, all of our interests are shared—which is clearly false. Some of them are and some of them aren't, as has always been the case. When nations do indeed share interests, whether they are economic or military, there are traditional ways of formalising their mutually advantageous understandings. There have always been bilateral or multilateral trade and credit arrangements, just as there have always been mutual defence treaties and foreign policy agreements. It is no coincidence that such arrangements have tended to be temporary: national interests change with time and circumstances. Does Mr Obama (and Mr Brown, who is trotting alongside him) believe that we have reached the end of history, or that circumstances are actually altering more slowly now than in previous eras? Surely not. All of his rhetoric, in fact, says the opposite.

Which brings us to the sticking point: the tricky bit comes when the interests of sovereign countries are not shared, but actually conflict. When Russia's territorial inclinations are at odds with the independence of eastern European republics, or China's reliance on exports is contributing to America's credit problems, or Germany's economic priorities threaten Britain's finance industry—what then? Intoning pious banalities about global consensus will not make these differences go away...

Read the rest: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/janetdaley/6234981/Thinking-global-brings-a-world-of-problems.html>

In Afghanistan, let U.S. troops be warriors

by Byron York, 25 Sept 2009

...When McChrystal met with local leaders in Kunduz, a few days after the bombing, he got an earful -- but not what he expected. According to a [detailed account](#) in The Washington Post -- a story that has received too little attention in the ongoing debate over U.S. policy in Afghanistan -- the local Afghan leaders told McChrystal to stop being so fussy and to go ahead and kill the enemy, which they said would help bring stability to the region.

Post reporter Rajiv Chandrasekaran was given extraordinary access to the bombing investigation. According to his account, McChrystal began the meeting with a show of sympathy for those who had been killed or wounded. The general didn't get very far before he was interrupted by the provincial council chairman, Ahmadullah Wardak.

The security situation has been getting worse in Kunduz, Wardak told McChrystal. American and NATO troops haven't been aggressive enough in pursuing and killing the Taliban. In Wardak's view, the bombing of the fuel tankers, rather than a mistake, was the right thing to do. "If we do three more operations like was done the other night, stability will come to Kunduz," Wardak said, according to the Post account. "If people do not want to live in peace and harmony, that's not our fault."

Chandrasekaran reported that McChrystal "seemed caught off guard." Wardak clarified a bit more: "We've been too nice to the thugs," he said. So instead of receiving an angry lecture on America's disregard for Afghan life, the general received an angry lecture on America's hesitance to go after the enemy...

More: http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/In-Afghanistan_-let-U_S_-troops-be-warriors-8291754-61261462.html

Obama's plan? What plan?

by Amir Taheri, 27 Sept 2009

...One can only imagine the general's surprise when President Obama, asked to comment on the leaked report, said he wouldn't allow himself to be rushed into sending more troops, as requested by McChrystal, pending the development of a "new strategy."

One might say, Wait a minute! We thought you had a strategy before you were elected, when you castigated Bush's performance in Afghanistan — or at least in March, when you announced "the new, smarter strategy," or in June, when you appointed a commander to "carry out the new strategy."

What of McChrystal's proposed "new strategy" spelled out in his report? No, the president says he's still looking for a strategy. Obama has reportedly set up a special "situation room" to look for a strategy. One meeting has been held, with three or four more planned for the next few months.

As on so many other issues with Obama, we have "on-the-job training" on grand scale...

More: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/obama_plan_what_plan_QdbYwTj5LfQYpLrjklLulO

What Bush got right offers clues for Obama

by Mark Bowden, 27 Sept 2009

http://www.philly.com/inquirer/opinion/20090927_The_Point_What_Bush_got_right_offers_clues_for_Obama.html

How To Lose Friends...

by David Harsanyi, 25 Sept 2009

...If Obama expects Israel to end the "occupation" that began in 1967 he is also demanding Israel abandon parts of Jerusalem. If he really anticipates a Palestinian state will be "contiguous territory," what he expects is that Israel can't be contiguous.

And when he uses the word "occupation" he is negotiating for the Palestinians. **None of the lands up for discussion are "occupied" territory. The president, a highly educated man, knows well that there has never been an ultimate agreement on borders, nor has there ever, in history, been a Palestinian state to occupy.**

There is an ethical question that the president might want to answer, as well. Why would the United States support an

arrangement that scrubs the West Bank of all its Jews? Why is it so unconscionable to imagine that Jews could live among Muslims in the same way millions of Arabs live within Israel proper? Not many international agreements feature ethnic cleansing clauses. Isn't this, after all, about peace?

Of course, we all know the answer to this question: Jews would be slaughtered, bombed from their homes, rocketed from their schools. This indisputable fact reveals the fundamental reality of these negotiations...

Entire column: http://www.denverpost.com/harsanyi/ci_13414157

The Obama Doctrine

by *Frank Gaffney* (to Hugh Hewitt, 25 Sept 2009)

Undermine our friends. Embolden our enemies. Diminish our country.

Christian hotel owners hauled before court after defending their beliefs in discussion with Muslim guest

by *Jonathan Petre*, 20 Sept 2009

A Christian couple have been charged with a criminal offence after taking part in what they regarded as a reasonable discussion about religion with guests at their hotel. Ben and Sharon Vogelenzang were arrested after a Muslim woman complained to police that she had been offended by their comments. They have been charged under public order laws with using "threatening, abusive or insulting words" that were "religiously aggravated."

The couple, whose trial has been set for December, face a fine of up to £5,000 and a criminal record if they are convicted. Although the facts are disputed, it is thought that during the conversation the couple were challenged over their Christian beliefs. It is understood that they suggested that Mohammed, the founder of Islam, was a warlord and that traditional Muslim dress for women was a form of bondage. They deny, however, that their comments were threatening and argue that they had every right to defend and explain their beliefs...

...The use by the police of the Public Order Act to arrest people over offensive comments has dismayed a number of lawyers, who say the legislation was passed to deal with law and order problems in the streets. Neil Addison, a prominent criminal barrister and expert in religious law, said: "The purpose of the Public Order Act is to prevent disorder, but I'm very concerned that the police are using it merely because someone is offended..."

More: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1214666/Christian-hotel-owners-hauled-court-defending-beliefs-discussion-Muslim-guest.html#ixzz0Rf8dXtPm>

On Winning

by *Oliver North*, 25 Sept 2009

...Here's the bottom line, which is based on months in the field with U.S. and NATO troops and Afghanistan's fledgling security forces: This is a fight we can and must win. It is a classical counterinsurgency campaign, not rocket science. Success requires U.S., NATO and coalition forces to protect the Afghan people from the Taliban while we train and equip sufficient numbers of Afghan soldiers and police to take responsibility for their own security.

To accomplish that mission, more U.S. and coalition combat troops and trainers—and the airlift to move them around and resupply them—will have to be sent to Afghanistan. We also desperately need better human intelligence on the Taliban and their supporters. From what we have seen on this trip, that last requirement is now being met—not by the allied military or intelligence agencies, but by special agents and intelligence specialists of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

DEA operations in Afghanistan are an untold success story. In the year since we were last here, the tiny agency has begun delivering superior human intelligence, analysis, mobility and firepower to the fight. Its ability to use local informants to verify other intelligence is unparalleled—and brings "value added" to every operation it leads. Because the Taliban are heavily dependent on opium for financing their insurgency, the DEA has become a "force multiplier" for Gen. McChrystal. Before pulling the plug on our mission in Afghanistan, the White House ought to listen to the "other counterinsurgency experts"—at the DEA.

Full column: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,555600,00.html>

All About Obama

by Michael Gerson, 26 Sept 2009

...Obama's rhetorical method in international contexts—given supreme expression at the United Nations this week—is a moral dialectic. The thesis: pre-Obama America is a nation of many flaws and failures. The antithesis: The world responds with understandable but misguided prejudice. The synthesis: Me. Me, at all costs; me, in spite of all terrors; me, however long and hard the road may be. How great a world we all should see, if only all were more like...me.

Read on: http://voices.washingtonpost.com/postpartisan/2009/09/all_about_obama.html

Appease-y does it for weak Prez on road to a Mideast apocalypse

by Ralph Peters, 26 Sept 2009

Did it surprise a single Post reader that Iran's been hiding a big nuclear weapons development facility? It stunned our president when he learned about it months ago. Then he kept it secret from *you*. Obama didn't want *you* to know how much progress Iran had made. It's an embarrassment.

And it raises the pressure on the White House to act—something this president's squirming to avoid. But the Iranians have now realized we know, so they tipped it themselves.

Obama had no choice but to come clean. Yesterday, he interrupted the G-20 summit to go public—before Mahmoud Ahmadinejad did. Flanked by French President Nicolas Sarkozy and Britain's dead man walking, Prime Minister Gordon Brown, our president offered more uselessly vague rhetoric in response to proof of a major "covert Iranian enrichment facility" and its implications.

Obama's statement amounted to, *Ooooh, I'll huff, and I'll puff, and I'll blow your house down . . . maybe . . . eventually . . . but not really . . . let's talk . . .*

Only Sarkozy made a serious attempt to get the Iranian leadership's attention, stressing the consistent failure of negotiations and the need for action. *He* understands that a decade of talking with Tehran brought zero results. Obama cringed. Shouldn't we be ashamed that a *French* president's leading the fight to protect Israel and the free world?...

More: http://www.nypost.com/f/print/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/appease_does_apocalypse_for_weak_9HzomoUqSd9gZJINlwtJIL

An extensive excoriation of everything The One has done.

An Enfeebled Obama

by Caroline Glick, 25 Sept 2009

...Since Obama took office, he has been abandoning one US ally after another while seeking to curry favor with one US adversary after another. At every turn, America's allies—from Israel to Honduras, to Columbia, South Korea and Japan, to Poland and the Czech Republic—have reacted with disbelief and horror to his treachery. And at every turn, America's adversaries—from Iran to Venezuela to North Korea and Russia—have responded with derision and contempt to his seemingly obsessive attempts to appease them.

The horror Obama has instilled in America's friends and the contempt he has evoked from its enemies have not caused him to change course. The fact that his policies throughout the world have already failed to bring a change in the so-called international community's treatment of the US has not led him to reconsider those policies. As many Western Europeans have begun to openly acknowledge, the man they once likened to the messiah is nothing but a politician—and a weak, bungling one at that. Even Britain's *Economist* is laughing at him.

But Obama is unmoved by any of this, and as his speech at the UN General Assembly made clear, he is moving full speed ahead in his plans to subordinate US foreign policy to the UN.

His stubborn insistence on advancing his feckless foreign policy in the face of its already apparent colossal failure is of a piece with his unswerving commitment to his domestic agenda in spite of its apparent colossal failure...

Read the rest: <http://www.carolineglick.com/e/2009/09/an-enfeebled-obama.php>

Is a Tax on Health Care Constitutional?

by Ernest S. Christian and Betty Jo Christian, 25 Sept 2009

...The controversial tax that both Obama and Baucus would impose on people who do not buy health insurance appears to be a "direct tax" on persons that is unlawful under Article 1, Section 2, of the Constitution, which requires that

"direct Taxes shall be apportioned among the several States ... according to their Numbers..."

In addition, Art. 1, Sec. 9, says: "No capitation, or other direct Tax, shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken..."

The only exception to the constitutional prohibition against unapportioned direct taxes is for the federal income tax, which was authorized by the 16th Amendment — but the direct tax on the uninsured is not an income tax.

Sen. Baucus claims that the tax on the uninsured is an "indirect" excise tax — like the federal gasoline tax — that does not have to be apportioned. But Sen. Baucus appears to be in error. An excise tax is a tax on a "thing" (such as a commodity or a license). That is why an excise tax is classified as "indirect."

People who choose not to buy insurance are not things...

More: <http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=507127>

Obama and the Trust Factor

by Kyle-Anne Shiver, 25 Sept 2009

For the scant few media folks still scratching their heads in puzzled frustration over the massive displays of public discontent with Barack Obama's presidency, this one's for you. No, the discontent is not about his race, his smoking or whether he wears a helmet while riding his bike. It's not about his wife's biceps or her shorts or her fake eyelashes. It's not even about the President's vainglorious love of the cameras. No, no, no. It's the trust factor, honey.

When a man campaigns for the presidency as an anti-ideological moderate, a lover of bi-partisan reconciliation, and vows to regain America's foothold on the world's respect, and then after becoming president, shoots down real bi-partisan input with a petulant, "I won," governs high-handedly from the farthest-left corner of American politics, all the while playing cozy-up with America's self-proclaimed enemies and arrogantly dissing our heretofore friends, then the citizens quite naturally feel they've been sucker-punched in the gut. And being sucker-punched in the gut tends to bring out the rudeness in even the most civil people.

On the pinnacle issue of the president's domestic agenda, healthcare reform, candidate Obama **promised** a completely open C-SPAN debate but instead has given Americans backroom deals and the same speech, recycled and spit out more than a hundred different ways. And the more Obama fights back against the so-called "smears," the more professional analysts jump into the verbal fray, calling him out on his own **misinformation**, falsehoods and crumbling credibility...

The whole column: http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/09/obama_and_the_trust_factor.html

Very calm, very sober, very logical.

Doubling Down on a Flawed Insurance Model

Obama's plan takes the problems of the current system—mandates, runaway spending and more—and makes them worse.

by John F. Cogan, R. Glenn Hubbard, and Daniel Kessler, 25 Sept 2009

...To persuade the American people to support his health reform agenda, the president has made two simple promises. First, his plan will benefit everyone who already has health insurance. Second, his plan will not add to the nation's yawning budget deficit. Both claims are essentially false, and examining them offers economic lessons for reform...

More: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204488304574426872264215790.html>

Leftist Bias Alert!

In Poll, Public Wary of Obama on War and Health

by Adam Nagourney and Dalia Sussman, 25 Sept 2009

...But the poll suggests that Mr. Obama is in a decidedly more commanding position than Republicans on this issue as Congressional negotiations move into final stages. Most Americans trust Mr. Obama more than Republicans to make the right decisions on the issue; 76 percent said Republicans had not even laid out a clear health care plan.

And by a lopsided margin, respondents said that Mr. Obama and not Republicans had made an effort to cross party lines and strike a deal that has the support of both parties. Two-thirds of respondents said they wanted Congress to come up with a bill supported by both sides.

At the same time, there has been a slip in confidence in Mr. Obama's handling of the war in Afghanistan. There is tepid support for maintaining troop strength there, much less increasing it, as his top commander in Afghanistan prepares to submit a request for additional forces. A majority of Americans do not want troops there for more than two years...

...About one in four respondents said they believed that health care legislation would create organizations to decide

when to stop providing medical care to the elderly — so-called death panels — despite an all-out effort by Mr. Obama to debunk the claim, which is false. Three in 10 say the bill would use taxpayer money to provide health care benefits to illegal immigrants. In fact, Mr. Obama has specifically rejected any effort to have the bill cover health insurance for illegal immigrants...

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/25/us/politics/25poll.html?ref=todayspaper&pagewanted=print>

This drivel about the latest New York Times/CBS poll means only one thing: you can always count on NYT and CBS to be biased and wildly inaccurate. Every other major poll shows far more people agreeing with the Republicans on health insurance. As for the alleged absence of a "clear health care plan" from the GOP: the Democrat plan is such a disaster that mere opposition to it **IS** a position. Health insurance does need some reform. But in a country where over 80% of the insured are happy with their current plans, and over 40% of the uninsured don't like the Democrat plan, the notion that it's all a big crisis that calls for nationalization **NOW! NOW! NOW!** is just a bunch of statist propaganda.

Bipartisanship? Obama has stonewalled the Republicans for months. First he told them to just shut up, and when they didn't, he called them liars, as he did repeatedly in his address to Congress.

On Afghanistan: why not ask people how they would feel about America losing that war?

Even if an ObamaCare bill were to specifically ban coverage of illegal immigrants, there are plenty of other bad laws and legal precedents already in effect that would guarantee their entitlement to universal health coverage, just as they are entitled to education and nearly everything else we citizens pay taxes for.

As for the "false claim" about death panels, Thomas Sowell **says it best**: "When there are 'advisory' panels on what treatments to approve, and the White House's existing medical advisor has complained of Americans' 'over-utilization' of medical care, what does it take to connect the dots?"

—Don John

An oration for the ages. Read it all.

Speech to the UN General Assembly

by Benjamin Netanyahu, 24 Sept 2009

Full text: <http://www.christiannewswire.com/news/3495511647.html>

Video clip: <http://www.breitbart.tv/netanyahu-slams-u-n-for-giving-ahmadinejad-forum-have-you-no-shame/>

Palin's Hong Kong Speech: I Can See Insanity From My Newsroom

by John Ziegler, 24 Sept 2009

...The initial element that shocked me about the coverage of this Hong Kong event (other than its magnitude) was that, at first glance, the reporting left a remarkably positive impression of the speech. The New York Times in its second paragraph reluctantly admitted that those in attendance thought, "she was articulate, well-prepared and even compelling." You can almost see the Times reporter and editors cringing at having to allow the Old Grey Lady to be soiled by such blasphemy to the modern liberal as the acknowledgement that Palin is not a complete dunce.

The AFP service's first quote in their article was, "She was brilliant," though they added the caveat that this assessment came from a delegate who requested their anonymity (presumably to protect the ability to make future dinner reservations in New York or Los Angeles). Meanwhile, Bloomberg, after quoting someone who left the speech early as calling it "boring," at least allowed the head of the sponsoring group to call it "a great speech."

But a closer look at the coverage reveals that Palin Derangement Syndrome is still a robust strain within the news media and that the rules for reporting on her are completely different than anyone else in public life...

Read on: <http://bighollywood.breitbart.com/jziegler/2009/09/24/palins-hong-kong-speech-i-can-see-insanity-from-my-newsroom/>

The blessings of Pax Americana, the good cop

by James Lewis, 24 Sept 2009

...The Middle East now has the closest thing to Adolf Hitler since World War II, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who is now within a year of having nukes in his grasp. Already they have ballistic missiles, built to carry nukes. That regime has been tested in a long and bloody war with Iraq in which a million people died. That war experience hasn't stopped their bloodthirsty actions; they glorify martyrdom. The Tehran regime routinely kills and tortures its own people, as a matter of

policy in the name of God.

Meanwhile our own president is proclaiming the end of Pax Americana, the most successful peace-keeping policy in human history. He publicly denies the plain and obvious lessons of history. The fascist regime in Tehran would not even exist were it not for the abject failures of another president in exactly the same mold, the blighted Jimmy Carter.

Einstein saw his own people murdered by the millions before beginning to understand reality well enough to sign that letter to FDR. Since that day in 1939, the United States has come to be the guarantor of peace in the world. Yes, the Soviet Union killed more German soldiers than any other combatant in World War II. But if Stalin had his druthers the USSR would have been a Nazi ally, as the Hitler-Stalin pact promised to do, to split up Poland and to allow the Nazi war machine to turn west and conquer all of Europe.

The United States came into the war not because it wanted to control the world, like Stalin's USSR, but because totalitarian aggression gave us no choice. That is the origin of Pax Americana, which has kept the peace in most of the world most of the time since 1946.

Obama doesn't believe it. He is a victim of revisionist Leftists, who deliberately twist the plain and obvious facts. So Obama is historically (and therefore morally) wrong. You can't get it right if you flip the facts.

We keep forgetting the most vital lessons of history...

Read the entire essay: http://www.americanthinker.com/2009/09/the_blessings_of_pax_americana.html

The Naif-in-Chief

New York Post editorial, 24 Sept 2009

Who wrote President Obama's speech for the start of the UN General Assembly yesterday—Rodney King? You know, the guy whose videotaped run-in with cops sparked the 1992 LA riots, leading King to ask: "Can't we all just get along?"

Today that question is used derisively, to mock naive "solutions" for social ills. But it essentially sums up Obama's 38-minute UN plea, as Washington's former UN envoy John Bolton noted.

Except that Obama is supposed to be the wise leader of the Free World.

What a truly pathetic performance. Not only because of the president's stunning cluelessness about the world's nature. But also because of his repeated insults to *America*. And his back-stabbing of Washington's top Mideast ally, Israel...

Read it all: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/editorials/the_naif_in_chief_AwM7RyxcOE1p7U0FljGogM

Prez comes across as a gullible sap

by Rich Lowry, 24 Sept 2009

President Obama yesterday did his best impression of a high-school sophomore participating in his first Model UN meeting, retailing pious clichés he learned from his pony-tailed social studies teacher. Even Woodrow Wilson might have blanched at the mushy-headed exhortations to world peace and collective action better suited to a college dorm-room bull session or a holiday-season Coca-Cola commercial...

..."For those who question the character and cause of my nation," Obama said, "I ask you to look at the concrete actions we have taken in just nine months." In other words, he's the redeemer of a nation sunk in war crimes (we condoned torture), high-handedness (we ignored the United Nations) and hypocrisy (we promoted democracy selectively) prior to the ascension of his blessed administration...

...Obama's mistake is in believing "the interests of nations and peoples are shared." They aren't. Georgia has an interest in becoming a strong nation capable of defending itself; Russia has an interest in quashing it. China has an interest in dominating all of East Asia; Japan and other neighbors have an interest in containing it. Iran has an interest in gaining a nuclear weapon; Israel—and the United States—has an interest in stopping it.

On the latter, Obama was shockingly weak, if his weakness still retained the capacity to shock...

More: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/national/prez_comes_across_as_gullible_sap_iThpnFL1g7RTYvQyCZjvQP

Democrats never seem to account for unintended consequences.

The Cost of a Presidential Cave-In

by George Will, 23 Sept 2009

...The president smote China because a single union, the United Steelworkers, asked him to. It represents rubber

workers, but only those responsible for 47 percent of U.S. tiremaking. The president's action will not create more than a negligible number of jobs, if any. It will not restore a significant number, if any, of the almost 5,200 jobs that were lost in the tire industry between 2004 and 2008. Rather, the president will create jobs in other nations (e.g., Mexico, Indonesia) that make low-end tires. They make them partly because some U.S. firms have outsourced the manufacturing of such tires to low-wage countries so the U.S. firms can make a small profit, while making high-end and higher-profit tires here in high-wage America.

The 215 percent increase in tire imports from China is largely the fault, so to speak, of lower-income Americans, many of whom will respond to the presidential increase in the cost of low-end tires by driving longer on their worn tires. How many injuries and deaths will this cause? How many jobs will it cost in tire replacement businesses, or among longshoremen who handle imports? We will find out. The costs of the president's sacrifice of the national interest to the economic illiteracy of a single labor union may also include injuries China might inflict by imposing retaliatory protectionism or reducing its purchases of U.S. government debt, purchases that enable Americans to consume more government services than they are willing to pay for...

More: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/22/AR2009092203007.html>

Pre-empting Michael Moore's film

by Walter E. Williams, 23 Sept 2009

...If one ranked countries according to whether they were closer to the capitalistic end of the spectrum or the socialistic or communistic end, then ranked countries according to per capita GDP and finally rank countries according to Freedom House's "Map of Freedom in the World," he would find a pattern that is by no means a coincidence. The people in those countries closer to the capitalist end of the economic spectrum have far greater income and enjoy greater human rights protections than those toward the socialist and communist end.

According to the London Telegraph article, Moore's film features priests who say capitalism is anti-Christian by failing to protect the poor. This is pure nonsense and revealed as such by asking, "If you're an unborn spirit, condemned by God to a life of poverty but allowed to choose the country in which to be poor, would you choose a country near the communist end of the economic spectrum or the capitalist end?"

If you chose the United States, you'd find that according to the government surveys, the typical "poor" American has cable or satellite TV, two color TVs, and a DVD player or VCR. He has air conditioning, a car, a microwave, a refrigerator, a stove, and a clothes washer and dryer, and whether he has health insurance or not, he is able to obtain medical care when needed. Try to find that in Cuba, Russia, China or North Korea. If we buy into the nonsense of Moore's priests, the world's poor people are incredibly stupid. Whether fleeing legally or illegally, their destination country is likely to be closer to capitalism than their departure country...

Complete column: <http://www.oeregister.com/articles/capitalism-film-country-2578526-system-moore>

The Internet's New Enforcer

The FCC chairman appoints himself top cop on the World Wide Web.

by Peter Suderman, 23 Sept 2009

...Unfortunately, Genachowski drew exactly the wrong lessons from his initial insight: Rather than see the Internet's growth and integration into everyday life as evidence that government intervention isn't necessary, the Web's chief regulator took the opposite view—that the Net's size and scope make government meddling a necessity. The Internet, in other words, is Too Connected to Fail...

...Genachowski talks a good game on Internet freedom and innovation, but then positions the FCC as a sort of Internet enforcer. "In the words of Tim Berners-Lee," he said, "the Internet is a 'blank canvas'—allowing anyone to contribute and to innovate without permission." That's how it should be. But the crucial question is *permission from whom?* Genachowski seems oblivious to the fact that that the regulatory regime he is promoting would implicitly require innovators to get permission for their innovations from his agency. In his words, "the FCC must be a smart cop on the beat preserving a free and open Internet."

A better analogy, however, would be to a judge and jury. Genachowski doesn't merely envision a Web bound by FCC rules, but one subject to the momentary whims of FCC commissioners. "I will propose that the FCC evaluate alleged violations of the non-discrimination principle as they arise, on a case-by-case basis." In theory, this gives the FCC more flexibility, allowing the agency to be smarter and more generous when weeding out violators. But in practice, it's likely to expand the bureaucracy's reach as it refuses to define the boundaries of its authority...

Iran and Russia put Obama to the test last week, and he blinked twice.

by Mark Helprin, 23 Sept 2009

...When Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich at least he thought he had obtained something in return for his appeasement. The new American diplomacy is nothing more than a sentimental flood of unilateral concessions—not least, after some minor Putinesque sabre rattling, to Russia. Canceling the missile deployment within NATO, which Dmitry Rogozin, the Russian ambassador to that body, characterizes as "the Americans...simply correcting their own mistake, and we are not duty bound to pay someone for putting their own mistakes right," is to grant Russia a veto over sovereign defensive measures—exactly the opposite of American resolve during the Euro Missile Crisis of 1983, the last and definitive battle of the Cold War.

Stalin tested Truman with the Berlin Blockade, and Truman held fast. Khrushchev tested Kennedy, and in the Cuban Missile Crisis Kennedy refused to blink. In 1983, Andropov took the measure of Reagan, and, defying millions in the street (who are now the Obama base), Reagan did not blink. Last week, the Iranian president and the Russian prime minister put Mr. Obama to the test, and he blinked not once but twice. The price of such infirmity has always proven immensely high, even if, as is the custom these days, the bill has yet to come.

More: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204488304574426880110463194.html>

Acorn Who?

Obama heads for the high grass.

by John Fund, 22 Sept 2009

Only one of the five television networks that interviewed President Obama for their Sunday shows bothered to ask him about Acorn, the left-wing community organizing group whose federal funding was cut off last week by an overwhelming vote in Congress...

...Mr. Obama took great pains to act as if he barely knew about Acorn. In fact, his association goes back almost 20 years. In 1991, he took time off from his law firm to run a voter-registration drive for Project Vote, an Acorn partner... He became a top trainer at Acorn's Chicago conferences. In 1995, he became Acorn's attorney, participating in a landmark case to force the state of Illinois to implement the federal Motor Voter Law. That law's loose voter registration requirements would later be exploited by Acorn employees in an effort to flood voter rolls with fake names...

In 1996, Mr. Obama filled out a questionnaire listing key supporters for his campaign for the Illinois Senate. He put Acorn first (it was not an alphabetical list). In the U.S. Senate, Mr. Obama became the leading critic of Voter ID laws, whose overturn was a top Acorn priority. In 2007, in a speech to Acorn's leaders prior to their political arm's endorsement of his presidential campaign, Mr. Obama was effusive: "I've been fighting alongside of Acorn on issues you care about my entire career. Even before I was an elected official, when I ran Project Vote in Illinois, Acorn was smack dab in the middle of it, and we appreciate your work..."

The rest: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204488304574427041636360388.html>

Michelle Obama's bizarre belt: a hose-clamp, or a suicide-vest?

Is it just me?

by Maynard, 19 Sept 2009

<http://tammybruce.com/2009/09/is-it-just-me.html>

Mr. Micheletti—not the Marxist scofflaw Zelaya—is the legitimate president of Honduras.

Moving Forward in Honduras

by Roberto Micheletti, 22 Sept 2009

My country is in an unusual position this week. Former president Manuel Zelaya has surreptitiously returned to Honduras, still claiming to be the country's legitimate leader, despite the fact that a constitutional succession took place on June 28. Amid all of the claims that are likely to be made in coming days, the former president will not mention that the people of Honduras have moved on since the events of that day or that our citizens are looking forward to free, fair and transparent elections on Nov. 29.

The international community has wrongfully condemned the events of June 28 and mistakenly labeled our country as undemocratic. I must respectfully disagree. As the true story slowly emerges, there is a growing sense that what happened

in Honduras that day was not without merit. On June 28, the Honduran Supreme Court issued an arrest warrant for Zelaya for his blatant violations of our constitution, which marked the end of his presidency. To this day, an overwhelming majority of Hondurans support the actions that ensured the respect of the rule of law in our country.

Underlying all the rhetoric about a military overthrow are facts. Simply put, coups do not leave civilians in control over the armed forces, as is the case in Honduras today. Neither do they allow the independent functioning of democratic institutions—the courts, the attorney general's office, the electoral tribunal. Nor do they maintain a respect for the separation of powers. In Honduras, the judicial, legislative and executive branches are all fully functioning and led by civilian authorities.

Coups do not allow freedom of assembly, either. They do not guarantee freedom of the press, much less a respect for human rights. In Honduras, these freedoms remain intact and vibrant. And on Nov. 29 our country plans to hold the ultimate civic exercise of any democracy: a free and open presidential election...

More: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/21/AR2009092103111.html>

The spiritual father of Barack and Hillary: Saul Alinsky

And notice their spiritual *grandfather*.

Dedication from Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals* (1971):

"Lest we forget, at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history...the first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom — Lucifer."

Much more about Alinsky, Obama, and Hillary: <http://www.crossroad.to/Quotes/communism/alinsky.htm>

(*Hat tip: R.V.*)

Taxes, Depression, and Our Current Troubles

Tariffs, rising state and federal taxes, and currency devaluation ruined the 1930s, and they could do the same today.

by *Arthur B. Laffer*, 22 Sept 2009

...The damage caused by high taxation during the Great Depression is the real lesson we should learn. A government simply cannot tax a country into prosperity. If there were one warning I'd give to all who will listen, it is that U.S. federal and state tax policies are on an economic crash trajectory today just as they were in the 1930s. Net legislated state-tax increases as a percentage of previous year tax receipts are at 3.1%, their highest level since 1991; the Bush tax cuts are set to expire in 2011; and additional taxes to pay for health-care and the proposed cap-and-trade scheme are on the horizon...

Read it all. It's crucial: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203440104574402822202944230.html>

Mr. Lomborg believes in anthropogenic global warming. But he also believes in economic realities.

Climate Change: A Perilous Path

by *Bjorn Lomborg*, 20 Sept 2009

...Research by climate economist Professor Richard Tol shows that carbon cuts big enough to keep temperature rises lower than 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit)—a target that the G-8 and many others argue is necessary—could cost a staggering 12.9% of global GDP in 2100. That is the equivalent of \$40 trillion a year. Available estimates show that the welfare loss induced by global warming will be just \$3 trillion per year by 2100. For each dollar spent on global carbon cuts, we buy two cents worth of avoided climate damage. The solution is far more costly than the problem.

A global deal based around carbon cuts is expected to include a lot of spending from rich countries to help poor nations to prepare for global warming. There is a great danger that this will actually be diverted away from saving lives that are at risk from *today's* problems. Developed countries seem set to spend much money to save few lives in the distant future, instead of combating malnutrition, malaria, or communicable diseases today. It is amoral to build a dam to avoid flooding in 100 years, when the people living beside that dam are starving today. We should be helping communities become stronger today and better able to prepare for global warming in 50 years.

Little wonder that five of the world's top economists—including three Nobel laureates—who gathered this month for the Copenhagen Consensus on Climate to evaluate policy responses to climate change found that global carbon taxes are a "very poor" option. Yet, carbon cuts have become the mantra of the political elite...

The entire column:

<http://www.forbes.com/2009/09/20/climate-change-global-warming-copenhagen-consensus-opinions-contributors-bjorn-lomborg.html>

Barack Obama is gambling with Europe's security

Telegraph editorial, 18 Sept 2009

...A prudent defence policy guards against every realistic menace, not a selection of threats. Mr Obama is behaving like an eccentric homeowner who refuses to lock his front door, but points out that a gleaming smoke detector will protect against fire. Just as the answer is to install the smoke alarm and use a latchkey, so a defensive shield should be able to counter any kind of missile, not merely those your potential adversary presently deploys...

...Will Russia allow such a resolution to pass—or will Moscow follow its usual practice and ally with China to shield Iran? If the Kremlin vetoes or dilutes a sanctions resolution, this will make a peaceful resolution of the confrontation with Iran far less likely, and shorten the odds on a war in the Middle East next year. It will also show that Mr Obama's monumental gamble has failed. The President has effectively placed the fate of a vital element of his foreign policy in the hands of the Kremlin. That is a sorry pass for a superpower to reach.

More: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/6207696/Barack-Obama-is-gambling-with-Europes-security.html>

National Endowment for the Arts renamed National Endowment for Propaganda. Stay tuned. "This is only the beginning."

by Roger Kimball, 21 Sept 2009

Andrew Breitbart is a national hero. Not only was he the impresario who brought the **exposure of ACORN** by filmmaker James O'Keefe and actress Hannah Giles to public attention, but he has just followed it up with a blistering exposé of how the White House has endeavored to use the National Endowment for the Arts as a propaganda arm for its left-wing agenda on health care, the environment, education, and "community renewal."...

...There is a German word for what we are witnessing at the NEA and elsewhere in the Obama administration's effort to push its agenda. It is *Gleichschaltung*. It means two things: first, bringing all aspects of life into conformity with a given political line. And second, as a prerequisite for realizing that goal, the obliteration or at least marginalization of all opposition.

More: <http://pajamasmedia.com/rogerkimball/2009/09/21/breaking-news-national-endowment-for-the-arts-renamed-national-endowment-for-propaganda-stay-tuned-this-is-only-the-beginning/>

"You have to work hard to make this many mistakes this fast...Barack Obama is making Jimmy Carter look like Ronald Reagan." —*Ralph Peters to Laura Ingraham, 18 Sept 2009*

The Truth That Tells a Lie

When Obama speaks about health care, he omits crucial details.

by Alex Castellanos, 21 Sept 2009

...Fact and truth are not the same thing...

...As President Obama said in his speech, the fact is that "nothing in this plan will require you or your employer to change the coverage or the doctor you have." But the truth is that millions will lose their coverage when they are dumped into a government-run health-care plan. The fact is that the president has pledged his plan won't add to the deficit. But the truth is that Americans will have to pay the near-trillion-dollar cost with higher taxes or reductions in their current care. The fact is that the words "death panel" do not appear in legislation. The truth is that government rationing of health care for seniors will have similar consequences...

More: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZTI2YmFlYmVkJGwZmQ0NTk2MjUzNzZhYTgyOTVmMTY=>

Two sets of inspiring pictures from the day that sensible Americans stood athwart Washington and yelled "Stop!"

The Day That Changed America?

Photos from the 9/12 gathering in DC.

by a friend of a friend (Hat tip: Tom L.)

http://www.standingonthedeck.com/uploads/DC_demo_090912.pdf

9/12 Protest — Washington, DC

A pictorial view.

by David P. Hayes

<http://912dc.dhwritings.com/>

These two clips are not brand-new by any means. But they provide crystal-clear proof of (1) Obama's overall agenda, and (2) what he really means when he says "health care reform."

1995 Obama bizarre, race baiting interview

posted by NakedEmperorNews1, 25 July 2009

His statements clearly support class warfare, socialism, and racial reparations.

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WIRTfKCAQno>

Obama to Jane Sturm: Hey, take a pill

posted by Radiovice, 25 June 2009

Jane asks the President if her 100 year old mother (now 105) would have gotten a pacemaker under his plan. Well now that's a tough one...that costs a lot and maybe we will have to say, just take a pill. Priceless.

"Maybe you're better off not having the surgery, but taking the painkiller."

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-dQfb8WQvo>

Carter, Pelosi Outrage Dubious

by Kevin Rennie, 20 Sept 2009

"A throwback to Hitlerian racism." A recent description of public debate in the eighth circle of polemic hell? No, that was the Rev. Jesse Jackson hurling an accusation at Democratic presidential aspirant Jimmy Carter 33 years ago. Vitriol wasn't invented this summer.

Carter incensed Jackson during his 1976 presidential campaign when the former Georgia governor declared "there's nothing wrong with ethnic purity being maintained" in a neighborhood. It was as jarring a phrase then as it is now, but Carter was in search of votes among the white ethnic urban Democratic primary voters hostile to government housing programs that brought racial integration.

Pressed to explain, Carter's venomous piety nearly ended his campaign. According to Time magazine, "Carter's face reddened with anger, and he began to sweat. Instead of softening his language, he spoke of housing policies in terms of 'black intrusion,' of 'alien groups' and of 'a diametrically opposite kind of family.'"

Carter apologized for being careless in his choice of words in time to win that year's decisive Pennsylvania primary. He went on to preside over four years of decline, to give outsiders a bad name, and to declare Americans self-indulgent and acquisitive.

Three years after accusing Israel of creating an apartheid with aspects worse than South Africa's, Carter was at it again last week...

More: <http://www.courant.com/news/opinion/editorials/hc-rennie-carter-pelosi.artsep20,0,828197.column>

The Godfather, R.I.P.

Irving Kristol, realist, humanist, institution-builder, friend.

by Myron Magnet, 18 Sept 2009

Irving Kristol, who died today at 89, was famously the godfather of neoconservatism, and he was the godfather of *City Journal*, too, having urged the Manhattan Institute's then-president Bill Hammett 20 years ago to start a magazine. Ever practical and realistic, Irving knew that it wasn't enough for conservatives to have good ideas; they also needed vehicles to communicate them. If the mainstream media—which in that pre-Internet era really had a monopoly on news and opinion—didn't want to give conservatives a platform, there was no use complaining: we'd just have to start our own publications.

Irving understood the power of ideas as well as anyone, but he also understood the power of institutions...

...His generosity, especially to young conservatives, was legendary. It was partly a matter of policy, for nurturing the talented and finding them influential jobs is the way to build a movement. But it was even more an emanation of the sweetness of his temper and the depth of his humanity. I was complaining to him about New York's plague of aggressive panhandlers back in the 1980s, and he said, "If someone is so in need that he asks me for money, who am I to determine what's driven him to it? I always give something." The reality he always had before him was the human reality.

More: <http://www.city-journal.org/2009/eon0918mm.html>

Some quotes from Irving Kristol:

"I have observed over the years that the unanticipated consequences of social action are always more important, and usually less agreeable, than the intended consequences."

"Democracy does not guarantee equality of conditions—it only guarantees equality of opportunity."

"An intellectual may be defined as a man who speaks with general authority about a subject on which he has no particular competence."

"It requires strength of character to act upon one's ideas; it requires no less strength of character to resist being seduced by them."

"After all, if you believe that no one was ever corrupted by a book, you also have to believe that no one was ever improved by a book (or a play or a movie). You have to believe, in other words, that all art is morally trivial and that, consequently, all education is morally irrelevant. No one, not even a university professor, really believes that."

"The danger facing American Jews today is not that Christians want to persecute them, but that Christians want to marry them."

Two of Mr. Kristol's best essays:

When virtue loses all her loveliness—some reflections on Capitalism and the free society (Fall 1970)

http://www.nationalaffairs.com/doclib/20080523_197002101whenvirtuelosesallherlovelinessomereflectionsoncapitalismandthefreesocietyirvingkristol.pdf

Utopianism Ancient and Modern (April 1973)

<http://www.hillsdale.edu/news/imprimis/archive/issue.asp?year=1973&month=04>

Acorn's a Creature of the CRA

by Steven Malanga, 16 Sept 2009

The Acorn scandal, in which amateur journalists posing as a prostitute and a pimp went seeking a mortgage for a house of prostitution and received advice on how to evade the law, is a fitting new chapter in the controversial history of the advocacy group.

Acorn found its way into the mortgage business through the Community Reinvestment Act, the 1977 legislation that community groups have used as a cudgel to force lenders to lower their mortgage underwriting standards in order to make more loans in low-income communities. Often the groups, after making protests under CRA, were then rewarded by banks with contracts to act as mortgage counselors in low-income areas in return for dropping their protests against the banks. In one particularly lucrative deal, 14 major banks eager to put CRA protests behind them in 1993 signed an agreement to have Acorn administer a \$55 million, 11-city lending program. It was precisely such agreements that helped turn Acorn from a network of small local groups into a national player. And Acorn hasn't been alone. A U.S. Senate subcommittee once estimated that CRA-related deals between banks and community groups have pumped nearly \$10 billion into the nonprofit sector.

Given the economic fallout from the long efforts by advocacy groups to water down mortgage lending standards, as well as the controversy surrounding Acorn's mortgage counseling methods, you would imagine that politicians in Washington would be eager to narrow the scope of the CRA and reduce the leverage that community groups wield under it. But to the contrary, Washington is actually looking to expand the CRA once again...

...As proof that Washington is a looking-glass world where basic values and logic get perverted, proponents of the new legislation claim we need more CRA to rein in the bad practices of the housing bubble, which is sort of like arguing that the cure for alcoholism is another martini...

Read it all: http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/09/16/acorns_a_creature_of_the_cra_97409.html

A brilliant 4,300-word story of the U.S. media's liberal bias, from the 1950s to *right now*.

Media Malpractice: Tom Brokaw's World Implodes

by Jeffrey Lord, 15 Sept 2009

...Americans have learned the hard way that there was and is a serious effort by some of the most powerful figures in American journalism to quite deliberately keep Americans from making "informed decisions" by denying them accurate information. By ignoring major news stories. By not reporting stories that were or are at variance with liberal politics, as if, like Mary Meyer's diary or John Edwards' affair with Rielle Hunter or Van Jones' speeches or ACORN's scandals or Mark Levin's book they simply didn't exist.

Or, if the subject was someone like a Goldwater, not simpatico with the journalist's personal political beliefs, sticking it to the target with the editor's scissors. Thus, when it came to stories like the Goldwater/Nazi story or the Goldwater/Bircher story—presto!—these false stories are, to use your term of art, "vetted" to deliberately *mis*-portray their subject..

What's particularly interesting is that the stories not reported about JFK were in the early 1960s, the effort to not report the story about President Clinton was in 1998, the story on John Edwards was hushed through the time it counted most, in the election cycle of 2008 when he was a serious presidential candidate, and the decision not to report on Van Jones was—well—two weeks ago, and ACORN but last week. Which is to say, September of 2009.

In other words, across five decades of American journalistic history, the instinct of many Old Media institutions—specifically including NBC and the *New York Times*—has been to deliberately withhold the truth. To quite deliberately use their journalism skills and tools to misrepresent those whose politics they do not favor.

Were this, say, the field of medicine, practitioners of this kind of thing would lose their license to practice, sued for and surely convicted of malpractice. As it is, the examples listed here are what might be termed "media malpractice," evidencing a clear and convincing pattern of deceit...

Read the entire piece: <http://spectator.org/archives/2009/09/15/media-malpractice-tom-brokaws>

(Hat tip: Jim D.)

The Whole Truth

Obama distorts it to his liking.

by Charles Krauthammer, 18 Sept 2009

You lie? No. Barack Obama doesn't lie. He's too subtle for that. He...well, you judge.

Herewith three examples within a single speech—the now-famous Obama-Wilson "you lie" address to Congress on health care—of Obama's relationship with truth...

Read on:

http://bostonherlad.com/news/opinion/op_ed/view/20090918the_whole_truth_obama_distorts_it_to_his_liking/srvc=news&position=also

Obama's Missile Offense

Wall Street Journal editorial, 18 Sept 2009

...President Obama promised he would win America friends where, under George W. Bush, it had antagonists. The reality is that the U.S. is working hard to create antagonists where it previously had friends...

...The White House justifies its decision by claiming to have new intelligence showing that Iran's long-range missile capabilities are not as advanced as previously believed. Instead, it intends to upgrade and deploy currently available missile interceptors that are useful mainly for intercepting short- and medium-range missiles, where, it says, Iranian capability "is developing more rapidly than previously projected."

We're all for deploying interceptors to stop Iranian missiles of every range. But the Administration's argument is difficult to credit, not least because our sources told us as early as February that the Administration was prepared to abandon those sites—which is to say, well before the allegedly new intelligence became available...

More: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204518504574418563346840666.html>

Back Door to a Public Option

Washington Times editorial, 18 Sept 2009

President Obama and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi claim that a new government health insurance option would strengthen competition and lower health care costs. If they really believe that theory, it doesn't explain why they are pushing a complete government takeover of the college-loan industry 16 years after federal tuition loans were created to compete with loans by private lenders. The student-loan power grab offers a cautionary tale that is relevant to the health care debate...

Read on: <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/sep/18/back-door-to-a-public-option/>

Afghanistan is hard all the time, but it's doable

by David Petraeus, 18 Sept 2009

...The region under my command consists of 20 countries, from Egypt in the west to Pakistan in the east, and from Kazakhstan in the north to Yemen and the waters off Somalia to the south. This region sits astride the traditional land of former empires and the pull of ancient tensions can still be felt.

It includes some 530 million people from at least 22 large ethnic groups, who speak 18 languages, and ascribe to four leading religions. The area is rich in oil and natural gas but poor in fresh water. It has countries with the highest per capita income in the world, and others in the lowest five. In 18 of the 20 states, young people between the ages of 15 and 29 constitute more than 40 per cent of the population, and economic opportunities for many are insufficient. It is the unique combination of all of the dangers and resources in the Central Command Region that make it so critical to the security of all developed nations...

More: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/guest_contributors/article6839220.ece#cid=OTC-RSS&attr=2270657

What would Joe Wilson say of Obama's auto fuel rules?

by Frank Beckmann, 18 Sept 2009

Under the new guidelines for decorum in the U.S. House, Rules Committee Chairwoman Louise Slaughter, D-N.Y., has advised members that their free speech should exclude terms like "liar" and "hypocrite" in referring to statements by President Barack Obama. So I'll refrain from using those words about the Obama administration's latest auto fuel standards...

More: <http://detnews.com/article/20090918/OPINION03/909180331/1008/opinion01/What-would-Joe-Wilson-say-of-Obama-s-auto-fuel-rules?>

Obama Admin: Cap And Trade Could Cost Families \$1,761 A Year

by Declan McCullagh, 15 Sept 2009

The Obama administration has privately concluded that a cap and trade law would cost American taxpayers up to \$200 billion a year, the equivalent of hiking personal income taxes by about 15 percent.

A previously unreleased analysis prepared by the U.S. Department of Treasury says the total in new taxes would be between \$100 billion to \$200 billion a year. At the upper end of the administration's estimate, the cost per American household would be an extra \$1,761 a year...

..."They're not telling you the cost—they're not telling you the benefit," says Horner, who wrote the *The Politically Incorrect Guide to Global Warming*. "If they don't tell you the cost, and they don't tell you the benefit, what are they telling you? They're just talking about global salvation."...

...One odd point: The document written by Jaffee includes this line: "It will raise energy prices and impose annual costs on the order of XX." The Treasury Department redacted the rest of the sentence with a thick black line...

More: http://www.cbsnews.com/blogs/2009/09/15/taking_liberties/entry5314040.shtml

So ... Now we all know this is just about Obama's race

by Neal Boortz, 16 Sept 2009

...Last year, before the election, some of us predicted that if (or when) Barack Obama became president that this would happen. We said that every time his policies met with opposition the Left would start screaming racism. So what happened when we said that this would happen? Well, you guessed it. We were called racists. You just can't imagine how surprised and shocked we were.

So here is what Jimmy Carter, Bill Moyers, Hank Johnson, much of the Washington and New York press corps, Newsweek Magazine and the brilliant thinkers on the American left would have you believe of Americans right now:

We would be more than willing to welcome cap-and-trade with open arms, even if we paid a thousand dollars or more extra every year for our energy use, if Barack Obama were only white. We would be dancing in the streets celebrating the dawning of government control of our health care if only Barack Obama were white. It would be just dandy if government bureaucrats rationed health care for our parents, as long as the president is white.

We would jump at the chance of the government owning ALL of the auto manufacturing companies—not just General Motors—if the president just didn't have dark skin. We would applaud those ACORN workers giving tax avoidance advice to a pimp and his prostitute if the workers hadn't been black. Most Americans—even ones that don't pay income taxes now—would be more than willing to give 70% of everything they earn to the federal government when asked, so long as they are asked by a white president...

The entire column: http://boortz.com/nealz_nuze/2009/09/so-now-we-all-know-this-is-jus.html

Reagan Coalition Redux

by Greg Mueller, 17 Sept 2009

...The President's announcement that he will walk back support for a defense shield in Europe for Poland and Czechoslovakia has shocked the world. Reports suggest that the President is weaning the free world's defenses to appease Russia so that they can help pressure Iran from developing nuclear weapons. I do not understand the logic—appease Russia because the administration's appeasement of Iran is not working? Is President Obama becoming Jimmy Carter on steroids? Is the President's foreign policy amounting to an Obama Appeasement Doctrine?...

More: <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=33590>

Defenseless

As ballistic threats proliferate, the Obama administration retreats on missile defense.

by Clifford D. May, 17 Sept 2009

Missile defense — as the term might suggest — is defensive, not offensive. Brilliant American scientists have developed sophisticated technologies to prevent missiles — including those armed with nuclear warheads — from reaching their intended victims. If we are willing to share this capability to protect people around the world, Sen. Jim DeMint asked, "What is controversial about that?"...

...Americans overwhelmingly favor missile defense, as poll after poll has revealed. But many don't realize that what we have deployed so far is not nearly adequate to the evolving threat. We are encouraging our enemies to invest in increasingly advanced weapons technologies in the belief that, at a time of their choosing, they will be able to overwhelm our outdated system.

American policy should be designed to elicit the opposite response: It should make clear to our enemies that resources spent on nukes and missiles will be wasted because we have both the means and the will to block them...

Read the rest: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZDdhZmE2MDNjOTdiZWYzMTk2YWEwMTE1OTU5N2NhMWQ=>

My goodness gracious! Look who's "shredding the Constitution" now.

White House collects Web users' data without notice

by Audrey Hudson, 16 Sept 2009

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/sep/16/obama-wh-collects-web-users-data/>

The Liberals' Breakdown

by Peter Wehner, 16 Sept 2009

...They see support for Obama's effort to nationalize our health-care system collapsing. They see the American people rising up against his brand of liberalism. They see Republicans with all the intensity on their side. They see GOP candidates leading in the New Jersey and Virginia gubernatorial races. They see the popularity of their majority leader, Harry Reid, cratering. They see the Republican party drawing almost even with Democrats on issues like health care—and surging ahead of Democrats on many other issues. They see a dangerous loss of support for Obama among independents and the elderly...

...Many liberals simply cannot process this new data, this horrible turn of events. What we are seeing is the equivalent of a computer crash. As a result, they are returning to what has become for some liberals an emotional and psychological norm: anger and fury, overheated and reckless charges, bitterness and pettiness. It is embodied in people like Frank Rich and Keith Olbermann and Joe Klein, but some version of this affliction extends to many others.

We're only eight months into the Age of Obama—the period in which he promised to unite our divided country, heal our wounds, and bind up our divisions—and Obama's critics are now routinely labeled as unpatriotic, racists, liars, mobsters, evil mongers, practitioners of un-American tactics, and more. As Obama's failures mount up, it will only get worse. The volume will only get louder. And the charges will only get more desperate and incendiary...

Read the rest: <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/wehner/95992>

Sadly, the morally vacuous Eric Holder would never, *ever* institute anything like this.

We Need a New Legal Regime to Fight the War on Terror

An Open Letter to the Attorney General.

by Judea Pearl, 12 Sept 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203440104574400560752229956.html>

CIA liar and turncoat Paul Pillar remains obstinately clueless

From his 16 Sept 2009 WaPo column: "Most American discourse about Vietnam in the early and mid-1960s took for granted the key—and flawed—assumptions underlying the whole effort: that a loss of Vietnam would mean that other Asian countries would fall like dominoes to communism, and that a retreat from the commitment to Vietnam would gravely harm U.S. credibility."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/09/15/AR2009091502977.html?sub=AR>

Pol Pot? Tehran hostages? Grenada? Kuwait? 9/11?

Background on Paul Pillar:

<http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110007981>

<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-pletka21feb21,0,2183736.story?coll=la-news-comment-opinions>

Chaos for Glory: My Time With ACORN

by James O'Keefe, 10 Sept 2009

A famous community organizer once said, "The only way to upset the power structure in your communities is to goad them, confuse them, irritate them and, most of all, make them live by their own rules. If you make them live by their own rules, you destroy them." Impossible demands can irritate modern leftists in ways nothing else can, whether it's by **banning Lucky Charms cereal** because it's racist against Irish people, **calling Planned Parenthood** saying you want to donate money for black abortions in the name of Margaret Sanger, or making Sen. Snowe **sign an oversized bailout check** for a billion dollars to Amtrak, in her own office.

The scenario we posed the ACORN Housing employees in Baltimore is due to the application of similar power tactics. We gave ACORN a taste of its own medicine. ACORN was alleged to be thug-like, criminal, and nefarious. This criminal behavior was evidenced by a **video of Baltimore ACORN community organizers** breaking the locks on foreclosed homes. Instead of railing against their radicalism, it is best to *bring out* this type of radicalism. Hannah Giles and I took advantage of ACORN's regard for thug criminality by posing the most ridiculous criminal scenario we could think of and

seeing if they would comply—which they did without hesitation...

More, including the housing videos: <http://biggovernment.com/2009/09/10/chaos-for-glory/>

(Hat tip: GP)

Technocracy in America

Obama neglects the real 'public option': listening to the public.

by *Matthew Continetti*, 14 Sept 2009 (Sept. 21 issue)

The partisan and misleading speech that President Obama delivered to a joint session of Congress last week revealed the president's preferences—more government mandates, regulations, and taxes—when it comes to refashioning the American health care system. It also showcased the contempt for debate and smug sense of moral and intellectual superiority that is now as much a part of contemporary liberalism as sympathy with the nuclear freeze movement and the RainbowPUSH coalition was two decades ago.

The way the president expresses his disdain is telling. He assumes that, given the facts, any rational person would reach policy conclusions identical to his. "I have no doubt," he said, "that these reforms would greatly benefit Americans from all walks of life, as well as the economy as a whole." If only everybody had read Atul Gawande's June *New Yorker* article on McAllen, Texas, the president believes, then there would have been none of those rowdy town halls.

So why has the White House already missed its self-imposed deadline for reform? Why do more Americans disapprove than approve of the president's approach to health care? Why did Obama's approval rating drop steadily—among independents, precipitously—throughout the summer? The answer, he said, is "all the misinformation that's been spread over the past few months." There is no legitimate basis for opposition. There are only lies. . . .

Read on: <http://weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/940lrbrri.asp>

Let the Moonbat Special / shine a light on me...

Moonbat Special

"If Obama can't defeat the Republican headbangers, our planet is doomed"

by *Jonathan Freedland*, 15 Sept 2009

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/sep/15/obama-healthcare-climate-change-copenhagen>

Why Europe Needs Star Wars

Obama's bid to scale back Eastern European missile defense systems is meant to ease tensions with Russia while protecting against Iranian aggression—but in fact it just threatens regional security.

by *Wess Mitchell and Jamie Fly*, 9 Sept 2009

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/09/09/why_europe_needs_star_wars?page=full

Bam vs. Democracy

by *Ralph Peters*, 7 Sept 2009

Why was former president Zelaya driven from his would-be throne in Tegucigalpa? He tried to subvert Honduras' Constitution and set himself up as president-for-life. In June, the *elected* legislators and the Honduran Supreme Court had enough. As Zelaya aligned with Chavez, the Castro regime, Nicaraguan *caudillo* Daniel Ortega and other extreme leftists, the Honduran government gave the would-be dictator the boot. Acting under *legal orders*, the army peacefully arrested Zelaya and shipped him out of the country. No murders, no Chavez-style imprisonments.

It was *not* a military coup. An elected congress and interim president, not a general, run the country today. But the Obama administration has decided that this "violation" is so dreadful that we won't even recognize *future* free elections in Honduras.

Well, President Obama's taste in elections is finicky. He'll recognize the utterly bogus results of Afghanistan's corrupt election. He initially blessed the results of Iran's rigged election (he was for it before he was against it). He hasn't spoken one word of criticism as Chavez continues to strangle Venezuelan democracy. He hasn't questioned the divisive, racist

politics of *Presidente* Evo Morales in Bolivia. He hasn't demanded free elections in Cuba—instead, he's easing up on the Castro regime.

But we're going to show those wicked Hondurans, by George! *They* can't boot out a crazy leftwing president just because he's trying to subvert their Constitution. Honduras is a small country. But the principle and precedent loom hugely. Have we abandoned democracy entirely? In favor of backing anti-American dictators?...

...If Obama thinks that handing over a "little" country he couldn't find on a map is going to win him enduring applause and cooperative friends in Latin America, he's crazy. What he's actually doing is frightening our friends. If democratic governments south of the border can't rely on US support, to whom can they turn?...

Read the rest: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/bam_vs_democracy_B8FEjdY8zredDCIOpNIIJP

Fables for Adults

by Thomas Sowell, 15 Sept 2009

Many years ago, as a small child, I was told one of those old-fashioned fables for children. It was about a dog with a bone in his mouth, who was walking on a log across a stream.

The dog looked down into the water and saw his reflection. He thought it was another dog with a bone in his mouth—and it seemed to him that the other dog's bone was bigger than his. He decided that he was going to take the other dog's bone away and opened his mouth to attack. The result was that his own bone fell into the water and was lost.

At the time, I didn't like that story and wished they hadn't told it to me. But the passing years and decades have made me realize how important that story was, because it was not really about dogs but about people.

Today we are living in a time when the President of the United States is telling us that he is going to help us take that other dog's bone away—and the end result is likely to be very much like what it was in that children's fable.

Whether we are supposed to take that bone away from the doctors, the hospitals, the pharmaceutical companies or the insurance companies, the net result is likely to be the same—most of us will end up with worse medical care than we have available today. We will have opened our mouth and dropped a very big bone into the water...

Continue: <http://www.creators.com/opinion/thomas-sowell/fables-for-adults.html>

Listening to a Liar: Part II

by Thomas Sowell, 12 Sept 2009

...Even those who can believe that Obama can conjure up the money through eliminating "waste, fraud and abuse" should ask themselves where he is going to conjure up the additional doctors, nurses, and hospitals needed to take care of millions more patients.

If he can't pull off that miracle, then government-run medical care in the United States can be expected to produce what government-run medical care in Canada, Britain, and other countries has produced—delays of weeks or months to get many treatments, not to mention arbitrary rationing decisions by bureaucrats. Obama can deny it in words but what matters are deeds—and no one's words have been more repeatedly the direct opposite of his deeds...

...One of the secrets of being a glib talker is not getting hung up over whether what you are saying is true, and instead giving your full attention to what is required by the audience and the circumstances of the moment, without letting facts get in your way and cramp your style. Obama has mastered that art.

Con men understand that their job is not to use facts to convince skeptics but to use words to help the gullible to believe what they want to believe. No message has been more welcomed by the gullible, in countries around the world, than the promise of something for nothing. That is the core of Barack Obama's medical care plan...

More: <http://www.creators.com/opinion/thomas-sowell/listening-to-a-liar-part-ii.html>

Campaign laws and free speech

Denver Post, 14 Sept 2009

...So could the Federal Election Commission ban political books? The answer, incredibly enough, is yes.

When Justice Anthony Kennedy asked Deputy Solicitor General Malcolm Stewart earlier this year whether an electronic book could be banned in the run-up to an election, he responded, "...a corporation could be barred from using its general treasury funds to publish the book and could be required to use Political Action Committee funds to publish the

book." The government backed off this position at a hearing last week, but the damage had been done.

Most Americans react in disgust to the idea of "banning a book." But why should it be any more acceptable for the FEC to ban a movie on the grounds that it has a political message? Why should the FEC even decide what constitutes a political message? Yes, *Hillary The Movie* amounted to transparent political electioneering, but quite often messaging can be subtle. Where does this kind of regulation end?...

Read the rest: http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci_13330050

Saving A Million Jobs at \$787,000 Per Job

by Bill Frezza, 14 Sept 2009

The White House Council of Economic Advisers said Thursday the \$787 billion stimulus plan kept one million people working who would otherwise not have had jobs.

You wouldn't let me stand up and make the simplistic claim that these million jobs were saved at a cost of \$787,000 per job without challenging the details of my accounting, would you? Surely, reality is more complex.

But when the White House Council of Economic Advisers calculated the number of jobs saved by our government's massive stimulus spending, how is it that they entirely neglected to account for the impact on employment of removing \$787 billion dollars from the balance sheet of the private economy?

What kind of single-entry bookkeeping is this? Who are these experts so willing to make glib claims with a straight face? How is it that the press, politicians, and pundits credulously report these claims as facts? And why are those who question whether the emperor is wearing any clothes treated like obstructionist members of some lunatic fringe?

There are those who passionately promote the theory that the government can, on net, create jobs by taking money from one set of citizens and handing it to another. Does this make sense to you? Are these promoters easily fooled, willfully blind, or cunningly smart? Let's take a look under the covers and examine the source of this week's claim...

Read on: http://www.realeclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/09/14/saving_one_million_jobs_at_787000_per_job_97404.html

Everyone on the Right knows that ACORN is the nastiest, most corrupt community-organizing group in America, and that it receives millions of dollars of **taxpayer money** each and every year. But now these Reds are getting caught red-handed. The general public, and even Congress, will have to take notice.

Census Bureau severs ties with ACORN in 2010 count

by Hope Yen, 11 Sept 2009

http://www.breitbart.com/article.php?id=D9ALCUJO0&show_article=1

ACORN fires more officials for helping 'pimp,' 'prostitute' in Washington office

11 Sept 2009

Includes video: <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,549241,00.html>

'Pimp & hooker' catch B'klyn staff

by Jeremy Olshan, 14 Sept 2009

Includes video: http://www.nypost.com/p/news/local/brooklyn/pimp_hooker_catch_staff Js4YPEcsCcxLZhAEehLhmL

Republican Lawmakers Turn Up the Heat on ACORN

A growing number of Republican lawmakers are calling for congressional hearings and IRS audits of ACORN following the release of three videotapes showing employees at the community organization assisting a purported "pimp" and "prostitute" in obtaining housing.

by Joshua Rhett Miller, 14 Sept 2009

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/09/14/lawmakers-continue-probes-acorn/>

House GOP demands cutoff of ACORN, Senate GOP demand probe

by Ed Morrissey, 15 Sept 2009

<http://hotair.com/archives/2009/09/15/house-gop-demands-cutoff-of-acorn-senate-gop-demand-probe/>

(Hat tip: Jim D.)

One Single-Payer System

by Misterdregs, 25 July 2009

Video: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQ_tAe87ELo

(Hat tips: Bob B. and Scott A.)

American politics stands at an unusual crossroads

by Walter Russell Mead, 13 Sept 2009

...There is, I think, a cold dark fact at the heart of this that means trouble for incumbents of all kinds, but especially for Democrats. The fact is that the liberal society we've built since the New Deal looks less and less capable of honoring its promises. It's not just Medicare and Social Security; there are a lot of state governments out there that have no way of paying for all the pensions they've promised their workers over the years—and no way to pay for all the services they've promised the voters.

Private sector labor unions seem to drive jobs overseas or to saddle their employers with unpayable costs. Public sector unions drive state and local governments into fiscal dead ends as well. People look at public schools and the postal system and they don't see much sign that the old institutions work very well. (I'm not saying this is all 100% true—only that it looks that way to a lot of people.)...

...It's not just the money and it's not just liberals who need to worry. As the promises of the liberal society look increasingly shaky, the experts and the professionals and the think tanks seem less and less worthy of respect...

More: http://www.politico.com/arena/perm/Walter_Russell_Mead_8D536F17-871A-489C-B55A-373C265B879A.html

Inside the 9/12 protest

by Byron York, 13 Sept 2009

...Some people were animated by a single issue—health care, taxes, the Second Amendment. But in dozens of interviews with marchers, the picture that emerged was of people who believe things are racing out of control along a whole range of fronts in Washington, and that no one is representing their interests. Obama and the Democrats in Congress, they believe, are simply pushing too hard on too many things. It's unlikely that there would have been a rally this size just about the stimulus, or just about cap-and-trade, or just about the takeovers of the auto companies, or even health care. But put them all together, and there is an enormous and growing fear that Obama and his allies are rushing to wreck the system.

So the protesters spent their own money and caught buses and came to Washington. And made their own signs. There were SILENT NO MORE banners. There was DON'T TAX ME, BRO! and WE NEEDED PROBLEM SOLVERS—WE GOT POWER GRABBERS and NO THANKS, I ALREADY HAVE A MESSIAH and perhaps the favorite, GRANDMA'S NOT SHOVEL-READY.

Some of the protesters had traveled farther than just the distance between their home town and Washington. Dr. David Levine, a psychiatrist from Rockford, Illinois, was Ramsey Clark's volunteer press secretary when the ultra-liberal former U.S. attorney general ran for the Senate from New York in 1976. Now, Levine, wearing a faded NEWT GINGRICH 2008 t-shirt, was on the streets of Washington in a crowd of conservatives. What accounted for the change? "It started when liberals just stopped making sense to me," Levine said. "I was listening to NPR, and nothing was making sense. So I started reading more and more conservative things, and here I am."...

More, including photos: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/Inside-the-912-Tea-Party-protest-59181917.html#>

Where Are the Condemnations of Abortion Protester James Pouillon's Murder?

by Jeffrey Weiss, 12 Sept 2009

<http://www.politicsdaily.com/2009/09/12/where-are-the-condemnations-of-abortion-protester-james-pouillon/>

(Hat tip: Tom L.)

Arab Festival 2009: Sharia in the US

This is a video of Nabeel Qureshi and David Wood asking questions at Arabfest, Dearborn. The date is June 21st, 2009. There was a booth at the festival which had a banner titled "Islam: Got Questions? Get Answers." From their table, we picked up a pamphlet claiming that Islam promotes peace. We noticed that it was full of poor logic and errors, so we decided to make a video refuting it. We went to the booth that gave us the pamphlet to give them the opportunity to defend their claims. Security, however, stepped in and forced us to turn off our camera.

We left the booth, received advice from police, and found out that the actions of the security guards were illegal. We went back to the booth to record a potential answer again. Realizing that the Muslims present had no answer, we left.

When we came outside, we were asked some questions by two young men, who had been sent by security to entrap us. While we responded to them, festival security started assaulting us, as you will see in this video. The conclusion of this video is a mob of festival security attacking our cameras, pushing us back, kicking our legs, and lying to the police.

We ask you, is it a coincidence that the city with the highest percentage of Muslims in the United States is the city where Christianity is not allowed to be represented (let alone preached) on a public sidewalk? Is it coincidence that in this city, people will say "No way!" when we say "This is the United States of America"?

Is this what will happen when Islam takes over the United States?

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fEPod-hxD7g>

(Hat tip: CrashKC)

Just published: a new book by the author of the 1987 classic *Cultural Literacy*.

The Making of Americans: Democracy and Our Schools.

by E.D. Hirsch

...Education professors eagerly joined New Left professors to promote the idea that any top-down imposition of any curriculum would be a right-wing plot designed to perpetuate the dominant white, male, bourgeois power structure...

More: http://www.amazon.com/Making-Americans-Democracy-Our-Schools/dp/0300152817/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1251596204&sr=1-1

Mainstream/liberal myths debunked in 20 delightful pages. Recommended by Walter E. Williams.

Great Myths of the Great Depression

by Lawrence W. Reed (1998 with significant additions in 2005 and 2008)

<http://www.gmu.edu/departments/economics/wew/articles/09/GreatMythsOfTheGreatDepression.pdf>

Fact-Checking the President on Health Insurance

His tales of abuse don't stand scrutiny.

by Scott Harrington, 14 Sept 2009

...To highlight abusive practices, Mr. Obama referred to an Illinois man who "lost his coverage in the middle of chemotherapy because his insurer found he hadn't reported gallstones that he didn't even know about." The president continued: "They delayed his treatment, and he died because of it."

Although the president has used this example previously, his conclusion is contradicted by the transcript of a June 16 hearing on industry practices before the Subcommittee of Oversight and Investigation of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce. The deceased's sister testified that the insurer reinstated her brother's coverage following intervention by the Illinois Attorney General's Office. She testified that her brother received a prescribed stem-cell transplant within the desired three- to four-week "window of opportunity" from "one of the most renowned doctors in the whole world on the specific routine," that the procedure "was extremely successful," and that "it extended his life nearly three and a half years."...

More whoppers: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203440104574409501904118682.html>

Where Politics Don't Belong

by Tyler Cowen, 13 Sept 2009

For years now, many businesses and individuals in the United States have been relying on the power of government, rather than competition in the marketplace, to increase their wealth. This is politicization of the economy. It made the financial crisis much worse, and the trend is accelerating.

Well before the financial crisis erupted, policy makers treated homeowners as a protected political class and gave mortgage-backed securities privileged regulatory treatment. Furthermore, they allowed and encouraged high leverage and the expectation of bailouts for creditors, which had been practiced numerous times, including the precedent of Long-Term Capital Management in 1998. Without these mistakes, the economy would not have been so invested in leverage and real estate and the financial crisis would have been much milder.

But we are now injecting politics ever more deeply into the American economy, whether it be in finance or in sectors like health care. Not only have we failed to learn from our mistakes, but also we're repeating them on an ever-larger scale...

Continue: <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/13/business/economy/13econ.html?ref=business>

Obama Won't Surrender In His War of Choice

He'll get some form of health care plan rammed through because it's key to permanently shifting America left.

by Mark Steyn, 11 Sept 2009

...The minute a first-world country has "free" health care, it becomes the provider of choice to anyone who can get there, particularly for any long-term ailments requiring state-of-the-art medications. In 2004, Britain's Health Protection Agency revealed that 44 percent of HIV patients being treated by the National Health Service were not residents of the United Kingdom at all but from southern Africa. In essence, a huge number of AIDS patients in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, Swaziland and Lesotho have decided to outsource their health care needs to British taxpayers. Similar trends will manifest themselves here in nothing flat.

But, for the sake of argument, let us concede the president's current number of 30 million uninsured. In order to do something for the 10 percent of the population outside the current system, why is it necessary to destabilize the arrangements of the 90 percent within it?

Well, says the president, not so fast. Lots of people with insurance run into problems when they change jobs or move to another state. OK, In that case, why not ease the obstacles to health care portability?

Well, says the president, shuffling his cups and moving the pea under another shell, we're spending too much on health care. By "we're," he means you and you and you and you and millions of other Americans making individual choices over which he casually claims collective jurisdiction.

And that, ultimately, gets closer than anything else he says to giving the game away... Governmentalization of health care is the fastest way to a permanent left-of-center political culture... Listen to your average British Tory or French Gaullist on the campaign trail, pledging to "deliver" government services more "efficiently."...

...What do all these Obama associates have in common? I mean, aside from the fact that Glenn Beck played a key role in exposing them. We are assured by the airbrushing media and "moderate" conservatives that Beck is crazy, a frothing spokesnut for the lunatic fringe. By contrast, Van Jones, Yosi Sergant and ACORN are all members of the lunatic mainstream, embedded philosophically and actually in the heart of Obamaland...

More: <http://www.oeregister.com/articles/health-obama-government-2562126-care-president>

The unbiased London Daily Mail estimated the crowd in the millions.

Naturally, the New York Times and the Washington Post called it "tens of thousands."



Up to two million march to U.S. Capitol to protest against Obama's spending in 'tea-party' demonstration

Daily Mail, 12 Sept 2009

Up to two million people marched to the U.S. Capitol today, carrying signs with slogans such as "Obamacare makes me sick" as they protested the president's health care plan and what they say is out-of-control spending. The line of protesters spread across Pennsylvania Avenue for blocks, all the way to the capitol, according to the Washington Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency. People were chanting "enough, enough" and "We the People." Others yelled "You lie, you lie!" and "Pelosi has to go," referring to California congresswoman Nancy Pelosi...

Much more: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1213056/Up-million-march-US-Capitol-protest-Obamas-spending-tea-party-demonstration.html#>



A stunning array of FACTS that prove U.S. health care is the best in the world.

An Unnecessary Operation

Obamacare threatens what's right with American health care.

by Fred Barnes, 12 Sept 2009 (Sept 21 issue)

<http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/943pfdxe.asp?pg=1>

(Hat tip: Jim D.)

Yale & the Danish cartoons

On the shameful censorship at Yale University Press.

by Roger Kimball and Hilton Kramer, Sept 2009 issue

...Yale's embrace of the new iconoclasm raises other questions. The YUP is one of the biggest producers of art catalogues for the museum world. What happens when some enterprising young curator puts together an exhibition of the work of Gustave Doré? Will he be told that he cannot include that work depicting Mohammed in Hell? What happens when someone wants to do a catalogue raisonné of the work of Salvador Dalí? Will his image of Mohammed be omitted? Ditto on William Blake, Botticelli, Giovanni da Modena, and Rodin, all of whom illustrated that passage from Dante. The Koran forbids any depiction of Mohammed, so what about that bas-relief at the U.S. Supreme Court by Adolph Weinman depicting Mohammed holding a sword? Tricky, isn't it? But those are questions for another day. The proximate question is: who got the censorship ball rolling at Yale?...

Read it all: <http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/Yale—the-Danish-cartoons-4180>

The Keynesians Were Wrong Again

by Peter Ferrara, 11 Sept 2009

...The Obama administration is claiming success, not because of recovery, but because of the slowdown in economic decline...

...The fallacies of Keynesian economics were exposed decades ago by Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman. Keynesian thinking was then discredited in practice in the 1970s, when the Keynesians could neither explain nor cure the double-digit inflation, interest rates, and unemployment that resulted from their policies. Ronald Reagan's decision to dump Keynesianism in favor of supply-side policies—which emphasize incentives for investment—produced a 25-year economic boom. That boom ended as the Bush administration abandoned every component of Reaganomics one by one, culminating in Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson's throwback Keynesian stimulus in early 2008.

Mr. Obama showed up in early 2009 with the dismissive certitude that none of this history ever happened, and suddenly national economic policy was back in the 1930s. Instead of the change voters thought they were getting, Mr. Obama quintupled down on Mr. Bush's 2008 Keynesianism.

The result is the continuation of the economic policy disaster we have suffered since the end of 2007. Mr. Obama promised that his stimulus would prevent unemployment from climbing over 8%. It jumped to 9.7% last month...

...Rejecting Keynesianism in favor of fiscal restraint, France and Germany saw economic growth return in the second quarter this year. India, Brazil and even communist China are enjoying growth as well. Canada enjoyed job growth last month.

U.S. economic recovery and a permanent reduction in unemployment will only come from private, job-creating investment... Producing long-term economic growth will require a fundamental change in economic policies—lower, not higher, tax rates; reliable, low-cost energy supplies, not higher energy costs through cap and trade; and not unreliable alternative energy surviving only on costly taxpayer subsidies.

Unfortunately, Mr. Obama seems to be wedded to his political talking points, and his ideological blinders seem to be permanently affixed. So don't expect any policy changes. Expect an eventual return to 1970s-style economic results instead.

Full column: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203440104574400580004827114.html>

Obama's Health Care Plan: Put Up And Shut Up

by Shikha Dalmia, 10 Sept 2009

...Perhaps the most striking—and disturbing—thing about the speech was the unblinking confidence Obama exuded while breaking key campaign promises he made to voters...

...It gets worse. In exchange for these bitter tax pills, Obama promised Americans would get eternal health care "security and stability." To deliver that, he would of course ban insurance companies from denying coverage to those with pre-existing conditions—tantamount to forcing fire insurance companies to write coverage on a burning building. He would also prohibit insurers from putting any limits on the coverage they offer and cap what they can require patients to pay out-

of-pocket.

In other words, Obama would encourage unlimited health care consumption by patients while eliminating the last vestige of price consciousness. But the reason America is facing unsustainable health care cost increases is precisely because its third-party system of insurance doesn't encourage prudent consumption by patients. Indeed, if Obama really can tame health care costs by making patients even less cost-conscious, I have an even better idea for him: Simply pass a law banning anyone from falling sick and mandate good health for all. If he can suspend the laws of economics, perhaps he can also transcend the laws of physiology.

The fact of the matter is that not too many health care underwriters will survive such crippling mandates. Many of them will fold, causing further consolidation in the insurance marketplace—not more competition and choice...

The rest: <http://www.forbes.com/2009/09/10/health-care-speech-obama-economics-opinions-columnists-shikha-dalmia.html>

Thomas Friedman is a Liberal Fascist

by Jonah Goldberg, 9 Sept 2009

...Thomas Friedman writes:

"Watching both the health care and climate/energy debates in Congress, it is hard not to draw the following conclusion: There is only one thing worse than one-party autocracy, and that is one-party democracy, which is what we have in America today.

"One-party autocracy certainly has its drawbacks. But when it is led by a reasonably enlightened group of people, as China is today, it can also have great advantages. That one party can just impose the politically difficult but critically important policies needed to move a society forward in the 21st century...Our one-party democracy is worse...."

So there you have it. If only America could drop its inefficient and antiquated system, designed in the age before globalization and modernity and, most damning of all, before the lantern of Thomas Friedman's intellect illuminated the land. If only enlightened experts could do the hard and necessary things that the new age requires, if only we could rely on these planners to set the ship of state right. Now, of course, there are "drawbacks" to such a system: crushing of dissidents with tanks, state control of reproduction, government control of the press and the internet. Omelets and broken eggs, as they say. More to the point, Friedman insists, these "drawbacks" pale in comparison to the system we have today here in America. I cannot begin to tell you how this is *exactly* the argument that was made by American fans of Mussolini in the 1920s...

More: <http://corner.nationalreview.com/post/?q=ZDcxZDkzN2EyNDQwYTQzNWNjNjdiZWNiZTlzYTcwOTA=>

Health Cost Crisis

by John R. Graham, 11 Sept 2009

...Data on how we spend our money reveal that rising health-care costs are far from ruining our personal finances.

Non-health-care personal consumption spending has increased faster than personal consumption spending on health care in recent years. Between 1995 and 2008, per-person spending on health goods and services increased from \$4,601 to \$5,716 in 2005 dollars—a 23 percent jump. But during the same period, spending on non-health-care goods and services increased from \$18,745 to \$24,886—a 33 percent jump.

What's that mean? For one, Americans have gained a great deal of purchasing power. Consumption of non-health goods and services grew more than \$6,000 per person and about \$16,000 per household during that 13-year period.

In addition, about 85 percent of every American's increase in personal consumption went to something other than health care. Our spending on movies, travel, and other consumer goods grew even faster than the supposedly debilitating increase in health costs.

Put another way, the innovation and competition that have brought lower prices, greater choice, and better quality outside the health-care system have made it easier for us to bear increasing health care costs.

Americans are also coping with rising health costs much better than people in countries with government-dominated health care systems. In 2005, U.S. per-capita GDP was about \$5,000 higher than in Canada or Great Britain and about \$8,000 higher than in Germany or France—even after subtracting health spending.

Would-be health reformers in this country have painted an alternative narrative, of families trying to decide whether to go to the doctor or pay rent. It's a powerful image, but it's ignorant of the facts...

Continue: <http://detnews.com/article/20090911/OPINION01/909110317/1008/OPINION01/Health-cost-crisis>

An Obama Speech In 13 Easy Steps

by Rich Lowry, 11 Sept 2009

- 1) Create a false center..
- 2) Scorn ideology...
- 3) Talk about your openness to ideas from opponents...
- 4) Embrace empty symbolic measures as a show of reasonableness...
- 5) Make lawyerly distinctions too subtle for most people to notice...

Details of these five, plus the other eight steps:

<http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0909/lowry091109.php3>



A thousand words, and counting.

Understanding Poverty in America

What the Census Bureau *doesn't* count when reporting on the "poor."

by Robert Rector, 10 Sept 2009

...Nearly 40 percent of all poor households actually own their own homes. On average, this is a three-bedroom house with one-and-a-half baths, a garage, and a porch or patio. Eighty-four percent of poor households have air conditioning. By contrast, in 1970, only 36 percent of the entire U.S. population enjoyed air conditioning. Nearly two-thirds of the poor have cable or satellite TV. Only 6 percent of poor households are overcrowded; two-thirds have more than two rooms per person.

The typical poor American has as much or more living space than the average individual living in most European countries. (These comparisons are to the average citizens in foreign countries, not to those classified as poor.)

Nearly three-quarters of poor households own a car; 31 percent own two or more cars. Ninety-eight percent of poor households have a color television; two-thirds own two or more color televisions. Eighty-two percent own microwave ovens; 67 percent have a DVD player; 73 percent have a VCR; 47 percent have a computer.

The average intake of protein, vitamins, and minerals by poor children is indistinguishable from that of children in the upper middle class. Poor boys today at ages 18 and 19 are actually taller and heavier than middle-class boys of similar age were in the late 1950s. They are a full inch taller and ten pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy during World War II.

Conventional accounts of poverty not only exaggerate hardship, they also underestimate government spending on the poor... Census counts only around 4 percent of total welfare spending as "income." Because of this, government spending

on the poor can expand almost infinitely without having any detectable impact on official poverty or inequality.

Also missing in most Washington discussions about the poor is an acknowledgement of the behavioral causes of official poverty...When the War on Poverty began, 7 percent of American children were born outside marriage; today the number is 39 percent...Before we further expand the welfare state and pile even greater indebtedness on our children, we need a more honest assessment of current anti-poverty spending and the actual living conditions of the "poor."

Read it all: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NjJiMDE5Y2M1OWNmNDFhMDIwNWMyYTA1Mzk5ZDkxMTk=>

A fascinating explanation of past and present—both in America and elsewhere—in 5,400 flowing words.

Capitalism After the Crisis

by Luigi Zingales, 8 Sept 2009 (Fall issue)

...Unlike in Europe — where the most vibrant opposition to the excesses of business came from socialist anti-market movements — in the United States this opposition was squarely pro-market. When Louis Brandeis attacked the money trust, he was not fundamentally trying to interfere with markets — only trying to make them work better. As a result, Americans have long understood that the interests of the market and the interests of business may not always be aligned...

... For all these reasons, the United States developed a system of capitalism that comes closer than any other to the ideal combination of economic freedom and open competition. The image many Americans have of capitalism is therefore that of Horatio Alger's rags-to-riches-via-hard-work stories, which have come to define the American Dream. By contrast, in most of the rest of the world, Horatio Alger is unknown — and the image of social mobility is dominated by Cinderella or Evita stories: fantasies more than plausible dreams. This understanding of opportunity has helped make capitalism popular and secure in the United States.

But because the free-market system relies on this public support, and this support depends to a certain extent on the public's impression that the system is fair, any erosion of that impression threatens the system itself. Such erosion occurs when government connections, or the power of entrenched incumbents in the market, seem to overtake genuine free and fair competition as the paths to wealth and success. Both government and big business have strong incentives to push the system in this direction, and therefore both, if left unchecked, pose a threat to America's distinctive form of capitalism.

Although the United States has the great advantage of having started from a superior model of capitalism and having developed an ideology to support it, our system is still vulnerable to these pressures — and not only in a crisis. Even the most persuasive and resilient ideology cannot long outlive the conditions and reasoning that generated it. American capitalism needs vocal defenders who understand the threats it faces — and who can make its case to the public. But in the last 30 years, as the threat of global communism has waned and disappeared, capitalism's defenders have grown fewer, while the temptations of corporatism have grown greater...

Entire article: <http://nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/capitalism-after-the-crisis>

The best item-by-item debunking I have read.

Obama's Speech: Did It Help Him?

by John Hinderaker, 9 Sept 2009

...But wait! If we can identify hundreds of billions of dollars in waste and fraud in Medicare and Medicaid and we know how to eliminate it, why haven't we done so already? Why don't we do so—right now!—regardless of the administration's highly controversial health care bill?

There is no possible answer to these questions. The Obama plan—whatever it is, once reduced to writing—depends for *most of its financing* on the bare assertion that we are currently wasting hundreds of billions of dollars, and that we will stop wasting that money only if taxpayers knuckle under to Obamacare.

This was not, to put it kindly, a speech that was directed at thinking people.

Read the rest: <http://www.powerlineblog.com/archives/2009/09/024478.php>

(Hat tip: Tom L.)

A Telling but Not Moving Speech

by Yuval Levin, 10 Sept 2009

Last night was a very strange evening of political theater...Obama did not seem to be advancing a very detailed plan, but rather championing some vague generalities. And when you line these generalities up, they form a very peculiar and

implausible picture. It will cost \$900 billion, involve no tax increases for the middle class and no Medicare benefit cuts for the elderly, but not add a dime to the deficit. The basic prerequisites for risk-based insurance will be rendered illegal, but the public is assured that insurance arrangements need not change—or rather that they will only improve.

To try to sneak these glaring contradictions past his listeners, the president engaged in some familiar misdirection. He said the government would not force people to lose their existing insurance. But the question of displacement is not about force: employers currently provide insurance not because they are forced to do so (they are not) but because a combination of policy and labor market pressures lead them to choose to do so. Change those pressures and coverage arrangements will change for millions.

He insisted that "no federal dollars will be used to fund abortions," but those dollars would be used to fund insurance that would pay for abortion, and new rules would require more insurers to pay for it. He insisted the public plan would not be subsidized by the public (though he then compared it to public universities, which are subsidized by the public). But the problem with that plan is that it would have regulatory advantages and negotiating power that would allow it to price private insurers out of the market, not that it would be directly subsidized in ways its competitors were not. To pass off this misdirection (not to say dishonesty), he accused his opponents of dishonesty...

...Obama concluded with a painfully inappropriate abuse of the memory of the late Sen. Ted Kennedy—calling by name on several Republican friends of Kennedy's, as if to shame them into voting for a bill they do not support because failing to do so would be a failure of friendship. Is this how a president behaves? Using the memory of the recently deceased as a club with which to pound upon the man's friends?...

More: <http://corner.nationalreview.com/post/?q=NGMwNTQ4ODNmYzA0MmRiY2YwMjU1MzUxYzk0YzVjYzI=>

A Man on His Way to Bitterness

by Tucker Carlson, 9 Sept 2009

...At times tonight, Obama sounded like an embattled second-termer with a 35 percent approval rating. What percentage of his speech was spent lashing out at his enemies, real and imagined? Radio and cable-television pundits, George W. Bush, former Congresses, unnamed ghouls employing "scare tactics," whose "only agenda is to stop reform at any cost"—they're all against him, Obama said. And they're lying. This isn't how confident leaders speak. These are the complaints of a man on his way to bitterness...

...When it came time to explain where the money would come from—that \$900 billion over 10 years—he flinched. His answer: Why, by eliminating waste and fraud from the current private system, of course. Also, the insurance companies (maybe the most reviled industry in the world since the makers of DDT went under) may have to reduce some of their obscene profits.

And that was pretty much it. Nobody else—not seniors, not the middle class or the poor or anyone else you have ever met personally—was going to have to pay anything for this wonderful new system. In Obama's telling, there are only upsides. Free ice cream for everybody. This is deceptive. In fact, it's a lie...

More: <http://www.thedailybeast.com/blogs-and-stories/2009-09-09/a-man-on-his-way-to-bitterness/?cid=bs:archive6>

Is Obama selling snake oil?

by Cooperscopy, 9 Sept 2009

...He sounded like an old time snake oil salesman, making outlandish claims, with no basis for support. He stated that we will provide coverage, one way or another, to the thirty million who are currently uninsured, without rationing. Notice the number has dropped from the 47 million we heard all summer. Probably to make us believe illegals won't be covered. Where are all these extra health care workers coming from, that will make it possible to absorb those extra patients. Wait, I've got it. Those 17 million illegals, must be doctors, nurses, hospital executives, and administrators!

He also stated that most of the cost for this new Obama care bill will come from a savings in Medicare. 500 billion in savings, without cutting care. It's simply a matter of waste and inefficiencies, that his administration is going to magically remove from the system. Ok, why didn't I think of that? If the Messiah can feed 5 thousand with a loaf and two fish, of course the new messiah can save 500 billion from Medicare without cutting care. Don't worry Gramps and Granny, Sarah Palin was just engaging in a rhetorical flourish that went awry, *a la* Sonia Sotomayor...

More: <http://cooperscopy.blogspot.com/2009/09/is-obama-selling-snake-oil.html>

Obama's Health Care Pitch

by Fred Barnes, 9 Sept 2009

...I had five questions that I looked for Obama to answer in his address. I wanted to see if he was serious about achieving moderate, bipartisan health care. It turns out he's not. Here are the questions.

1) Did he advocate real tort reform to curb health care costs? Nope. He simply talked up a pilot project that he said was President Bush's idea. This was a trifle.

2) Did he offer anything of significance to Republicans? No.

3) Did he bring up his favorite straw man about those whose alternative to ObamaCare is to do nothing at all to reform the health care system? Yes, more than once.

4) Did he demonize the health care providers he's actually made deals with? Well, not all of them, but the health insurers took their usual beating.

5) Did he repeat the false claims he's made repeatedly in earlier speeches? Yes indeed. He brought up nearly all of them, including the ones on no abortion coverage, no loss of one's current health insurance, and the "savings" that would come from more preventive care...

Full column: <http://www.weeklystandard.com/Content/Public/Articles/000/000/016/935debnv.asp>

Obama's Middle East Teachable Moment

by Michael Freund, 9 Sept 2009

For a president who has been in office for just over seven months, Barack Obama can at last point to some meaningful change that he has brought about in the Middle East. Thanks to his administration's arm-twisting and bullying of Jerusalem over settlements, Obama has unwittingly succeeded in galvanizing the Israeli public like never before. The result is a broad coalition that extends all the way from the moderate left, through the center and over to the reasonable right, giving Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu plenty of political breathing space...

...Obama has managed to attain what various right-wing MKs and settler lobby groups could only dream of. Through his obstinacy, the American president has inadvertently brought about a resumption of construction in the territories by unfairly pressing Israel to agree to a "freeze."

No matter how one looks at it, Obama misplayed his hand, thinking he could push Israel around. But this approach has clearly backfired. Instead of dividing and conquering the Israeli public, Obama has instead riled them up and united them...Just 4 percent of Israelis now think Obama's policies are pro-Israel, while 51% consider his administration to be pro-Palestinian. In effect, Obama has changed the way Israelis view America. It was once considered unthinkable for a prime minister to say no to the United States, yet that is exactly what is happening now, and the bulk of Israelis support it...

More: <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1251804521512&pagename=JPost%2FJPArticle%2FShowFull>

Tax-and-Offend Charlie Rangel

by Steven Malanga, 9 Sept 2009

...Rangel's woes, ranging from unpaid taxes to undisclosed assets, shouldn't be shocking to anyone who has followed his four decades in office. For much of that time Rangel operated with impunity a powerful patronage machine in Harlem centered around several controversial, government-funded groups which spent millions of dollars with no records to back up the expenditures, failed to pay withholding taxes on some employees, billed government for a host of questionable expenses, and "pumped millions of dollars into New York's underground economy through off-the-books payments," according to investigators.

In a sane world, Rangel's sad history with organizations like the Harlem Urban Development Corp. and the Apollo Theater Foundation would have raised serious questions about whether he should assume so important position as head of the House Ways and Means committee...The history and evolution of the Harlem development group HUDC illustrates how the good intentions of the War on Poverty were quickly subverted by local pols like Rangel...

...Although patronage is nothing new in American politics, once upon a time it meant handing out a few jobs to workers at a local political club to cement their loyalty and demanding payoffs from businessmen looking for government contracts. But starting in the 1960s government changed the game when it started funding a wide range of community groups, a process which quickly became politicized. Dysfunctional programs like the Community Development Block Grant—scandal ridden for decades—grew and thrived because so many of the groups that got funding were tied to local

politicians who used them as patronage mills operating under the pretense that they were helping their community...

...Rangel has done so much good for himself and friends that he helped an organization squander almost \$100 million in Harlem. He grabbed four rent-controlled apartments for himself that might have gone to families needing housing, and allowed a friend a sweetheart deal that helped result in the decay of a Harlem landmark. Besides all of this, a little bit of unreported income seems like small potatoes, although in the end that's what will probably sink Charlie Rangel. If he had just stuck to the legalized patronage of wasting millions of taxpayer dollars on ineffective groups run by political friends and allies, he wouldn't be in this mess.

More: http://www.realeclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/09/09/tax-and-offend_charlie_rangel_97395.html

Mr. Feldstein points out something that recurs over and over in discussions of fiscal policy: Democrats ignoring the changes in people's incentives that their policies produce. They are literally *ignorant* of economic forces. And this ignorance is willful, because they're not stupid people—well, maybe Joe Biden and Maxine Waters and Patty Murray and a few dozen others. But mostly, they're smartish folk who happen to be arrogant enough to think (1) they know best, and (2) they can control everything just by passing laws. Dead wrong on both counts.

ObamaCare's Crippling Deficits

The higher taxes, debt payments and interest rates needed to pay for health reform mean lower living standards.

by *Martin Feldstein*, 7 Sept 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203585004574393110640864526.html>

When Bush spoke to students, Democrats investigated, held hearings

by *Byron York*, 8 Sept 2009

The controversy over President Obama's speech to the nation's schoolchildren will likely be over shortly after Obama speaks today at Wakefield High School in Arlington, Virginia. But when President George H.W. Bush delivered a similar speech on October 1, 1991, from Alice Deal Junior High School in Washington DC, the controversy was just beginning. Democrats, then the majority party in Congress, not only denounced Bush's speech—they also ordered the General Accounting Office to investigate its production and later summoned top Bush administration officials to Capitol Hill for an extensive hearing on the issue.

Unlike the Obama speech, in 1991 most of the controversy came after, not before, the president's school appearance. The day after Bush spoke, the Washington Post published a front-page story suggesting the speech was carefully staged for the president's political benefit. "The White House turned a Northwest Washington junior high classroom into a television studio and its students into props," the Post reported.

With the Post article in hand, Democrats pounced. "The Department of Education should not be producing paid political advertising for the president, it should be helping us to produce smarter students," said Richard Gephardt, then the House Majority Leader. "And the president should be doing more about education than saying, 'Lights, camera, action.'"

Continue: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/When-Bush-spoke-to-students-Democrats-investigated-held-hearings-57694347.html>

The text that was released over the weekend was unexceptional. But that's not the main point.

Obama's schoolchildren address, and where we are in Afghanistan

Victor Davis Hanson on the Hugh Hewitt Show, 1 Sept 2009

...Hugh Hewitt: Then, they distributed a bunch of suggested classroom activities, which are just so creepy. But the one that I'll draw your attention to, "Extension of speech—Teacher can extend learning by having students write letters to themselves about what they can do to help the President. These would be collected and redistributed at an appropriate later date by the teacher to make students accountable to their goals." Your reaction, Victor Davis Hanson?

VDH: Well, I mean, this is what, all he has to do is put a red cover, and he's in China, and a green cover, and he's in Libya. This is what totalitarian societies do. They reach out to children in the schools who don't have any choice. The teacher apparently can't say you know what? I don't want to do this, or a child can't say I don't want to read this, because it's part of a mandated curriculum. It's...and this is happening, remember, at a time when his polls are crashing, so you get the impression that last week, it was to invoke God and say that people who were against health care were not properly religious, and now it's to go over the heads of everybody to the children. You know, this administration, we saw this in the

campaign with the Latinate, Vero Possumus, yes we can, this is our moment that the seas will stop rising, the planet still start cooling. There was this whole narcissistic, messianic sense of himself. And it's kind of, it is creepy. That's a perfect word for it...

More: <http://hughhewitt.townhall.com/talkradio/transcripts/Transcript.aspx?ContentGuid=33282bab-cd76-4d03-af2c-6e049027597f>

A new hero of the culture wars.

English mayor pledges end to political correctness in government

by Hilary White, 2 Sept 2009

...Mayor Peter Davies, a member of the English Democrat party and the father of Tory MP Philip Davies, has scrapped all future funding for the annual Gay Pride event. "I'm not a homophobe," he said, "but I don't see why council taxpayers should pay to celebrate anyone's sexuality."...

...Davies promised to end council funding for "politically correct initiatives" and to "scrap politically correct non-jobs" such as "community cohesion officers" and "encourage the former employees to seek meaningful employment."

In his first week in office, Davies fulfilled his promises by cutting his own salary from £73,000 to £30,000; reducing the number of councillors from 63 to 21, saving the town £800,000 a year. He immediately announced plans to reduce council tax by 3 per cent and got rid of the mayoral limousine. He ended a "twinning" arrangement with five towns around the world, which he described as "just for people to fly off and have a binge at the council's expense."

While campaigning earlier this year, and in the midst of a national pandemic of violent youth crime, Davies, who is a retired school teacher, called for harsher punishments for "young thugs." As a founding member of the Campaign for Real Education, Davies has pressed for restoration of traditional methods in schools that he says will reduce crime and restore Britain's once-legendary public order.

He also called on the government to withdraw Britain from the European Union "in order to save billions of pounds each year and return control of the country's affairs to our own parliament."...

More: <http://www.lifesitenews.com/ldn/2009/sep/09090203.html>

Arctic ice proves to be slippery stuff

The extent of the sea-ice is now half a million square kilometres more than it was this time last year.

by Christopher Booker, 5 Sept 2009

BBC viewers were treated last week to the bizarre spectacle of Mr Ban Ki-moon standing on an Arctic ice-floe making a series of statements so laughable that it was hard to believe such a man can be Secretary-General of the UN. Thanks to global warming, he claimed, "100 billion tons" of polar ice are melting each year, so that within 30 years the Arctic could be "ice-free" This was supported by a WWF claim that the ice is melting so fast that, by 2100, sea-levels could rise by 1.2 metres (four feet), which would lead to "floods affecting a quarter of the world."

Everything about this oft-repeated item was propaganda of the silliest kind. Standing 700 miles from the Pole, as near as the stubbornly present ice would allow his ship to go, Mr Ban seemed unaware that, although some 10 million square kilometres (3.8 million square miles) of sea-ice melts each summer, each September the Arctic starts to freeze again. And the extent of the ice now is 500,000 sq km (190,000 sq m) greater than it was this time last year—which was, in turn, 500,000 sq km more than in September 2007, the lowest point recently recorded (see the Cryosphere Today website). By April, after months of darkness, it will be back up to 14 million sq km (5.4 million sq m) or more.

Mr Ban seems equally unaware that, even if all that sea-ice were to melt, this would no more raise sea-levels than a cube of ice melting in a gin and tonic increases the volume of liquid in the glass. If he is relying for his "100 billion tons" on land ice melting in Antarctica and Greenland, he should note that much of their ice sheets are growing rather than shrinking. His "100 billion tons" is fantasy...

...According to Government figures, however, we in Britain are already committed to spending, under the Climate Change Act, £18 billion every year between now and 2050 on this nonsense—daft light bulbs (see below), electricity blackouts and all. In other words, we are only beginning to see some of the nastier consequences of this crazy make-believe, based on nothing more substantial than the kind of gibberish we got last week from Mr "Light Bulb" Ban and the BBC.

More: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/columnists/christopherbooker/6143587/Arctic-ice-proves-to-be-slippery-stuff.html>

Will's Loss of Nerve

by Peter Wehner, 1 Sept 2009

So George Will, who strongly supported the Iraq war before he strongly opposed it, is now strongly opposing the Afghanistan war after he once strongly supported it...

...Here is a disturbing fact to ponder: If George Will were commander in chief, we would, under his leadership, have begun and lost two wars of enormous consequence. The damage to America — militarily, geopolitically, and morally — would be staggering. The boon to militant Islam — militarily, geopolitically, and in terms of morale — would be incalculable. Yet nowhere in his most recent column does Will even begin to grapple with what surrender in Afghanistan would mean — to that country, to Pakistan, to jihadists around the world, to confidence in America's word and will, and to our national-security interests. And while Afghanistan, like Iraq, is a very difficult undertaking, declaring defeat at this stage is unwarranted and terribly unwise. If General David Petraeus thinks the task is hopeless, then I will take a hard second look at the war. But if George Will declares it hopeless, I will simply take a hard second look at his record...

A devastating critique: <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/blogs/index.php/wehner/82951>

This great 3,600-word essay addresses every tenable argument on the war, and arrives at some hard-headed conclusions.

A Dangerous Delusion

We go to war to defend our interests, not to encourage democracy.

by Andrew C. McCarthy, 4 Sept 2009

...We can't stop Muslim countries from being Islamist. That is their choice. It should be no concern of ours who rules them as long as they do not threaten American interests. When they inevitably do threaten us, or allow their territories to be launch pads for terrorists, we should smash them. But the price of defending our nation cannot be spending years — at a cost of precious lives and hundreds of billions of dollars — in a vain attempt to give people who despise us a way of life they don't want.

Meanwhile, we must accept that Islamism is our enemy and has targeted our constitutional system for destruction by slow strangulation via sharia. Instead of worrying about democracy in Afghanistan, we need to worry about democracy in America. The surge we need is at home: to roll back Islamism's infiltration of our schools, our financial system, our law, and our government. In addition to not being universal, the "values of the human spirit" are not immortal. If we don't defend them in the West, they will die.

The whole thing: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=MzFiZDY4MzlmMmU0MDdiNDViN2QxYzcxMDI5ZWl3MTQ=>

The Jobless Recovery

Obama's war against small business and paper money.

by Larry Kudlow, 5 Sept 2009

...So while the big companies are getting healthier, the smaller firms are being left in the dust. Unfortunately, small businesses provide most of the new job creation in the United States.

Veep Joe Biden is out there saying the Obama stimulus plan has saved or created 150,000 jobs in the administration's first 100 days and another 600,000 in its second 100 days. But he sure isn't talking about small-business jobs.

In fact, it's hard to know *what* he's talking about...the government is *draining* close to \$800 billion from the private-sector savings supply—\$800 billion that will not be invested in new-business enterprises, including small businesses.

Borrowing from Peter to redistribute to Paul is not fiscal stimulus. It's a fiscal depressant. Small businesses are having enough trouble getting their hands on credit. And now they can't find enough capital for new start-ups. The government prospers, but the small-business sector sinks.

Then there are all the tax and regulatory threats related to health care and energy reform. Until Obama retreats from his plan for a government takeover of the healthcare sector and a cap-and-trade program that will cripple the energy sector, the cost of hiring the new job will continue to rise.

The threat of higher payroll taxes and energy costs is more than enough to deter new hiring...

Entire column: <http://kudlowsmoneypolitics.blogspot.com/2009/09/jobless-recovery.html>

Honduran Headache

Investor's Business Daily, 4 Sept 2009

...The June 28 ouster of Honduran President Mel Zelaya is rapidly shaping up as a never-ending crisis for the Obama administration. The more it tries to punish Honduras for getting rid of its would-be dictator, the more the freedom-loving Hondurans dig in to keep their democracy.

That isn't going to be good for us in the long run. Back in June, Zelaya launched an illegal referendum to extend his rule. As recently as Thursday, he called the referendum "necessary to the legislature and the constitution" in a George Washington University speech.

The Honduran Constitution is quite clear: Any president who expresses such talk gets the boot. Hondurans have stood by it...

...In the end, it's quite likely that the U.S. will be the loser, since it's increasingly clear that this time, we're on the wrong side of history.

More: <http://ibdeditorials.com/IBDArticles.aspx?id=336955160324173>

In the Megrahi affair, the more we learn, the worse it gets

The way the Lockerbie bomber gained his release brings shame upon Britain.

Sunday Telegraph, 5 Sept 2009

...There can be cases in which it is reasonable, when the national interest clashes with justice, to prefer protecting the former. The Government has dismally failed, however, to provide a persuasive argument that the release of Megrahi is one of those cases. The Libyan was responsible for one of the worst terrorist outrages perpetrated in peace-time. His guilt has been upheld by the numerous Scottish judges who examined the evidence. He was certainly not solely responsible. But the fact that he had accomplices, and that others ordered the explosion, does not lessen his culpability for it.

Even if it were true that the future of BP's contracts in Libya depended on Megrahi's repatriation, the heinousness of his crime would make most people pause before concluding that that was the correct path to take. The logic of the Government's case seems to be that £545 million, or whatever sum shall eventually be gained from the deals with Libya, covers the murder of 270 people: the money is enough to forgive and forget the crime...

Read the rest:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/telegraph-view/6143741/In-the-Megrahi-affair-the-more-we-learn-the-worse-it-gets.html>

Obama repeating mistakes of Great Depression

Policies undermining growth potential of US economy.

Institute of Economic Affairs, London, 7 Sept 2009

The economic policies of the Obama administration are repeating many of the mistakes made during the Great Depression, according to a study released today by the Institute of Economic Affairs, and endorsed by Nobel-Prize-winning economist James M. Buchanan.

The authors, Charles Rowley and Nathanael Smith, argue that there are "troubling similarities" between the approach of the current U.S. government and the disastrous economic policies of President Roosevelt during the 1930s.

By trying to revive the economy with profligate deficit-spending and increased state intervention, Obama is undermining the long-term growth potential of the U.S. economy and risks delaying full economic recovery by several years.

Examining the economic evidence, the study challenges the widely held view that conservative fiscal policies caused the Great Depression and Keynesian fiscal policies brought recovery. Rather, excessively loose monetary policy was the cause of the stock market bubble that burst in 1929, while excessively tight monetary policy was the principal reason that a normal recession turned into a deep depression...

Read on: <http://www.iea.org.uk/record.jsp?type=release&ID=166>

The study: [Economic Contractions in the United States: A Failure of Government](#) (144-page pdf, 3092 KB)

Libtaker Montel Williams Urges Congresswoman To Kill Herself

AAR's Williams: 'Michelle, Slit Your Wrist'

by Brian Maloney, 3 Sept 2009

<http://radioequalizer.blogspot.com/2009/09/libtaker-montel-williams-urges.html>

Massachusetts' Obama-like Reforms Increase Health Costs, Wait Times

by Michael Cannon, 27 Aug 2009

If you are curious about how President Barack Obama's health plan would affect your health care, look no farther than Massachusetts. In 2006, the Bay State enacted a slate of reforms that almost perfectly mirror the plan of Obama and congressional Democrats.

Those reforms reveal that the Obama plan would mean higher health insurance premiums for millions, would reduce choice by eliminating both low-cost and comprehensive health plans, would encourage insurers to avoid the sick, and would reduce the quality of care.

Massachusetts reduced its uninsured population by two-thirds—yet the cost would be considered staggering, had state officials not done such a good job of hiding it. Finally, Massachusetts shows where "ObamaCare" would ultimately lead: Officials are already laying the groundwork for government rationing.

The most sweeping provision in the Massachusetts reforms—and the legislation before Congress—is an "individual mandate" that makes health insurance compulsory. Massachusetts shows that such a mandate would oust millions from their low-cost health plans and force them to pay higher premiums...

Details, and more:

<http://detnews.com/article/20090827/OPINION01/908270338/1008/Massachusetts—Obama-like-reforms-increase-health-costs—wait-times>

These two columns don't agree about much. But both of them are serious and tenable—unlike George F. Will's recent pronouncements on military affairs.

A Stable Pakistan Needs a Stable Afghanistan

The fight against militant Islam must be pursued on both sides of the border.

by Frederick W. Kagan, 5 Sept 2009

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204731804574386602057103982.html>

O's Afghan woes

by Ralph Peters, 3 Sept 2009

http://www.nypost.com/seven/09032009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/os_afghan_woes_187815.htm

Pledging allegiance to our beloved Obama

The starry-eyed Hopechangeey Generation is growing bored with Obama.

Now he's targeting the kindergarten constituency.

by Mark Steyn, 4 Sept 2009

...On Friday, Aug. 28, the principal of Eagle Bay Elementary School in Farmington, Utah—in the name of "education"—showed her young charges the "Obama Pledge" video released at the time of the inauguration, in which Ashton Kutcher and various other big-time celebrities, two or three of whom you might even recognize, "pledge to be a servant to our president and to all mankind because together we can, together we are, and together we will be the change that we seek."

Altogether now! Let us chant for mankind and use our pens to write, "O beloved Obama, our courageous president, we are all servants defending the hope for you and marching to change."

And, unlike Saddam's Iraq, we don't have the mitigating condition of being a one-man psycho state invented by the British Colonial Office after lunch on a wet afternoon in 1922.

Any self-respecting schoolkid, enjoined by his principal to be a "servant" to the head of state, would reply, "Get lost, creep." And, if they still taught history in American schools, he'd add, "Oh, and by the way, that question was settled in 1776."...

Great stuff: <http://www.ocregister.com/articles/president-obama-saddam-2552741->

(Hat tip: Tom L.)

The Second World War—70 Years Later

by Victor Davis Hanson, 3 Sept 2009

...Lately, the role of the United States in World War II has been downplayed, since we came late to it, and suffered the fewest military and civilian casualties of the major Allies. But no other power fought on so many fronts in so many crucial ways: strategic air campaigns against Germany and Japan; invasions of North Africa, Sicily, Italy, Western Europe and the Pacific islands; submarine and surface fleet operations against Germany and Japan; and massive convoys and supplies to Britain, China and the Soviet Union.

Likewise, it has become fashionable to diminish the British role, given that by 1943 its manpower reserves were exhausted and the bulk of the later fighting against the Axis was conducted by Russian and American troops.

In fact, Britain nearly alone saved Western civilization between September 1939 and June 1941. From May 1940, it fought almost alone against the entire continent of occupied Europe, when the United States was still isolationist and the Soviet Union was actively helping the Nazi cause...

More: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZDA3NmExZDYzZTBiMGJmOTY5ODAwZmUzZDU1ZmFmNWY=>

Global Warming and the Sun

We have only just now discovered how sunspots make the Earth warmer.

by Jonah Goldberg, 2 Sept 2009

... We live in a moment when we are told, nay lectured and harangued, that if we use the wrong toilet paper or eat the wrong cereal, we are frying the planet. But the sun? Well, that's a distraction. Don't you dare forget your reusable shopping bags, but pay no attention to that burning ball of gas in the sky—it's just the only thing that prevents the planet from being a lifeless ball of ice engulfed in darkness. Never mind that sunspot activity doubled during the 20th century, when the bulk of global warming has taken place.

What does it say that the modeling that guaranteed disastrous increases in global temperatures never predicted the halt in planetary warming since the late 1990s? (MIT's Richard Lindzen says that "there has been no warming since 1997 and no statistically significant warming since 1995.") What does it say that the modelers have only just now discovered how sunspots make the Earth warmer?

I don't know what it tells you, but it tells me that maybe we should study a bit more before we spend billions to "solve" a problem we don't understand so well.

Read it all: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZmU0NDMzZTIkM2E5MDBhY2Q4N2ViYTFkNjVmNzU5NTc=>

New Facts Undercut Old Positions on Immigration

by Michael Barone, 2 Sept 2009

... The apparent sharp decline in immigration and the possible or likely return of masses of illegals to their countries of origin won't necessarily change the stands of supporters and opponents of comprehensive immigration reform. But they should prompt all of us to rethink our positions. As one who has tended to support comprehensive bills, I think we might, at a time when high unemployment means we have less need for unskilled workers, have to consider moving away from family reunification and toward high skill levels in our criteria for legal immigration, as Canada and Australia already do.

That's not likely to be the approach taken by the Obama administration or congressional Democrats. Obama may be eager for action, but we all may be better off taking time to understand the emerging facts that may be redefining the problem...

Those facts: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/politics/New-facts-undercut-old-positions-on-immigration-8184494.html>

Obama Adviser Van Jones: Republicans are "Assholes"

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yt66eWnjoTo>

Van Jones, Obama's green jobs czar, is a 9/11 truther

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/weblogs/back-story/2009/sep/03/green-jobs-czar-signed-truther-statement-in-2004>

Van Jones, cop-killer Mumia Abu-Jamal, and fellow Communists lie about Israel

Video: <http://www.breitbart.tv/the-album-van-jones-rants-against-israel-on-shocking-record-produced-by-his-group/>

Van Jones says Only Suburban White Kids Shoot Up Schools...

Video: <http://www.breitbart.tv/van-jones-only-suburban-white-kids-shoot-up-schools/>

Rep. Mike Pence calls on Van Jones to resign

http://www.politico.com/blogs/glennthrush/0909/Pence_calls_on_Van_Jones_to_resign.html

The Van Jones (non) feeding frenzy

by Byron York, 4 Sept 2009, 11:30 AM EDT

From a Nexis search a few moments ago:

Total words about the Van Jones controversy in the New York Times: 0.

Total words about the Van Jones controversy in the Washington Post: 0.

Total words about the Van Jones controversy on NBC Nightly News: 0.

Total words about the Van Jones controversy on ABC World News: 0.

Total words about the Van Jones controversy on CBS Evening News: 0.

More: <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/blogs/beltway-confidential/The-Van-Jones-non-feeding-non-frenzy-57271402.html>

Will on Afghanistan

by Frederick W. Kagan, 31 Aug 2009

In response to George Will's column "Why are we still in Afghanistan?," it is worth noting some factual inaccuracies....

...The one-to-50 ratio would call for about 320,000 counterinsurgents in that area. But that group would include indigenous forces. Granting Will's anecdotal observations that the Afghan police are at best ineffective (which is far too sweeping a statement), the Afghan National Army is at least as good as many of the organizations that have functioned as counterinsurgents in Iraq. The ANA numbers about 90,000 right now, and it can be expanded to 134,000 next year, and perhaps to 240,000 within a couple of years after that. There are around 100,000 U.S. and international forces in Afghanistan now. So: How inconceivable is it? And for how long?

The surge of forces that some (including me) are proposing is intended to bridge the gap between current Afghan capacity and their future capacity, while simultaneously reducing the insurgency's capabilities. Whatever may happen in Afghanistan, counterinsurgency theory does not call for the deployment of hundreds of thousands of coalition forces for decades. Lastly, neither waving the bloody shirt nor rudely disparaging the efforts of allies who have shed their own blood alongside our troops is appropriate to this discussion. But doing both in the same column is simply reprehensible.

More: <http://corner.nationalreview.com/post/?q=NjRhYzk0N2UxM2U2MzZiMGJmODJmMjM1MWY1NTBkMzY=>

Bear in mind that Mr. O'Hanlon and Kenneth Pollack were the first journalists to **correctly identify** the success of the U.S. surge in Iraq.

What's Right With Afghanistan

A poll earlier this year showed Taliban support at 6%

by Michael O'Hanlon and Bruce Riedel, 1 Sept 2009

...Opposition is mounting to the current policy—to say nothing of possible requests for additional troops from the U.S. commander in Afghanistan, Gen. Stanley McChrystal.

The questions and concerns being raised are legitimate. Clearly, the mission has not been going well. Problems with our basic strategy, especially on the economic and development side, still need immediate attention. Moreover, our Afghan friends have a crucial role to play in both security and development, and if they fail to do so the overall warfighting and state-building effort will not succeed.

However, it is important to remember our assets, and not just our liabilities, in the coming debate over Afghanistan policy this fall. Democracies sometimes talk themselves out of keeping up the faith in tough situations, and we should avoid any such tendency towards defeatism, especially so early in the execution of the Obama administration's new

military/civilian/economic strategy, which combines stronger and more widespread counterinsurgency measures with increased nation-building efforts. Indeed, the U.S., our NATO allies, and the future Afghan government—be it another Hamid Karzai presidency, or a new administration—have a number of major strengths in this mission. Consider...

Read on: <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204731804574384981877588144.html>

The Six Moral Arguments Against Socialized Medicine

by David Swindle, 30 Aug 2009

...This response isn't just to Pat but to Moyers, Maher, and all the "progressives" who claim that conservatives' opposition to single-payer health care is the result of a moral deficiency. First, let's define what we're talking about:

mor-al // (môrĭ, mr-) *adj.* **1.** Of or concerned with the judgment of the goodness or badness of human action and character: moral scrutiny; a moral quandary. **2.** Teaching or exhibiting goodness or correctness of character and behavior: a moral lesson.

Thus we see how ambiguous the term "morality" is — how people can choose to make it mean whatever they want in order to further their objectives. What is moral derives from whatever religious or ideological belief system (BS) one ingests. What is immoral to one person's BS is moral to another. In the Muslim world it's "moral" to flog a woman for wearing pants. In the Western world this is profoundly immoral. So too in the health care debate. In the leftist world it's "moral" for government to swallow up the health care industry to insure everyone gets "cheap" medical care. In the conservative world this is tremendously immoral.

Am I advocating "moral relativism" or some kind of ethical nihilism here? Certainly not. Not all moral systems are equal. Arguments can be made on behalf of one system of values as superior to another. And that's what needs to be done. Either side merely invoking "morality" does nothing here to further the argument one way or another...

The 6 moral arguments: <http://newsrealblog.com/2009/08/30/newsreal-sunday-the-six-moral-arguments-against-socialized-medicine/>

Obama's soak-the-rich mentality

by Jeff Jacoby, 2 Sept 2009

...High taxes can have unwelcome, and unintended, consequences.

Governments delude themselves when they imagine they can easily raise all the money they want by soaking the rich. The rich always have other options. When taxes grow too onerous, high earners can adjust their economic behavior. Some move to Spain to play soccer for La Liga. Others, less glamorously, cut back on their investments, forgo new business opportunities, seek out tax havens, or work fewer hours. The impact is felt not only in lower-than-expected tax revenues, but in lower rates of growth and productivity and job creation. Jobs are disproportionately created by those who have money to invest. "You can't have employment and despise employers," Massachusetts Senator Paul Tsongas used to say. "No goose, no golden eggs."...

...By any reasonable standard the rich pay far more than their fair share. According to the latest (2007) IRS data, the top 1 percent of US taxpayers earn 22.8 percent of adjusted gross income but pay 40.4 percent of all federal income taxes. By contrast, the bottom 95 percent of taxpayers, who earn 62.5 percent of the income, pay just 39.4 percent of the income tax burden. **That bears repeating:** The income tax burden of the top 1 percent, who comprise just 1.4 million taxpayers, now exceeds that of the bottom 134 million combined...

More: http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2009/09/02/obamas_soak_the_rich_mentality/

Clunker Legislation

by John Stossel, 2 Sept 2009

The economic illiterates in Washington are so impressed with the "success" of Cash for Clunkers that they're readying **Cash for Clunker Appliances**. The ludicrous "stimulus" bill gave \$300 million to the Department of Energy to provide rebates for 10 types of appliances that have been rated energy efficient.

Before government extends Cash for Clunkers to more products, it might be a good idea to examine the original. The fact that Washington and the buyers who took advantage of Cash for Clunkers are gaga is hardly evidence that it was in the public interest.

It wasn't. As usual, the program has been judged only by its first and most visible consequences, violating Henry Hazlitt's **teaching** in his classic, "Economics in One Lesson":

"The art of economics consists in looking not merely at the immediate but at the longer effects of any act or policy; it consists in tracing the consequences of that policy not merely for one group but for all groups."

Read on: <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=33376>

Who Decides What

by Richard W. Rahn, 2 Sept 2009

Do you think pedophiles should be given Viagra at taxpayers' expense? Despite what appears to be an absurd question, that is exactly what occurred in Britain under their National Health Service (NHS).

Reports surfaced last week that a pedophile who had abused an 11-year-old girl had been spared jail, yet was continuing to receive Viagra, courtesy of the British taxpayer...

...If the United States creates a government-run health system, either as a monopoly single-payer system like Canada's or one that allows people to acquire medical care outside the government's system (provided they pay for both the government system and whatever private alternative they select), it is a safe bet the same types of abuses and problems that plague Britain and Canada will occur.

The reason is simple: There will only be limited funds available for the government-run health care system, and thus individuals employed by the government will decide who gets what and when. Some of the decisions will be wise; others will be foolish, wasteful, or just plain daffy—because humans who spend other people's money don't tend to be all that careful.

Unlike most other goods, there is an insatiable demand for health care, particularly as people age. Any government trying to provide "free" health care for all its citizens for whatever they deemed to be a health problem would soon be bankrupt. To avoid bankruptcy, all governments ration health care—by price, queuing or by form of treatment. Many members of Congress and the president—after first admitting it—now deny some form of rationing will be necessary. President Obama earlier suggested limiting forms of treatment, particularly to the elderly—as is done under Medicare...

More: <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/sep/02/who-decides-what/>

How about "I pledge to flush Barack Obama and stop his urinating on America"?

Parents upset over leftist propaganda video

Principal apologizes for showing 'I Pledge' to students.

by Lisa Schencker, Salt Lake Tribune, 2 Sept 2009

...Children at Eagle Bay Elementary School in Farmington were shown a short video called "I pledge" on Aug. 28. The video opens with an image of President Barack Obama and part of a speech in which he says, "Let us summon a new spirit of patriotism, of responsibility where each of us resolves to pitch in and work harder and look after not only ourselves but each other." The video then features celebrities making pledges about how they will help the president and the world—and that's where some say the problem lies.

...Many pledges, such as supporting local food banks, smiling more, and caring for the elderly are noncontroversial. But other pledges, such as "to never give anyone the finger when I'm driving again," "to sell my obnoxious car and buy a hybrid" and to advance stem cell research cross the line, some say...

...Gayle Ruzicka, president of conservative Utah Eagle Forum, said the video was blatantly political. She said other offensive pledges included, "I pledge to be of service to Barack Obama," "I pledge allegiance to the funk, to the united funk of funkadelica," and pledges to not use plastic grocery bags and not flush the toilet after urinating.

"It's very inappropriate to show a radical, leftist propaganda piece that political to children," Ruzicka said. "If parents want their children to learn about those things and do them in the home, wonderful, fine, but it's not the place of the school to show a one-sided propaganda piece to children without parents knowing about it."...

The rest of the story: http://www.sltrib.com/news/ci_13249171?_requestid=5883011

The video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wqcPA1ysSbw>



http://www.zazzle.com/do_not_criticize_obamas_reforms_tshirt-235564933881194850

This is what socialized medicine leads to.

Sentenced to death on the NHS

Patients with terminal illnesses are being made to die prematurely under a National Health Service scheme to help end their lives, leading doctors warn today.

by Kate Devlin, 2 Sept 2009

In a letter to The Daily Telegraph, a group of experts who care for the terminally ill claim that some patients are being wrongly judged as close to death.

Under NHS guidance introduced across England to help doctors and medical staff deal with dying patients, they can then have fluid and drugs withdrawn and many are put on continuous sedation until they pass away.

But this approach can also mask the signs that their condition is improving, the experts warn...

Read on: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/healthnews/6127514/Sentenced-to-death-on-the-NHS.html>

Great Big Grains of Caveat

Don John, 2 Sept 2009

George Will and David Harsanyi make some thoughtful points in the two columns linked below. But it would have been better if both of them had come out and recommended the logical alternative to nation-building: **punitive warfare**. In punitive warfare, the United States will just trash an enemy-controlled country, tell the survivors how they should reconstruct, and then trash the country again if they don't do it right. This will be a neat alternative to the messy business of assuming responsibility for what we smash.

Also, it's worth remembering that Mr. Will went wobbly on surveillance in "[Why Didn't He Ask Congress?](#)" (20 Dec 2005), defeatist on Iraq in "[Rhetoric of Unreality](#)" (2 March 2006), equivocal on Guantanamo in "[Contempt of Courts](#)" (17 June 2008), and betrayed conservatism by suggesting, in the last months of the 2008 campaign, that Sarah Palin would not be fit to assume the presidency.

Time to Get Out of Afghanistan *by George Will, 1 Sept 2009*

George Will is Right on Afghanistan *by David Harsanyi, 2 Sept 2009*

Is Conservatism Dead?

A review of Sam Tanenhaus's *The Death of Conservatism*

by James Piereson, 1 Sept 2009

...Tanenhaus condemns conservative writers who draw parallels between the New Deal and fascism, but carelessly suggests parallels between American conservatives and European fascists—one of the more unsavory aspects of a book filled with unsavory allusions and implications.

The argument that contemporary conservatives are reactionaries or *revanchists* is wrong on its face. The market school of economics cannot be dismissed because it is critical of the New Deal or of Keynesian policies, nor are free-

market thinkers reactionary in any sense of that term. Tanenhaus does not inquire seriously into the reasons why conservatives are uneasy with the welfare state, why some see in it a threat to liberty and others an encouragement to the breakdown of the family and self-government. The market revolution of the last thirty years, moreover, contributed greatly to world prosperity over that period, to the fall of Communism, and to much else that was beneficial besides. It may be true that the current economic crisis presents a challenge to market thinking, but it certainly does not vindicate central planning or the welfare state, and there is nothing about that challenge that justifies the conclusion that market economics is dead. As we shall shortly learn, the path back to prosperity will lead through free and flexible markets.

Nor does the intervention in Iraq, whatever its ultimate outcome, support Tanenhaus's case. That intervention, after all, was endorsed not only by conservatives and neo-conservatives, but also by every Democratic candidate for president in last year's election, save for Barack Obama (who was a member of the Illinois legislature when the war began). President Bush, in addition, justified the war on liberal or Wilsonian grounds, so that if the war discredited anything, it was the liberal ideal of achieving collective security through the promotion of democracy. One may argue that such an approach is misguided or impractical, or even that it is inconsistent with conservative principles, but it is not possible to say that it is *revanchist*. As for the culture war—well, most conservatives would be glad to have it over with, if only cultural liberals and radicals would call a halt to their provocations. The historical record is clear that the first shots fired in every engagement of the culture war came from the left in the form of school busing, the abortion decision of the Supreme Court, the Mapplethorpe exhibition, political correctness on the campus, and (now) gay marriage. Indeed, what many call the "religious right" came into existence in the late 1970s in response to the Carter administration's effort to deny tax exemption to religious schools on the grounds that they were segregated. Absent liberal provocations, there would have been no culture war and probably no "religious right" to wage it...

The whole review: <http://www.newcriterion.com/articles.cfm/Is-conservatism-dead—4166>

Punishing Patriots

by Ralph Peters, 1 Sept 2009

The Obama administration's determination to hold witch-hunt "investigations" of CIA interrogators who did their patriotic best to keep us safe endangers us all. Castrate the CIA, and Americans will die. But the Obama White House wants *vengeance* against those who don't fit its ideology. Your family's safety comes a distant second...

...Some hard-core terrorists *do* have to be broken. Patiently playing to the prisoner's vanity works best in run-of-the-mill interrogations, but there are always exceptions. In those cases, our intelligence warriors must feel confident that our government's behind them—and not waving an indictment.

The American people get this. The left's obsession with the rights of terrorists finds no support among sensible citizens. But the issue's been hijacked by the America-hating zealots who shaped our president's worldview and by media scoundrels whose credo comes from Grace Slick's 1960s lyric "I'd rather have my country die for me."

For the rest of us to live in peace, patriots must stand at the edge of darkness where our enemies dwell. This *is* a war. And it is sometimes necessary to do evil in war to achieve a greater good. Fighting Islamist terrorism isn't about campus theories. It's about the fate of millions. In this bitter struggle that has been forced upon us, the Obama administration stands for creeping surrender.

More: http://www.nypost.com/seven/09012009/postopinion/opedcolumnists/punishing_patriots_187490.htm?&page=1

Suicide of the West?

America, too, will now approach its implacable enemies with concessions and smiles.

by Thomas Sowell, 1 Sept 2009

...The release of a mass-murdering terrorist, who went home to a hero's welcome in Libya, shows that President Obama is not the only one who wants to move away from the idea of a "war on terror"—as if that will stop the terrorists' war on us.

The ostensible reason for releasing al-Megrahi was compassion for a man terminally ill. It is ironic that this was said in Scotland, for exactly 250 years ago another Scotsman—Adam Smith—said, "Mercy to the guilty is cruelty to the innocent."...

...Those who are pushing for legal action against CIA agents may talk about "upholding the law" but they are doing no such thing. Neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Geneva Convention gives rights to terrorists who operate outside the law.

There was a time when everybody understood this. German soldiers who put on American military uniforms, in order

to infiltrate American lines during the Battle of the Bulge were simply lined up against a wall and shot—and nobody wrung their hands over it. Nor did the U.S. Army try to conceal what they had done. The executions were filmed and the film has been shown on the History Channel.

So many "rights" have been conjured up out of thin air that many people seem unaware that rights and obligations derive from explicit laws, not from politically correct pieties. If you don't meet the terms of the Geneva Convention, then the Geneva Convention doesn't protect you. If you are not an American citizen, then the rights guaranteed to American citizens do not apply to you...

More: <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=NmMxMDZmZjdhNGQxOGRmYTFjOWRjMzhiYTAzMzVmZmE=>

Rep. Mike Rogers (R-MI) Dissects ObamaCare (HR 3200)

16 July 2009

Video: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G44NCvNDLfc>

(Hat tip: MM)

Support Our Troops

They're still fighting for us.

Soldiers' Angels

Wounded Warrior Project

Fisher House: help military families

Our Military

Be sure to read these superb pieces:

Health Care Mythology *by Clifford Asness*

Just Make Stuff Up *by Victor Davis Hanson*

100 Stimulus Projects: A Second Opinion *by Sen. Tom Coburn*

The State Despotism *by Mark Steyn*

And here's what a **trillion dollars** looks like.