

Government, not business, caused the Crash of 2008

An ongoing collection of economists' essays, last updated 28 Sept 2016

The Public-Sector Money-go-Round

Don John, 12 July 2013

There is a very big difference between public sector and private sector unions.

Many public-sector unions and their political cronies have been robbing the public blind for years, and guys like Harry Reid and Dick Durbin want to keep on enabling them.

Here's how it works. Elected officials are the "employer." They negotiate contracts with the public-sector unions, **and pay them with money that comes from you and me**, via taxation. Then those same public-sector unions **give generous contributions** to any and all politicians who've been generous to them. Next time they negotiate a contract---Presto! Another sweet deal, quid pro quo. In some cases, this cycle has continued for decades with little interruption.

Private-sector companies **use their own money---not the taxpayers' money---**to pay their employees. And the employees **don't bribe them with contributions**. They just work hard and (if they're organized) negotiate hard. Big difference.

As a renowned U.S. president once said, "All government employees should realize that the process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service. It has its distinct and insurmountable limitations when applied to public-personnel management. The very nature and purposes of government make it impossible for administrative officials to represent fully or to bind the employer in mutual discussions with government-employee organizations. The employer is the whole people."

And what president could that have been? Reagan? Coolidge? Eisenhower? Nope. That famous right-winger Franklin Delano Roosevelt!

A wild guess about the new Pope

Don John, 13 March 2013

I don't know much about **Jorge Cardinal Bergoglio**, who today was elected Pope Francis I. But for the past 50 years or so, "Jesuit" has mostly meant "moonbat." He does oppose abortion and gay marriage; but he also has a history of involvement with so-called "social justice." That's ominous, of course. It could mean that he is indeed the antipope that was predicted by the late **Father Malachi Martin**, to wit: a scandal would lead to a papal resignation, and the new pope would work with leftist politicians towards creation of some kind of "world government."

UPDATE: As head of the Jesuit order in Argentina, Jorge Bergoglio may have colluded with the torturing, murdering 1976-83 military regime. **And even worse**, after he became a cardinal in 2001, he blamed capitalism for Argentina's deeply dysfunctional economy.

Willful ignorance of Obama's nature

Don John, 10 March 2013

Max Boot is thinks it's "obvious" that no president would use drones to assassinate non-combatant Americans on American soil. And he creates several straw-men to cloud the issue, by citing Lincoln's use of force against the *very* combatant Confederacy, Eisenhower's use of troops to escort black children to school in Arkansas, and the fact that Jane Fonda wasn't killed for "protesting the Vietnam War." Of course Fonda wasn't merely protesting, but that's as beside-the-point as the rest of Mr. Boot's argument.

The aspect that Boot willfully ignores is the nature of the current president, who thinks he has the right to redistribute the wealth; make the government the arbiter of all health-care issues; force Catholics to buy abortion insurance; cause energy prices to skyrocket; effectively disarm all non-criminals; and a host of other "good ideas" from the faculty lounge.

It's clear that Obama's dictatorial arrogance goes beyond even that of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and Lyndon Johnson. All Senator Paul was asking for was a clear statement from the White House: not of the administration's *intent* (which would be useless, coming from an arrogant dictator), but of its interpretation of the Constitution on a single, well-defined point of law. The filibuster, and public response to it, forced the Justice Department to concede. That's all.

On Drones, It's Paul vs. the Polls

Max Boot, 8 March 2013

To a liberal friend, on "Can the world survive Washington's hubris?"

by Don John, 9 July 2012

Dear _____,

Paul Craig Roberts' **column** is interesting, certainly, but it's also paranoid, and reflexively anti-American.

Major countries have to look out for themselves, and their allies. It would be nice if that weren't necessary, and no country would need to be a superpower protecting a lot of other countries under its umbrella. But history has shown that whenever the good guys start acting that way, it creates a power vacuum, and a megalomaniacal tyrant like Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot, Khomeini, or Saddam rushes in to take advantage. As many foreign policy experts have said, "weakness is a provocation."

That's why America has been "saving the world's ass since 1917." Even in times of relative peace, we have protected our allies, to the point where few countries in Western Europe even bothered to fully rebuild their military after World War II.

We're no Boy Scouts, but who is? We're not as "nice" as Sweden or Denmark, for example—but then we've been the guarantors of their independence for 65 years. As George Orwell wrote, **"People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only because rough men stand ready to do violence on their behalf."** In the year 2012, most of those rough men are Americans.

Mr. Roberts seems to think America is some kind of evil force in the world. Compared to whom? Russia? China? North Korea? Iran? Venezuela? Al Qaeda? The Palestinians? Please.

And Georgia is "a Washington puppet"? What's wrong with that? Only someone who thinks Vladimir Putin is a choir-boy considers that a problem. We are the good guys, and so are the Georgians.

Sometimes our actions have serious unintended consequences despite our good intentions. But hey, you could say that about 3/4 of all government programs over the last 100 years. And not just here; name almost any country except maybe Estonia, and you'll find a government that screws everything up for all the best reasons.

I wouldn't have invaded Iraq or even Afghanistan the way Bush did. But I admired his good intentions of liberating people from fascist Islam. And I backed him all the way, because whether or not his plan was going to work, it's always better to be killing Muslims than not killing Muslims. As a Greek, you should be able to relate.

What would President Don John have done in the wake of 9/11?

Well, they killed about 3,000 of our people. I would have retaliated at the rate of 100 Muslim deaths for every American killed on 9/11. I would have carpet-bombed Kabul, Tehran, Baghdad, Damascus, and Tripoli until a total of 300,000 were dead. Then I would have announced "If you don't want this to happen to you again, don't let 9/11 happen to us again. Next time it'll be 1,000 to 1."

True, that's probably the same thing President Tony Soprano would have done. But it would have cost about half a trillion dollars less than Bush's good intentions did. And it would have been over in the fall of 2001.

I'm not just shooting off my mouth now...well, OK, I am shooting off my mouth. But this isn't just hindsight. I detailed the the exact same "President Don John" plan in the autumn of 2001, over lunch with our mutual friends _____, _____, and _____. If prodded (or maybe waterboarded), I'm sure they would remember.

See you soon!

Don John

Bon voyage, Mr. Roberts! by Don John, 28 June 2012

Let all conservatives join together and wish Chief Justice John Roberts *bon voyage* as he sails off into his new life as a liberal.

Some pundits are saying that in upholding ObamaCare (the Patient Rejection and Unaffordable Care Act) by calling its insurance mandate a tax instead of the regulation of interstate commerce, he has cleverly managed to square some kind of circle and preserve the integrity of the Supreme Court.

We've got some news for Roberts. The Supreme Court hasn't had any integrity since 1973, when it cynically decided that murdering babies is some kind of universal right. And his "clever" splitting of hairs will soon become an abject failure, because bargains with the Left are never worth anything for long. Leftists will always say anything, and concede anything—until the moment they can seize enough power to kill yet another portion of the people's liberty.

Back in 1982, President Reagan **made a deal** with a Democrat House that was led by his "friend," the bulbous-nosed Speaker Tip O'Neill. In exchange for a tax increase, the Dems would make some major budget cuts. Naturally, the tax increase happened, but the budget cuts did not. O'Neill had lied. That's just what liberals do.

Ronald Reagan really thought he had a deal. He wasn't intentionally double-crossing the American people. But after 30 more years of leftist lies, the Chief Justice should have known better. Worst of all, he had an opportunity to side with Justices Scalia, Kennedy, Thomas, and Alito in voting to kill not just the mandate, but the whole nightmare of ObamaCare in its entirety. He blew it, willfully.

So now John Roberts is leaving the people and going to live among his new friends, the subhumans. That's an accurate term for creatures like Ginsburg, Breyer, Kagan, Sotomayor, Obama, and all the rest—because they lie, steal, and destroy so much that they have no more humanity than Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Mao, the Castros, Guevara, or "Pol Pot and others," including Senator Durbin.

G.W. Bush and John McCain routinely allowed the Dems to smear conservatives without a peep of opposition. We've all noticed lately that Mitt Romney isn't letting that happen. In most instances, he and his campaign are quick to refute the lies spewed by the Dems and the MSM—and counter-attack, to boot.

The rest of us should do the same. We should continue to seek redress in the courts—but not to expect salvation from them. Lawfare is certainly one of the weapons that we need to employ, just as Marxists, Fascists, and Islamists do. But we must also redouble our efforts to thwart, obstruct, and defeat them at every opportunity.

The enemy we face today, freedom-killing Statism, is no less a threat to liberty than the one Winston Churchill **spoke of** on 4 June 1940, in the wake of Dunkirk. We must fight our enemy in precisely the same way, and never again surrender as John Roberts has done so cravenly.

The Rules of the Game by Don John, 5 May 2011

If a Republican president had ordered a secret mission into a neutral country—without receiving permission or even informing that country's government—and then proceeded to kill a man without giving him a trial, the Democrats and the mainstream media would be beside themselves with rage and righteous indignation. And when they learned that information gleaned from torture had been employed to help lead U.S. forces to the target, they would be calling loudly for the president's impeachment.

But when a Democrat president does all those things, the Dems and the media say we're all supposed to rejoice. How can they say that? Because they are nakedly partisan. In their world, there's an excuse for everything they do, and none for the GOP. They never want a Republican to succeed at anything.

When President Bush invaded Iraq—with Congressional approval and a coalition of 39 countries in support of 17 United Nations resolutions—it was called "an illegal war," and "going it alone," and "cowboy diplomacy."

In December 2006, Senator Obama called President Bush's planned surge in Iraq an "escalation." By that standard, I guess D-Day was an escalation, too.

In April 2007, Senator Reid famously proclaimed "This war is lost." In September 2007, Senator Clinton called General Petraeus a liar, saying she had to suspend her disbelief at his testimony about remarkable progress in Iraq. Around that same time, MoveOn called him "General Betrayus."

And then there's the late, unlamented Congressman John Murtha, a Marine veteran of the Vietnam War who constantly pushed bogus stories about our Marines in Iraq. This led to courts martial for eight Marines who supposedly killed innocent civilians in the town of Haditha. All eight men were found innocent, but neither Murtha nor the media ever apologized.

This partisanship isn't limited to war. It happens every day on the domestic front, too. **Here's** a short but

illuminating example.

If Republicans played by the same sleazy, partisan rules as the Democrats, they would decry the killing of Osama Bin Laden, they'd cheer for Qaddafi to hang on in Libya, and they'd hope that all those deposed non-Islamist Middle Eastern dictators get replaced by Muslim Brotherhood fascists.

Ugly? Unpatriotic? Unfair? That's how Democrats act all the time.

"The Republican Threat to Voting" by Don John, 27 Apr 2011

Today in an **editorial with that title**, the *New York Times* gets out its Stradivarius once again, to play the classic tunes of woe and pity for people who don't have a photo I.D., which would be required under many states' new laws designed to prevent voter fraud.

Before the 1980s, of course, relatively few people in the world had such I.D.'s. But in 2011, it is nearly impossible to lead any kind of active, involved life in America *without* acquiring a photo I.D.—sometimes several of them.

The Gray Lady's editors claim that "Anyone who has stood on the long lines at a motor vehicle office knows that it isn't easy to get such documents. For working people, it could mean giving up a day's wages." And they bemoan the fact that "Before they can register, Kansans will have to produce a proof of citizenship, such as a birth certificate. Tough luck if you don't happen to have one in your pocket when you're at the county fair and you pass the voter registration booth."

For the *New York Times* to complain about the inefficiency of government is the height of hypocrisy. And it's not a question of happening to have a birth certificate in your pocket when a convenient voter-registration opportunity presents itself to you on a silver platter. The essential truth is this: if you can't be bothered to acquire a valid photo I.D. in today's America, you are either (a) an illegal immigrant, or (b) too **feckless** to be considered competent to vote.

To its credit, though, the *Times* does hit the mark on one point: the overwhelming majority of feckless Americans are Democrats.

A Craven Capitulation by Don John, 9 Apr 2011

I'm not familiar with the authors of the story below. But Weisman and Levitz seem like they're from another planet. I'll bet they're from the Journal's famously non-conservative news staff, rather than its editorial staff. If they were actual conservatives of any kind, they'd know enough to capitalize Tea Party, and not randomly insert a hyphen between the two words. They'd also be familiar with the what Tea Party people actually expected the House GOP to achieve in this week's confrontation.

The size of the budget cuts being considered was paltry enough at \$61 billion. But the final figure of "up to \$39 billion" is an insult, in view of the fact that it isn't accompanied by *any* of the four riders that the Tea Party really wanted: defunding Planned Parenthood's abortion mills, defunding NPR, defunding ObamaCare, and blocking the EPA's dictatorial, unconstitutional, economy-killing regulations. If *any two* of the four were defunded, we would have been happy with much less than \$39 billion (for now). But the GOP delivered none of the four riders.

And so Friday night's deal with Obama and Reid is nothing but a craven capitulation, an utter defeat for a GOP that rarely displays enough backbone, and never seems to know its own strength. As Hugh Hewitt **wrote** recently, "The majority in the House of Representatives isn't just 'one-half of one-third.' That majority holds a veto. Nothing happens in D.C. unless the House GOP goes along. Nothing at all." But in order to exercise that veto, the Republicans have to be ready to shut down the government—and possibly more than once. If they're not, they might as well turn everything back over to Chairman Maobama and let him ruin the country just as fast as he wants to.

—Don John, 9 Apr 2011

Activists give Boehner a nod of approval

by Jonathan Weisman and Jennifer Levitz, 9 Apr 2011

Leaders of the small-government, Tea Party movement are generally giving House Speaker John Boehner high marks for his leadership in the spending showdown, even though the agreement eventually reached Friday night **fell short of the cuts the Tea Party once demanded**...

O'Donnell and the Constitution by Don John, 19 Oct 2010

Recently, Christine O'Donnell said separation of Church and State isn't in the U.S. Constitution, and **idiot law students laughed at her**. But knowledgeable people know the Constitution simply says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The phrase "wall of separation between church and state" first appears in President Jefferson's 1802 letter to the Danbury Baptists. And this expression has been used ever since by anti-religion factions as some kind of proof that the Founding Fathers intended to utterly ban religion from public life. But Jefferson's letter was only meant to assure the Baptists that they'd be free to practice their faith, and Connecticut's Congregationalist majority would not be allowed to tyrannize or coerce them.

A better guide to the Founders' intent can be found in the **vast majority of their statements and actions**, which included nondenominational Christian services they attended every Sunday *in the Hall of Congress*.

The "wall of separation" reared its head again in Justice Hugo Black's opinion in *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947). But Justice Black was a Ku Klux Klansman, just like so many 20th century Democrats, including the recently (and happily) deceased Senator Robert Byrd. So much for his credibility.

The people who believe in the banning of religious from public life are, without exception, the same ones who think foul-mouthed entertainers have the right to be heard by Everyone, whether Everyone likes it or not. And most of these postmodernist numbskulls also think the Constitution contains the right to an abortion. They're wrong about that, too. In *Roe v Wade* (1973) the Supreme Court's "living constitution" freaks claimed to have discovered such a right within an "emanation from a penumbra" of a citizen's right to privacy. But the right to privacy is another thing that isn't stated in the Constitution. And in any case, it doesn't include the right to kill anyone—not even a fetus (a.k.a. *a baby*).

As Aesop said in his fable of **The Wolf and the Lamb**, any excuse will serve a tyrant.

E.J. Dionne: class warrior, economic and civic illiterate by Don John, 29 July 2010

Today's column, "**In American politics, stupidity is the name of the game**," combines economic illiteracy with petulant abuse of its opponents. The column itself is so stupid that it was pre-published online yesterday at the lunatic website **TruthDig**.

In calling for a tax increase against the "rich," Dionne cites a growing disparity in net (after-tax) income between the top and bottom earners. But he fails to mention that nearly half of all adults pay no federal income tax at all, and 86% of federal income tax receipts come from the top 25% of taxpayers. These facts mean nothing to a liberal, to whom anything that's not *equal* is bad, wrong, unfair, racist, stupid—you name it.

Then he trumpets another laughable liberal talking-point, saying "studies showing that the stimulus created or saved as many as 3 million jobs are very hard to refute." Yeah, they may be hard to refute—but that's only because they're impossible to prove in the first place, since the very terms they're couched in are impossible to verify.

Finally, Dionne bemoans the fact that small states have just as many Senators as large states, making it much harder to "get anything done." Dig it, Mr. TruthDig: the Founding Fathers did this on purpose—firstly, to recognize the sovereignty of our Republic's member states; and secondly, for the very purpose of cooling off any movement to make sudden, sweeping changes. The Founders knew that while most new ideas may sound good in concept, they have a tendency to be very wrong in practice.

Earlier this year, Mike Rosen of the *Denver Post* **traced E.J. Dionne's transition** from respectably liberal, to left-liberal, to delusional-left:

Clueless in New York by Don John, 28 July 2010

David Margolick's piece "**Maybe I Am Chopped Liver**" (5 Nov 2006) was a review of David Mamet's book of essays *The Wicked Son: Anti-Semitism, Jewish self-hatred, and the Jews*. The review included the following passage, which Terry Teachout calls a summation of elite opinion on Mamet's views:

On Israel, Mamet's problem isn't timing but oversimplification. That Israel represents so much of what he admires in contemporary Jewish life, that he has become the lineal descendant of another Hollywood figure — Ben Hecht — should not blind him to its faults, nor lead him to caricature its critics. Not all Jewish criticism of Israel is self-hatred, and not all gentile criticism is anti-Semitic. Jews who sympathize with the Palestinians are not necessarily neurotic. Few Jews consider Zionism "criminal," and are there any who condone suicide bombing? And, by the way, not all Israeli crimes are "imaginary."

A clueless NYT hack, Mr. Margolick unwittingly validated Mr. Mamet's main points—because most Jewish criticism of Israel **is** self-hatred, most Gentile criticism of Israel **is** anti-Semitic, most Jews who sympathize with the Palestinians **are** neurotic, and most of the crimes Israel gets accused of **are** imaginary.

Not a zero-sum game by Don John, 28 July 2010

I'm not a professional economist—just a rational human being. As you may have noticed, I reserve the term "leftist" for **really bad people**. I call Ruth Marcus a centrist, because even though she's a liberal, she sometimes writes some good columns. However, her "**GOP peddling the same old tax nostrums**" (27 July 2010) is economically illiterate and intellectually dishonest.

She bleats that the Bush tax cuts resulted in smaller Federal tax revenues *relative to the Gross Domestic Product*—ignoring the fact that both the GDP and Federal tax revenues skyrocketed between 2002 and 2008. **Both went up approximately 36%**.

It's clear that the increased economic activity that was made possible by the Bush tax cuts put more money into the hands of the people *and* the government. A rising tide, as they say, lifts all boats.

Ms. Marcus also says that the "rich" are less likely than the rest of us to "spend" any extra money that the government allows them to keep. But that assertion confuses saving (and more importantly, investing) with hoarding, and is **refuted here**.

Finally, she cites the fact that America's *overall* tax burden is slightly lower than that of the average developed country, while ignoring the fact that our *corporate* tax rate—you know, the one on companies that can hire a lot of people and "spread the wealth around," to coin a phrase—is **nearly the highest** of all industrial nations. Japan's is very slightly higher, by some measures. But that's the only one higher than the USA.

A Facebook Exchange by P.C. and Crash KC, 19 Apr 2010

On April 15, a woman we'll call Mrs. H. posted this nuanced, well-informed, sophisticated statement on Facebook: "Mrs. H. thinks any member of the "Tea Party" should be publicly stoned. I can't believe that such ignorant, racist, homophobic people still exist."

This kind of stupidity could not go uncorrected. [So two fine conservatives, P.C. and Crash KC, replied.](#)

Iran may have to be vaporized by Don John, 10 Feb 2010

And that would require a military coup in the U.S.

The lunatic regime that runs Iran has promised to deliver a "**punch**" to the West, on or about February 11. There is a possibility that this will consist of an EMP, or electromagnetic pulse: a massive nuclear explosion high above a country or region, which will instantaneously destroy nearly all electronic systems and devices. Any area hit by an EMP is cast back into the technology of the 1840s—but of course with few of the tools, devices, systems, and infrastructure that people actually used in the 1840s. In other words, the people are condemned to chaos, mass starvation, illness, and death.

Much of America's weaponry, especially nuclear missiles, is deep underground and insulated from EMP's. Should the Iranians even *attempt* to do such a heinous deed to the United States (or indeed, *any* country), the proper response will be for our military to unleash a thermonuclear holocaust that will utterly vaporize Iran and all its people, leaving no

evidence that any civilization ever existed there.

This will be a great pity, because most of Iran's people are good, and are hoping to somehow overthrow the madmen who've been ruling them for 31 years. But an example will have to be made, for the enlightenment of the rest of the world: this is what happens when you attack America.

In the autumn of 2001, the United States might have chosen to retaliate for 9/11 by simply vaporizing Kabul, Baghdad, Damascus, and Tripoli, making an example of those four cities. Instead, we chose a far more noble, difficult, and costly course of action: to invade and liberate Afghanistan, and make plans to eventually invade and liberate Iraq.

The noble/difficult/costly way is not currently an option with regard to Iran. "Exemplary vaporization" will have to do. Unfortunately, the current regime in Washington is almost as lunatic as the one in Tehran. It would never agree to such violence. The U.S. regime will have to be removed by a military coup—but only temporarily, while our military does what is necessary. Afterwards, it can be returned to office, if not to power.

***Howard Zinn, Burn in Hell* by Don John, 27 Jan 2010**

Zinn (24 Aug 1922 - 27 Jan 2010) is best known as the author of the notorious anti-American screed *A People's History of the United States*, which is actually used as a textbook in some moonbat schools. David Horowitz calls the book [a Stalinist cartoon](#):

"It is certainly disgraceful that a political hack like Zinn—who still thinks America started the Korean War and who has rallied to the cause of every Communist enemy of the United States from Stalin to Castro to Hugo Chavez (not unlike *The Nation* itself)—should be an icon of the American Historical Association. Or that he should be a classroom authority throughout the university system and have his discredited Marxist trash shoved down unsuspecting student throats."

Zinn turned against his country and its allies when, as a bombardier in World War II, he got into a tizzy about civilian casualties (as if he were the only one who every faced such a quandary). This weakness of character led him to a 60-year career of America-bashing. Zinn was so extreme in his reflexive hatred of America and the West that he rivalled Noam Chomsky as a living caricature of a self-loathing, knee-jerk leftist. He warped the mind of one youngster in particular: Matt Damon had the misfortune to live next door to Zinn, and he swallowed everything Zinn preached to him. I sometimes wonder what else he may have swallowed.

As an adult, Damon converted a number of showbiz folk to the cult of Zinn: Danny Glover, Bruce Springsteen, Marissa Tomei, Josh Brolin, and Eddie Vedder became lickspittle acolytes of the old America-hater.

With Zinn's original tizzy in mind, let us read over his grave two quotations from Arthur "Bomber" Harris, head of Britain's Bomber Command in WW2:

"Dresden was a mass of munitions works, an intact government center, and a key transportation point to the East. It is now none of these things."

"I do not personally regard the whole of the remaining cities of Germany as worth the bones of one British grenadier."

Amen.

—Don John, 27 Jan 2010

More on Zinn [here](#).

***They Think You're Stupid* by Don John, 14 Aug 2009**

Here are three ridiculous columns by pompous, elite liberals—and my comment on each.

[Winston Churchill Was a Bolshevik](#), by Joe Conason, 14 Aug 2009: When Churchill backed National Health, he didn't have the advantage we have: the retrospect of 60 horrific years of U.K. socialized medicine.

[When the Kooks Take the Stage](#) by Scot Lehigh, 14 Aug 2009: Never raise your voice to your betters, even when they're lying and trying to screw you.

[Republican Death Trip](#), by Paul Krugman, 13 Aug 2009: As if any bill would come out and say there'll be a "euthanasia chute" in every oncologist's office.

Liberals always used to complain that conservatives weren't reflective and analytical enough, and incapable of "critical thinking." But now, plenty of conservative and centrist Americans are doing just that. Unlike most

Congressmen, they've actually read the 1017-page bill known as HR 3200. They've reflected on it and analyzed it. Now they're criticizing it, out loud. *Really* loud.

The liberals don't like it one bit. They must still think we're stupid, because they insist that the bill says nothing about establishing "death panels" (for instance), or about doing away with private insurance and forcing everyone into a government plan. Well of course the bill doesn't come out and say those things. That would be really stupid. Our Congressweasels are smarter than that. When they're robbing people of freedom, they prefer stealth mode.

But "ordinary" non-elite people actually are capable of *figuring out the implications* of what the bill does say. You can peruse all 1,017 pages here: http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111_cong_bills&docid=f:h3200ih.txt.pdf

Just a few of the things people have found in HR 3200:

p. 16 Current insurance policies will be "grandfathered." But private insurance will become illegal, because when anything changes, the people involved must transfer to the public "option."

p. 29 Care will be rationed.

p. 42 Health Choices Commissioner will decides benefits for you.

p. 58 Every person will get a national I.D. health card.

p. 59 The federal government will have direct, real-time access to citizens' bank accounts, for purposes of collecting payments via Electronic Funds Transfer.

p. 72 All private insurance plans must conform to federal guidelines. Anyone who does not buy acceptable insurance will be taxed 2.5% of his income each year.

p. 195 Health bureaucrats will have access to all financial and personal records.

p. 203 The tax imposed on p. 72 shall not be treated as a tax.

p. 424 Advanced Care Planning designed to make sick old people give up and die.

p. 838 Home Visitation Programs mandate visits by parenting "experts"

The biggest weasel-word defense of ObamaCare's thinly-veiled power-grabs comes from The Master himself. He says "Here's a guarantee that I've made. If you have insurance that you like, then you will be able to keep that insurance. If you've got a doctor that you like, you will be able to keep your doctor. Nobody is trying to change what works in a system. We are trying to change what doesn't work in the system."

My first question for President Obama would be: Why not just say "I guarantee"? But my second question is more important: HOW LONG will we "be able to keep that insurance"? Two months? Five months? A year?

Introducing...Charles Blow! *by Don John, 9 Aug 2009*

What an appropriate name! I'd never heard of this preening liberal until his August 7 *New York Times* [column](#) "Health Care Hulabaloo," in which he attacks the anti-ObamaCare protesters:

...Not only are anti-reformists showing up, they're terrorizing legislators with their tomfoolery when they do. Blinded by fear and passion, armed with misinformation and misplaced anger, they descend on these meetings and hoot and holler in an attempt to shut down the debate rather than add to it. I must say that this says more about them than it does about any forthcoming legislation. Belligerence is the currency of the intellectually bankrupt...

...A Daily Kos/Research 2000 [poll released last Friday](#) found that 28 percent of Republicans don't believe that Barack Obama was born in the United States and another 30 percent are still "not sure." That's nearly 6 out of 10 Republicans refusing to accept a basic truth. Then again, this shouldn't surprise me. According to a Gallup poll released last summer, 6 in 10 Republicans also said they thought that humans were created, in their present form, [10,000 years ago](#).

Let's face it: This is no party of Einsteins. Really, it isn't. A Pew poll last month found that only 6 percent [of scientists said](#) that they were Republicans...

But the problem is that it's all *ad hominem* (yes, Mr. Blow, Republicans can speak Latin). He never addresses the protesters' arguments at all—probably because he doesn't think they could possibly have any. He's haughty, dismissive, and prejudiced. But then, [one look](#) at Mr. Blow and I'm certain that he's not qualified to be a captain in the New Haven Fire Department.

It's not surprising that only 6% of scientists admit to being Republican. People in most academic fields have reason to fear that being labelled as a conservative will hurt, or even end, their careers. Today's American academia is controlled by liberal intellectuals living cozy, tenured existences well-insulated from the realities of ordinary life. And they're so cocksure of their own moral rectitude that they're prejudiced against the work of people who disagree.

It is surprising to learn that 60% of Republicans believe that humans were created 10,000 years ago. But Mr. Blow doesn't tell you that according to the same poll, that view is also held by 40% of Independents and 38% of Democrats. That puts it in perspective: a Republican is only 1½ times as likely to believe that as another person.

Homeland Fascism *by Don John, 14 Apr 2009*

Well of course "the White House" (a.k.a. Barack Hussein Obama) distanced itself from "[the analysis](#)" by the Department of Homeland Security. Obama has a known history of distancing himself from whatever and whomever he finds inconvenient ([William Ayers](#), [Jeremiah Wright](#), [Rashid Khalidi](#), [Tony Rezko](#), [Louis Farrakhan](#)) or repellent (economic freedom; Judeo-Christian moral standards; Western culture; infants' right to life; American sovereignty and primacy; the state of Israel). And since his election by a [bunch of nincompoops](#), he now has people and institutions who can suppress conservatives *for him*.

He doesn't have to get his cotton-pickin' hands any dirtier than they already are. He's got the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Homeland Security, big-city police departments, and significant elements of the military at his disposal. With scumbag thugs like Rahm Emanuel and Dick Durbin leading the charge for him, Obama will harass and criminalize conservative (and centrist) speech and actions as much as he possibly can.

During the presidency of George W. Bush, no one was spied upon or sent to jail for favoring abortion or illegal immigration. But now, opponents of abortion and illegal immigration are eligible for such mistreatment. This is a truly chilling development.

George W. Bush was often called a fascist and a "shredder" of the Constitution.

He was neither.

Obama is both.

Bad Paper Planes *by Don John, 2 Apr 2009*

With apologies to M.I.A. ([Lyrics](#); [Video](#))

[x2]

Got bad mortgages from [Franklin Raines](#)
Nancy Pelosi takes Air Force planes
If you make any money, I'll tax you all day
I'll write another bill in a second if you wait

[x2]

Everything I do is from [J.M. Keynes](#)
[Adam Smith](#) would call it really insane
I will pick the winners, the others I'll blame
Bait-and-switch hustler makin' my name

[x4]

All I wanna do is (BANG BANG BANG BANG!)
And (KKKAAAA CHING!)
And tax your money

[x2]

Democrat plans are strange
Cap and trade and hope and change
Brewing when we pass them
Poison for the market system

[x2]

No one in the Congress has swagger like us
You're gonna get run over by an [ACORN](#) bus
We pack and deliver like GMC trucks
Already going hell just pumping that gas

[x4]

All I wanna do is (BANG BANG BANG BANG!)

And (KKKAAAA CHING!)

And tax your money

B.H.O.

Social Democracy

Got more plaintiffs' lawyers than the DNC

So, uh, no capitalist business

Some some fetuses I murder

Some I some I let live

Some some I choose to murder

Some I some I let live

The Flim-Flam Man by Don John, 5 Nov 2008

I've never much cared for H.L. Mencken's dictum that "Nobody ever went broke underestimating the taste of the American public." It has always struck me as cynical, elitist, snotty...and a little bit unpatriotic. But it rings true for me today, because the American people have elected The Flim-Flam Man as their next President.

Barack Obama has done nothing but spout a string of extravagant campaign promises that would have been laughed off the national stage if they'd been made by a white candidate *decades ago*, when the populace was supposedly much more credulous and less media-savvy than today's jaded "sophisticates." And his chief catch-word, "Change," should have been the biggest laugh-line of all, because it was a tired cliché even in those bygone days of yesteryear.

Earlier this year, Obama's hateful and grievance-mongering wife famously said that she'd never been proud of her country before. Well, I've never been ashamed of my country before—not even when I was on the Left myself. But I am today, because 52% of my countrymen have bought into the lamest of campaign hypes, at a time when we can least afford to install such an empty suit in the Oval Office.

Obama is a socialist, a transnationalist, a baby-killer, and a Jew-hater. He has promised to confiscate money from people who've earned it, and give it to worthless layabouts in the name of social (puke) justice. That ambition-crushing policy will be harmful enough to America's economic prosperity. But the Obamessiah won't stop there. He also plans to curtail international free-trade agreements which have fostered a net *increase* in jobs. And perhaps worst of all, he has promised to trash our economic growth with burdensome and costly regulations designed to reduce "global warming"—a mere hoax that's been created by statists to provide an excuse to crush capitalism and other forms of freedom.

President Obama will be certain to capitulate to foreign feces like Hugo Chavez (Venezuela), Mahmoud Ahmedinejad (Iran), Kim Jong-il (N.Korea), Evo Morales (Bolivia), and Ban Ki-Moon (United Nations). Fortunately—thanks to our military and President Bush—the situation in Iraq has been improved to the point where Obama can't get away with abandoning it without being blamed for the aftermath.

Along with henchmen like Harry Reid, Nancy Pelosi, Chuck Schumer, John Conyers, and Barney Frank, he has promised to destroy freedom of speech by effectively outlawing conservative talk-radio, while leaving untouched the leftist-dominated media of television, magazines, and newspapers.

Once Obama is in office, tens of thousands of crackpot moonbat intellectuals and functionaries will descend on Washington, hoping to assist the new administration in "fundamentally transforming" our country, i.e. completing the destruction of its economic prosperity, social fabric, national sovereignty, and moral standards.

Heaven help us. But we must also help ourselves. Let's do all we can to undermine, obstruct, and criticize these evil and Godless socialists, until their follies bring our countrymen to their senses.

To an Obama supporter by Tom and Joann, 3 Nov 2008

Dear Jackie,

Your Obama e-mail came to us apparently through a "reply to all" response to an e-mail that we were all sent.

Though we don't know you, we are willing to discuss your points on Obama.

Here are a few thoughts about Obama you may have overlooked. Consider that we really don't know anything about Obama. That is because he has concealed much of his past. His college transcripts from Occidental College, Columbia, and Harvard are all "unavailable." His master's thesis from Columbia is under faculty lockdown. His legal writings from Harvard are under faculty lockdown. He has written no scholarly reviews or legal reviews for any publications. His schedule from the Illinois State Senate is "unavailable." This man has covered up his past to an amazing extent.

There is no one from his past other than his wife who can speak on his behalf. The others from his past, he hides: William Ayers, Tony Rezko, Jeremiah Wright, Michael Pflieger, Bernadine Dohrn, Rashid Khalidi—a collection of felons, terrorists and American-hating communist revolutionaries. A man is known by the company he keeps. We would rather spend our time with someone who graduated from the bottom of his class at Annapolis than with someone who hides his past and has consorted with radical revolutionaries for over 20 years. By the way, our military academies are institutions of such rigor that any graduate from the top or bottom of a class is one who has been educated and trained to a significantly higher degree than nearly anyone graduating from a civilian university.

While you deride Senator McCain, you are incorrect in saying he voted "98%" of the time with President Bush. Remember, President Bush is not in the Senate. So, it is impossible for any senator to vote with President Bush. The president signs or vetoes bills that are passed by the Congress. What is more accurate is to look at how often a senator votes with his party. Senator McCain voted with his party 88% of the time according to the Washington Post. That percentage is fairly average among GOP senators. However, Obama voted 98% of the time with his party. Since President Bush has vetoed barely anything at all since Obama has been a senator, you could say that Obama has "voted with President Bush nearly 100% of the time."

Moving on, as far as experience is concerned, Governor Sarah Palin has more executive experience than Obama. It is not even debatable. We think most women who react negatively to Sarah Palin do so because of her pro-life positions. Supporters of abortion see a real, credible spokesperson on behalf of the rights of the unborn in Sarah Palin—and it makes them extremely uncomfortable in trying to defend the hypocrisy of abortion as "women's rights." Can you show us where there is a constitutional right to an abortion? Nope. Didn't think so. Terror will rain down on the unborn if Obama is elected.

Furthermore, you ought to be frightened as heck by a possible Obama presidency. In his autobiographies, he clearly states he is a socialist. He has a track record of advocating socialist policies and he has gone so far as to state the he believes the US Constitution was written with fundamental flaws. An Obama presidency will seek to subordinate US interests with the EU and the UN. Please do look around the world at countries which have adopted or have been forced to adopt socialism. They are not anywhere you would want to live.

Quite frankly, it is an appalling indictment on the lack of intelligence of American voters that someone as patently unqualified for the office of president as Obama is on the threshold of winning the election.

Finally, ask yourself why Hamas, the PLO, Iran's President Ahmadinejad, et al., want to see Obama as president. Is it because Obama will be a really nice guy who inspires them with a good speech? Or is it because our enemies know that an Obama presidency will weaken us against their threats? We don't know if you are old enough to remember the Jimmy Carter years. We are. It was a disaster for the economy and our national security. If that is what you want, then, God, please help us.

F.T.P. by Don John, 26 Oct 2008

Contains foul language

Dear Mr. Obama,

I don't make anything like \$250,000 a year. Not net, not even gross. But there is no reason to believe that a Democrat Congress will keep your tax increase threshold as high as that. And there is no reason to believe that you would veto a much lower threshold if the "wisdom" of Pelosi and Reid submitted one for your presidential signature.

So who do you want to "spread the wealth around" to? The poor? There are no poor people in America. As a number of foreigners have noted, America is the country where the "poor" people are fat, and have cars, cell phones, and TV sets. The truly destitute who have none of those things are mostly drug addicts, alcoholics, and lazy louts and layabouts who think the world owes them a living.

Social justice? I can feel the vomit rising in my gorge. There is no social justice in taking money from me and giving it to someone else. The only social justice is *freedom*.

"Spreading the wealth around" really means spreading the poverty around. Seventy years of Soviet communism are eloquent proof of that. So are five years of LBJ, six of Nixon, and four of Carter. Look at prosperous South Korea.

Now look at North Korea, ravaged by years of socialist policies under a Dear Leader whose egotistical style you seem to emulate. Look back just twenty years, and see how Germany's four decades of partition ended up: the capitalist West, successful and powerful, and the socialist East, a failed state if ever there was one.

You say that poor people in one of the Democrats' favorite constituencies, Other Countries, need my help? Poor foreigners have no claim on my money either. They are the responsibility of their own countries and cultures. If they want less poverty, they should become more capitalist. Look at China.

Besides, we can't just give handouts to poor foreigners. Their kleptocrat socialist overlords keep the money for themselves. Look at the United Nations' disastrous "Oil for Food" program. You say you have a better program? Sure. Oil for Food was supposed to be a better program, too. Socialists always say their next freedom-crushing scheme will *really* work.

You say my money must be confiscated to help stop global warming? There is no global warming. It is a scam, a sham, and a hoax concocted as cover for more socialist interference in the lives of free people.

When a politician says he's going to take my money and give it to other people, I have just two things to say to him. Fuck those people. And fuck you.

Cafeteria "Catholics" and Human Dignity by August West, 23 Oct 2008

I continue to find the trend of cafeteria "Catholics" who [support pro-abortion politicians](#) to be mind-boggling.

First, the auxiliary bishop quoted at length in E.J. Dionne's article is not what you would call an orthodox Catholic bishop.

Second, he repeats the classic (but illogical) dissenting Catholic line: sure abortion is wrong, but candidates who say they promote more social programs to help the poor, downtrodden, etc... will help to bring about a culture where abortions become less common.

This is fallacious. First, candidates like Obama et al., support legislatively abortion-on-demand, without restriction. Second, dissenting Catholics misinterpret what are referred to as the non-negotiable issues: abortion, embryonic stem-cell research, human cloning, euthanasia, and homosexual "unions." Traditional Catholic teaching holds that these issues deal with the essential and fundamental core of humanity, the essence of life itself. The evil of these outweigh any other evil. Politicians who try to assert like Clinton did (make abortion safe, legal, and rare) are trying to put a band-aid on a patient who is hemorrhaging.

It is not making the Catholic Church a "single-issue" voice. Rather, faithful adherence to the five non-negotiable issues means that one accepts what the Church is teaching about the very sanctity of life.

It doesn't matter how many programs for the poor one establishes. If Obama thinks that it is fine to kill babies in the womb or the petri dish, or to let grandpa die at the hands of a dignified suicide assistant, then he is not capable of seeing every single person as having absolute unassailable dignity. There will always be his ability to see some people as disposable. And as long as he sees people this way, he's not going to get it right on how to treat the poor.

Liberal Tolerance and the Unfairness Doctrine by Don John, 20 Oct 2008

Liberals are famously tolerant. They're *so* accepting and understanding of America-hating preachers, unrepentant domestic terrorists, anti-capitalist dictators, and mobsters who launder money for leftist causes. Most would like to normalize every sexual practice under the sun. Huge numbers of them favor every possible form of abortion, including the euphemistically-named "partial birth" version which for thousands of years was called infanticide.

The mainstream media (*New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, Associated Press, Reuters, ABC, NBC, CBS, PMSNBC, CNN, NPR, PBS, et cetera) has relentlessly opposed George W. Bush for the past eight years and told countless lies about him, his party, and his policies. But he never tried to silence their freedom of speech—not even when the NYT [revealed](#) state secrets connected with [national security](#). When Bush's popularity was at its height, he probably could have made some moves in that direction. But he knew that would be a violation of the First Amendment. So instead, back then, all we heard was a constant drone from liberal celebrities like Tim Robbins, Natalie Maines, and Michael Moore about the "chilling effect" on free speech that was posed by citizens who chose to boycott their products.

Liberals will tolerate just about anything—except disagreement with their own opinions and policies. Now they're getting ready to use an expected Congressional super-majority to shut down conservative talk radio, and leave television,

newspapers, and magazines (media dominated by liberal viewpoints) free to say any rubbish they choose.

In 1949, when the Orwellianly-named [Fairness Doctrine](#) was originally instituted, it was all about regulating what was (at that time) a limited commodity: the "public airwaves." There were only so many frequencies for the broadcast of radio and television, and it seemed reasonable to ensure that these precious resources were not abused.

But technology has long since overtaken that argument and rendered it meaningless. Cables, satellites, and telephone lines now transmit audio, video, photos, and text in ways that were unimaginable in 1949, and scarcely more so in 1979.

Government still has the right to control the *allocation* of radio frequencies, in order to preserve clarity of signals. It has the right to regulate the public streets, too, in order to assure safety and freedom of movement. But it has no more right to regulate broadcast content than it would have a right to regulate the content of newspapers and magazines which, after all, are distributed and delivered via the public streets.

YOU are "the rich" *by Don John, 16 Oct 2008*

Most voters who are under age 50 don't know what life is like under the heel of a classic liberal tax-and-spend regime. Obama's economic policies would be a throwback to the bad old days of Carter and LBJ. Those presidents used to drone on about change, too. "Change" is among the oldest political clichés in the book. And they'd always claim that they wouldn't increase taxes on you—only on "the rich." But it always turned out that if you made any kind of a decent living (top 40% or so), YOU were "the rich."

Obama claims he's only going to raise the taxes of the top 5%. That's bad enough, because those tend to be the folks who create and maintain the business that enable the rest of us to make a decent living. But Obama's rosy scenario of *cutting* taxes for the other 95% of us won't hold for long. In fact, it's not even accurate now.

To begin with, it's a deliberate deception. Dear Leader Obama knows very well that only the top 60% pay any taxes at all. And the rest of the numbers don't add up a whole lot better. Many of the Democrats' promised spending programs will have to be cut—or, alternatively, the tax increase will have to apply to the top 15% instead of just the top 5%. If the Dems control Congress *and* the White House, which alternative do you think they'll choose?

And they won't stop at 15%. By early 2011 (right after the mid-term elections), the tax increase will have reached the top 40%: that means YOU. And the Dems won't care a bit, because they've still got their base: (1) the bottom 40% who pay no tax at all, and (2) large numbers of better-off folk who suffer from the psychosis of social guilt.

Just what is it that the Democrats plan to spend so much money on? Well, it's two basic areas. Between 5% and 10% of the increased spending will be on measures designed to halt global warming—which is a hoax and a chimera anyway. The rest of the projects Obama has said "we're going to invest in" (waste money on) fall under the general heading of taking your money and giving it to scumbags and lazy layabouts. IT'S WHAT LIBERALS DO.

On the Other Hand *by Don John, 14 Oct 2008*

This morning, the following e-mail message was forwarded to me by several people.

Racism and Politics in the USA

Obama/Biden vs McCain/Palin. What if things were switched around?..... think about it. Would the country's collective point of view be different? Could racism be the culprit? Ponder the following:

What if the Obamas had paraded five children across the stage, including a three month old infant and an unwed, pregnant teenage daughter?

What if John McCain was a former president of the Harvard Law Review? What if Barack Obama finished fifth from the bottom of his graduating class?

What if McCain had only married once, and Obama was a divorcee?

What if Obama was the candidate who left his first wife after a severe disfiguring car accident, when she no longer measured

up to his standards?

What if Obama had met his second wife in a bar and had a long affair while he was still married?

What if Michelle Obama was the wife who not only became addicted to pain killers but also acquired them illegally through her charitable organization?

What if Cindy McCain graduated from Harvard?

What if Obama had been a member of the Keating Five? (The Keating Five were five United States Senators accused of corruption in 1989, igniting a major political scandal as part of the larger Savings and Loan crisis of the late 1980s and early 1990s.)

What if McCain was a charismatic, eloquent speaker?

What if Obama couldn't read from a teleprompter?

What if Obama was the one who had military experience that included discipline problems and a record of crashing seven planes?

What if Obama was the one who was known to display publicly, on many occasions, a serious anger management problem?

What if Michelle Obama's family had made their money from beer distribution?

What if the Obamas had adopted a white child?

You could easily add to this list. If these questions reflected reality, do you really believe the election numbers would be as close as they are?

This is what racism does. It covers up, rationalizes and minimizes positive qualities in one candidate and emphasizes negative qualities in another when there is a color difference.

Educational Background:

Barack Obama: Columbia University - B.A. Political Science with a Specialization in International Relations. Harvard - Juris Doctor (J.D.) Magna Cum Laude

Joseph Biden: University of Delaware - B.A. in History and B.A. in Political Science. Syracuse University College of Law - Juris Doctor (J.D.)

vs.

John McCain: United States Naval Academy - Class rank: 894 of 899

Sarah Palin: Hawaii Pacific University - 1 semester. North Idaho College - 2 semesters - general study. University of Idaho - 2 semesters – journalism. Matanuska-Susitna College - 1 semester. University of Idaho - 3 semesters - B.A. in Journalism.

Education isn't everything, but this is about the two highest offices in the land as well as our standing in the world. You make the call.

Well isn't that just a big, steaming mound of sanctimony? It manages to be snotty and elitist while simultaneously engaging in a favorite activity of many liberals: accusing America of being racist. They just think they're *so-o-o* perceptive, *so-o-o* sophisticated, *so-o-o* caring, *so-o-o* tolerant. It simply drips with condescension. This was my response:

On the Other Hand

What if, in his famous speech on March 18, 2008, Barack Obama had referred to his black grandmother as "a typical black person"? Why wasn't it racist for him to refer to his white grandmother as "a typical white person"?

The polls are saying that in this year's presidential election, 95% of black voters will be voting for the black candidate. What if 95% of the white voters were voting for the white candidate? Would that be racist? And if so, why?

Robert E. Lee finished at the top of his class at West Point. Ulysses S. Grant finished near the bottom; but he's the one who led the Union army (the one that freed the slaves) to victory in the Civil War. Which man was the better leader?

Which man possessed the better moral compass?

What fancy Ivy League college did Andrew Jackson or Abraham Lincoln attend? How about Booker T. Washington, George Washington Carver, or Martin Luther King Jr.? What if Republicans ridiculed people of humble birth, just for not having Ivy League credentials like Barack Obama, Michelle Obama, Joe Biden, Franklin Raines, and Barney Frank?

What if Barack Obama had been held captive and tortured for 5 1/2 years? What if he had rejected offers of early release, and instead chose to remain a prisoner of war, providing significant spiritual and medical help to his fellow prisoners?

What if John McCain had worked closely with, and shared the world-view of, an unrepentant American terrorist, and a Palestinian who supports terrorism and Jew-hatred? What if John McCain had been a member of a racist church for 1,000 Sundays?

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=YThjYTU1ZDBjNmQ2YzZwNzU1MmYwN2JiMWY0ZGI0NDA=>

<http://1000sundays.wordpress.com/author/1000sundays/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yxLZ8xhkeZ8>

<http://chronicle.uchicago.edu/971106/justice.shtml>

What if John McCain had a long history of working with, and contributing to, a group whose major activities involve vote-fraud on a massive scale?

<http://wikileaks.org/leak/chicago-the-barack-obama-campaign.pdf>

<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=Y2UxY2F1MWZhMzFkYTE1MDQ3NjY3OWRhYmIwMjA3Y2Q=>

<http://www.clevelandleader.com/node/7231>

<http://www.cnn.com/2008/POLITICS/10/09/acorn.fraud.claims/index.html>

http://www.nypost.com/seven/10102008/news/politics/1_voter__72_registrations_132965.htm

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/09/acorn_obama_and_the_mortgage_m.html

http://www.nypost.com/seven/10052008/postopinion/opedcolumnists/voter_fraud_expected_to_be_rampant_132170.htm

What if John McCain had bought a house with the help of a shady mobster who was involved in fraud, money-laundering, and influence-peddling?

<http://www.thetownofcicero.com/news/contentview.asp?c=186730>

<http://cbs2chicago.com/local/rezko.trial.verdict.2.740375.html>

<http://www.suntimes.com/news/politics/432197,CST-NWS-obama18.article>

http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2008/06/27/grim_proving_ground_for_obamas_housing_policy/

Any one of the above would immediately end the campaign of any white Republican candidate for President.

What if Sarah Palin said that the U.S. had kicked Hezbollah out of Lebanon (which no one has ever done)? Or talked of visiting a restaurant in her home town which actually closed 18 years ago? Or said that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt went on television to address the nation, shortly after the stock market crash in 1929? Would we ever hear the end of the media sneering about those gaffes, both on news shows and on comedy programs? Would Palin rightly be called a moron for uttering such howlers? Well, Joe Biden has said all those things just in the past month, and the mainstream media has barely mentioned them at all.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122325448093406451.html>

<http://hotair.com/archives/2008/09/23/biden-on-fdrs-management-of-the-1929-crash/>

What if Cindy McCain repeatedly complained of how hard and unfair life is "in this country," the way Michelle Obama has?

"Like many young people coming out of college, with their MA's and BA's and PhD's and MPh's coming out so mired in debt that they have to forego the careers of their dreams, see, because when you're mired in debt, you can't afford to be a teacher or a nurse or social worker, or a pastor of a Church, or to run a small non-profit organization, or to do research for a small community group, or to be a community organizer, because the salaries that you'll earn in those jobs won't cover the cost of the degree that it took to get the job."

—Michelle Obama, April 2008 speech

"The bar is shifting and moving on people all the time. And folks are struggling like never before, working harder than ever, believing that their hard work will lead to some reward, some payoff. But what they find is that they get there, and then the bar has changed. Things are different. It wasn't enough. So you have to work even harder. And see, what happens when you live in a nation where the vast majority of Americans are struggling every day to reach an every-

shifting and moving bar, then what happens in that nation is that people do become isolated."
—Michelle Obama, 2 May 2008 speech

What if John McCain sent teams of scumbag lawyers to harass people who dared to criticize him?
<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=YjUwZWlwZTNhY2Y0YTFkYzFmZTIyZWUwZW5k4ZGM=>

What if Barack Obama had been officially exonerated in a scandal that happened two decades ago, and McCain kept trying to dredge it up to deflect attention from his own scandals?
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keating_five#Glenn_and_McCain:_cleared_of_impropriety_but_criticized_for_poor_judgment

What if John McCain lied repeatedly about Barack Obama's tax and health care proposals, and falsely inflated his own?
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122385651698727257.html>
http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2008/10/americans_deserve_a_real_healt.html
<http://wsj.com/article/SB122360618747721991.html>

It's not the color of Barack Obama's skin. It's the content of his character. He's not some post-partisan, centrist politician. He is a socialist, a transnationalist, and an abortion absolutist who intends to guarantee a dead baby to every woman who wants one—even if it survives a botched abortion. And he is so highly partisan that he was ranked the most liberal Senator of 2007.

<http://article.nationalreview.com/print/?q=N2NmMGNkMTdkZWJkZW5kZWRkMjRkNjY5NjllNzZlYjkyNmY=>
<http://www.creators.com/opinion/tony-blankley/the-man-who-never-was.html>
<http://nj.nationaljournal.com/voteratings/>
<https://www.commentarymagazine.com/viewarticle.cfm/special-preview-br--obama-s-leftism-12961?page=all>
<http://www.babalublog.com/archives/009577.html>
<http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=MzQ4YTY4YjQyMzRjYjA5MGZlNDBiZTkWYmEyODg5NTc=&w=MA>
http://www.spectator.org/dsp_article.asp?art_id=14015

In addition, Senator Obama and his wife have a rather sinister, authoritarian tone at times:
<http://www.lvrj.com/opinion/19595329.html>

"Barack Obama will require you to work. He is going to demand that you shed your cynicism. That you put down your divisions. That you come out of your isolation, that you move out of your comfort zone. That you push yourselves to be better. And that you engage. Barack will never allow you to go back to your lives as usual, uninvolved, uninformed."
—Michelle Obama, February 2008 speech

People are actually ready to give Barack Obama a free pass on a lot of things *because he is a black man*. If McCain, or any other white politician, spouted all those feel-good platitudes and promises without committing to specific, rational explanations—and then adjusted to changing facts by prefacing his new positions with "as I've always said"—the media and the public would laugh him out of town.

I would happily vote for a black man like Michael Steele or Kenneth Blackwell, or an Indian-American like Bobby Jindal. But I don't think an Obama presidency will be very good for prosperity, or freedom—or the Western culture which bestowed those gifts on all of us.

***Bill O'Reilly Is a Lunatic* by Don John, 28 Sept 2008**

On 25 Sept 2008, the host of Fox News Channel's *The O'Reilly Factor* turned into a lunatic populist mountebank, saying, on his radio show, that the financial crisis "is not Clinton's fault...It happened on Bush's watch...It's Bush's fault." He also bloviated that other conservative radio hosts are idiots and liars.

Well, Billy boy, let's get into the No-Spin Zone, shall we? President Carter created sub-prime mortgages with the [Community Reinvestment Act](#). But they weren't widely offered until the 1990s. That's when President Clinton [twisted Wall Street's arm](#) by threatening companies that refused to offer these ridiculous financial products on a massive scale.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were run almost entirely by and for Democrat politicians, because they ~~entered~~ pandered to "the underprivileged." Pals of both parties [received campaign money](#) from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac PAC's and employees. But the top three recipients were Senators Christopher Dodd (\$165,400), Barack Obama

(\$126,349), and John Kerry (\$111,000)—all Democrats.

Those dollar figures represent contributions made between 1989 and 2008. Christopher Dodd and John Kerry were in the Senate in 1989. But Barack Obama has only been there since 2005. On a pro-rata basis, his total would be approximately **\$631,745**.

Since 2001, its very first year, the Bush Administration [has given repeated warnings](#) that subprime mortgages—and the fiscal recklessness they engendered—would eventually wreak havoc on the economy.

In 2005, the GOP-controlled Senate Banking Committee [adopted a strong reform bill](#). John McCain endorsed it in a Senate speech. The Democrats, although a minority at the time, abused the Senate's unique rules and prevented the bill from coming to a vote.

Also in 2005, John McCain was a co-sponsor of [S.190](#), "a bill to address the regulation of secondary mortgage market enterprises," another reform effort that was blocked by Democrats.

In 2008 alone, President Bush asked the Democrat-controlled Congress [on 17 separate occasions](#), to help him reform the system and prevent the chaos that could result from the unintended consequences of this massive government meddling in the market. Congress didn't even begin to act until July, when it was too late to prevent a crisis.

Blaming the current Wall Street crisis on Bush is like blaming him for the weather, or the 9/11 attacks. What will we hear next from O'Reilly? That the crisis was "an inside job"? Well, maybe it was: **inside the Democrat Party!**

Will: A Weasel Once Again by Don John, 24 Sept 2008

Over the years, George Will has written hundreds of splendid columns. And there were periods, most notably the 1970s, when he and William Buckley were nearly the only conservative voices on network television. But he went defeatist on [surveillance](#) and [Iraq](#) rather early on, and has been equivocal, at best, on [civil rights for terrorists](#).

He managed to maintain some credibility with consistently wise essays on economic and ecological topics. But now he's gone and stuck his foot far into his mouth with his appalling "[McCain Loses His Head](#)"—a column which is not merely inaccurate, but truly reckless.

John McCain does have some actual flaws. And before he clinched the GOP nomination, I delighted in enumerating them. But none of McCain's faults come within a light-year of the diriment impediments that apply to his opponent.

To criticize McCain without also criticizing the other side does a disservice to conservatism, and to America. The Democrat candidate isn't Joseph Lieberman, or Hillary Clinton, or even John Kerry. The country could survive four years of them; maybe even eight.

But George Will has willfully chosen to ignore the fact that Barack Obama is the [farthest left candidate](#) ever nominated by the Democrat Party: a socialist, transnationalist, race-baiting grievance-monger whose presidency could wreak serious, long-lasting damage on America, capitalism, and Western culture.

I won't remove Will's columns from this site. But from now on, I'll be reading him about as often as I read Maureen Dowd, Paul Krugman, and Richard Cohen—and with just as much suspicion.

It's Good to be Fighting Them by Don John, 10 July 2008

I never expected the Iraq war to be easy. But I've supported it from the start, because people who want us dead must be fought. I have no patience for those who say that our attack on Iraq was "unjust" because (1) there were no WMD and (2) there was no operational connection between Iraq and 9/11.

Even if both those statements are true (and they may not be), there were plenty of reasons for us to depose Saddam Hussein and liberate Iraq. He was a very bad man who tortured and killed many hundreds of thousands of his own people, and those in neighboring countries like Iran and Kuwait. He tried to have a former U.S. president assassinated. He financed and rewarded terrorist acts in Israel, and harbored terrorists in Iraq. [He liked what happened on 9/11](#). People are entitled to hold that opinion, and many millions do. But they'd better stay out of our reach, because Americans are entitled to kill every last one of them.

Strategically, Iraq is a great place to occupy and/or control on a long-term basis. It's right in the middle of the Middle East, and contains an enormous amount of oil which shouldn't be allowed to fall into the wrong hands.

For all these reasons, I've always supported the decision to liberate Iraq. Even when things were going badly,

and many mistakes were being made, and many American troops and innocent Iraqis were being killed, it was right to be fighting against the jihadis. They hate us and want to kill us all.

Yes, the appeasers are right about one thing. There were more jihadis in Iraq after the invasion than there were before. But since jihadis must be fought, what better place to fight them? The mountains of Afghanistan? The jungles of Indonesia? The streets of America?

It's an existential struggle. They cannot tolerate us as we are, and we cannot tolerate them as they are. The jihadis, too, are right about something: one side must kill enough of its enemies to make them surrender.

It's our job to make the jihadis surrender. Whether we have to kill another 5 thousand, another 50 thousand, or another 500 thousand doesn't matter, as long as we keep our casualties low. I was dismayed recently to read an estimate that we've killed only 4 or 5 times as many of them as they have of us. Maybe that estimate is wrong. We should try for a ratio of at least 20-1, and perhaps even 100-1.

All of the foregoing paragraphs are based on judgments. Liberals hate judgments that lead to conflict. They love to say "Who are we to judge?" To them, there are no absolutes—except, of course, that "Bush lied."

Hyping China vs. America by Don John, 9 July 2008

China's economy to become world's biggest in 2035: study

Associated Press, 8 July 2008

China's economy will overtake that of the United States by 2035 and be twice its size by midcentury, a study released Tuesday by a US research organization concluded. The report by economist Albert Keidel of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace said China's rapid growth is driven by domestic demand more than exports, and will sustain high single-digit growth rates well into the 21st century...

Stop it right there! Leave it to anti-American moonbats like the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (a disgrace to the name of a great capitalist) to trumpet the coming economic triumph of Asian totalitarians over America's free-market republic.

China's economy has been growing rapidly in recent years, since the introduction of something like free-market capitalism a mere 15 years ago. But the Chinese will have to continue liberalizing *everything* in order to sustain anything like their recent growth.

The economist [Todd Buchholtz](#) points out that the today's "scissors economy" forces more efficiency, by cutting out so many middlemen. Our economy is "light": its value no longer comes from physical weight and mass and brawn ("arm & hammer"), but from ideas and brain power and imagination. Technology isn't just *high* tech, but smart adaptation. One example: in the film *On the Waterfront*, it took 100 men a whole week to unload a cargo ship. Now, half a century later, it takes only 7 men just one day—all because of containerization, fork-lifts, and cranes.

The private sector speeds ahead, while governments *naturally* move slowly. It took 14 years (!) to get China into the World Trade Organization. As Mark Steyn wrote in *America Alone*, "It's in the nature of government to do things worse, and slower." That's true in all countries, but especially Communist ones. Real economic growth and prosperity comes mostly from invention and innovation, both of which are the products of FREEDOM. We in the West are still the innovators.

Last year, Thomas P.M. Barnett—a Democrat and the author of *The Pentagon's New Map*—told Hugh Hewitt:

"We don't really have a trade deficit with China. We basically send our multinationals over there, and we export, we control about 70% of their exports. And all we're really turning China into is one big final assembler. People talk about it as a trade deficit, because we put value on the good when it's assembled in China. But the reality is, the people who are making the money are most of the subcontractors on the components, the other Asian countries. We get the cheap goods, China gets a few cents for labor. So they're not rising to the extent that people make them out to be, and yet they are increasing their savings rate to a tremendous degree, which creates another kind of interesting dependency. We're reliant on them in terms of their willingness to hold our currency, and they're increasingly relying on us, because their economy's so tied to our willingness to take their exports, that if we ever turned on each other, the self destruction would be rapid and complete."

The United States economy is still four times as large as China's. We hope that they, too, will become innovators some day—but it's not going to happen until the Chinese have been a lot freer for a lot longer. In terms of up-and-coming innovators in the developing world, the smart money might just be on India.

Bush Rips Appeasement; Appeasers Cry "Foul"! by Don John, 15 May 2008

In a speech to the Knesset today in Jerusalem, President George W. Bush said, *inter alia*:

"Some seem to believe that we should negotiate with terrorists and radicals, as if some ingenious argument will persuade them they have been wrong all along. We have heard this foolish delusion before...As Nazi tanks crossed into Poland in 1939, an American senator declared: 'Lord, if only I could have talked to Hitler, all of this might have been avoided.' We have an obligation to call this what it is—the false comfort of appeasement, which has been repeatedly discredited by history."

Within minutes—even though Bush didn't mention any names—appeasers [Joseph Biden](#), [Hillary Clinton](#), [Nancy Pelosi](#), [Barack Obama](#), Rahm Emanuel, John Kerry, Dick Durbin, and Harry Reid started squealing like a bunch of pacifist pigs:

Possibly the most ludicrous squeal came from Appeaser Joseph Biden, who said of Bush "He is the guy who has weakened us. He has increased the number of terrorists in the world. It is his policies that have produced this vulnerability that the U.S. has. His intelligence community has pointed this out, not me."

Not a single syllable of that is true—least of all the "intelligence community." The CIA (Valerie Plame's outfit) hates President Bush, and has worked nonstop to undermine him.

Another risible assertion issued from the mouth of Appeaser Rahm Emanuel, who squealed: "The tradition has always been that when a U.S. president is overseas, partisan politics stops at the water's edge. President Bush has now taken that principle and turned it on its head: for this White House, partisan politics now begins at the water's edge, no matter the seriousness and gravity of the occasion n. Does the president have no shame?"

What two-faced nonsense from a House colleague of Nancy Pelosi, who made a special trip to Syria in 2007 just to suck up to its brutal dictator, Bashar Assad. What cynical carping from the political party that has criticized Bush's every move—loudly, bitterly, and publicly in the worldwide media for the past seven years. It's a far cry from the way Wendell Willkie worked with FDR to support the war effort in the 1940s.

Still, these appeasers are the folks who insist that "dissent is the highest form of patriotism."

Well, OK, let's reduce this to the not-so-absurd. What's the highest form of dissent?

"That would be treason, Bob."

Now we're talking! Appeasers *really* hate it when we question their patriotism. Let's all question the patriotism of Appeasers Joseph Biden, Hillary Clinton, Nancy Pelosi, Barack Obama, Rahm Emanuel, John Kerry, Dick Durbin, and Harry Reid. And as soon as Appeaser Jack Murtha finishes eating that greasy pork chop and issues a statement, we can question his patriotism, too.

Guilty By Association by Don John, 28 Apr 2008

Like the intellectually bankrupt morons who glibly proclaim that "everything is relative," leftists love to cry "Guilty by association!" as if that ends all argument.

Last month, Sen. Obama told the *Chicago Tribune* that the indicted Chicago businessman [Tony Rezko](#) "gave me assurances that he was not doing anything wrong" and "my instinct was to believe him."

As president of the United States, Barack Obama would receive all kinds of assurances from Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Hugo Chavez, Kim Jong Il, Mahmoud Abbas, Evo Morales, CAIR, Hamas, and perhaps even Al Qaida. What will his instincts be about them?

A clear answer is provided by his association with Tony Rezko, Jeremiah Wright, Rashid Khalidi, William Ayers, and Bernadine Dohrn. Obama thought they were OK because he desperately *wanted* to—just as fans of roller derby and pro wrestling blind themselves to the fakery because it's so much fun.

But the presidency is not a theatrical diversion; it's real life. Obama's association with those individuals makes him guilty of willful blindness to evil. We've seen where that can lead: the disastrous presidency of Jimmy Carter. America could barely afford such a president back then, and it certainly cannot afford one now.

***The Audacity of Hype: Obama's slick race speech* by Don John, 20 March 2008**

In an attempt to distance himself from the racist and seditious rantings of his pastor, Senator Obama delivered a [speech](#) in Philadelphia on 18 March 2008. It's a brilliantly-constructed oration. But shining through it all are Mr. Obama's continued espousal of grievance-mongering; big-government handouts and waste; defeatism in Iraq; hatred of capitalism; and blaming white people—including our Founding Fathers.

Below are some of the more *egregious passages*, followed by **the truth**.

...It was stained by this nation's original sin of slavery, a question that divided the colonies and brought the convention to a stalemate until the founders chose to allow the slave trade to continue for at least twenty more years, and to leave any final resolution to future generations.

Thomas Sowell, an African-American whom the playwright David Mamet recently called "our greatest contemporary philosopher," [wrote in 2003](#):

"...Although slavery was a worldwide institution for thousands of years, nowhere in the world was slavery a controversial issue prior to the 18th century. People of every race and color were enslaved—and enslaved others. White people were still being bought and sold as slaves in the Ottoman Empire, decades after American blacks were freed.

...Slavery was just not an issue, not even among intellectuals, much less among political leaders, until the 18th century—and then only in Western civilization. Among those who turned against slavery in the 18th century were George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry and other American leaders. You could research all of 18th century Africa or Asia or the Middle East without finding any comparable rejection of slavery there. But who is singled out for scathing criticism today? American leaders of the 18th century."

And yet words on a parchment would not be enough to deliver slaves from bondage, or provide men and women of every color and creed their full rights and obligations as citizens of the United States. What would be needed were Americans in successive generations who were willing to do their part – through protests and struggle, on the streets and in the courts, through a civil war and civil disobedience and always at great risk—to narrow that gap between the promise of our ideals and the reality of their time.

Between 1861 and 1865, 359,000 white Americans gave their lives to free black people from slavery.

Despite the temptation to view my candidacy through a purely racial lens,

Senator, the "temptation" is entirely yours and the media's, not Hillary's or the GOP's.

Given my background, my politics, and my professed values and ideals, there will no doubt be those for whom my statements of condemnation are not enough. Why associate myself with Reverend Wright in the first place, they may ask? Why not join another church? And I confess that if all that I knew of Reverend Wright were the snippets of those sermons that have run in an endless loop on the television and You Tube, or if Trinity United Church of Christ conformed to the caricatures being peddled by some commentators, there is no doubt that I would react in much the same way.

Those clips are not caricatures, Senator. They speak for themselves.

Not once in my conversations with him have I heard him talk about any ethnic group in derogatory terms, or treat whites with whom he interacted with anything but courtesy and respect.

OK, so Rev. Wright is a two-faced dissembler: a faker.

I can no more disown him than I can disown the black community.

Yes you can! And you must.

Some will see this as an attempt to justify or excuse comments that are simply inexcusable. I can assure you it is not.

Few things are less assuring than this assurance, and few things ring more hollow.

We do not need to recite here the history of racial injustice in this country. But we do need to remind ourselves that so many of the disparities that exist in the African-American community today can be directly traced to inequalities passed on from an earlier generation that suffered under the brutal legacy of slavery and Jim Crow.

What about a somewhat later generation that was crippled by the grievance-mongering of Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton, and the plantation politics of LBJ and Carter?

This is the reality in which Reverend Wright and other African-Americans of his generation grew up. They came of age in the late fifties and early sixties, a time when segregation was still the law of the land and opportunity was systematically constricted. What's remarkable is not how many failed in the face of discrimination, but rather how many men and women overcame the odds; how many were able to make a way out of no way for those like me who would come after them.

It's also remarkable that people like Jeremiah Wright, who grew up in segregation, simply refuse to recognize the tremendous progress that our society made between 1960 and 1990.

But the anger is real; it is powerful; and to simply wish it away, to condemn it without understanding its roots, only serves to widen the chasm of misunderstanding that exists between the races.

Oh yes, of course. There are root causes for bad behavior: just like Al Qaeda, another group that hates Whitey.

Talk show hosts and conservative commentators built entire careers unmasking bogus claims of racism while dismissing legitimate discussions of racial injustice and inequality as mere political correctness or reverse racism.

I've never heard Rush Limbaugh, Laura Ingraham, Sean Hannity, or Hugh Hewitt dismiss any legitimate discussion of racial injustice. But then, none of them has been my pastor for 20 years.

Just as black anger often proved counterproductive, so have these white resentments distracted attention from the real culprits of the middle class squeeze – a corporate culture rife with inside dealing, questionable accounting practices, and short-term greed; a Washington dominated by lobbyists and special interests; economic policies that favor the few over the many. And yet, to wish away the resentments of white Americans, to label them as misguided or even racist, without recognizing they are grounded in legitimate concerns – this too widens the racial divide, and blocks the path to understanding.

So it's capitalism's fault! Socialism works much better. Just look at Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea, or any such "worker's paradise," past or present. The people are so prosperous and happy!

Ironically, this quintessentially American – and yes, conservative – notion of self-help found frequent expression in Reverend Wright's sermons.

Please pardon our incredulity on that point, Senator.

The legacy of discrimination—and current incidents of discrimination, while less overt than in the past—are real and must be addressed. Not just with words, but with deeds – by investing in our schools and our communities; by enforcing our civil rights laws and ensuring fairness in our criminal justice system; by providing this generation with ladders of opportunity that were unavailable for previous generations. It requires all Americans to realize that your dreams do not have to come at the expense of my dreams; that investing in the health, welfare, and education of black and brown and white children will ultimately help all of America prosper.

Just throw money at problems. More gimme-gimme-gimme. Less punishment for crime.

In the end, then, what is called for is nothing more, and nothing less, than what all the world's great religions demand – that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us. Let us be our brother's keeper, Scripture tells us. Let us be our sister's keeper. Let us find that common stake we all have in one another, and let our politics reflect that spirit as well.

You mean we should try to be color-blind? Really? Or do you mean Big Brother (and Big Sister)?

We can play Reverend Wright's sermons on every channel, every day and talk about them from now until the election, and make the only question in this campaign whether or not the American people think that I somehow believe or sympathize with his most offensive words.

Great idea. Lets!

This time we want to talk about the shuttered mills that once provided a decent life for men and women of every race, and the homes for sale that once belonged to Americans from every religion, every region, every walk of life. This time we want to talk about the fact that the real problem is not that someone who doesn't look like you might take your job; it's that the corporation you work for will ship it overseas for nothing more than a profit.

Capitalism bad! Tariffs good!

This time we want to talk about the men and women of every color and creed who serve together, and fight together, and bleed together under the same proud flag. We want to talk about how to bring them home from a war that never should've been authorized and never should've been waged, and we want to talk about how we'll show our patriotism by caring for them, and their families, and giving them the benefits they have earned.

I guess you wouldn't be a modern-day Democrat without being a defeatist.

***The Audacity of Hate* by Kelan J. Vorbach, 19 March 2008**

It seems what we have from Obama and his pastor is the Audacity of Hate.

The Reverend and the Candidate both justify Americans with African ancestors hating Americans without African ancestors because of the so-called black experience and history.

How about this for history: most Italians who came to this country came after slavery was over. Do Americans with Italian ancestors get a pass on the whole being hated thing? How about the Irish who got off the stinking boat in New York, signed up for the Union army and marched into battle to free the slaves? Do Americans with Irish ancestors have to be hated? What about Americans whose ancestors were active in the anti-slavery movement? Do Reverend Wright and Barak Obama believe it is okay to hate Americans without African ancestors if those people were Freedom Riders of born of Freedom Riders because of the so-called black experience and history?

What if we don't know what our ancestors did or didn't do? What about what we may or may not have done ourselves? How do they know who to hate? They just hate based on the color of a person's skin. It has nothing to do with history. It is pure racism and to try to justify it the way Barak Obama did is the Audacity of Hate.

***The Reverend is Near* by Don John, 15 March 2008**

On 14 March 2008, Senator Obama issued a statement titled "[On My Faith and My Church](#)," in which he claims that he never heard Rev. Jeremiah Wright preach anything like the hateful garbage that's recently been revealed, and that every sermon he ever *did* hear at Trinity United Church of Christ "always related to our obligation to love God and one another, to work on behalf of the poor, and to seek justice at every turn." He asserts that Wright "has never been my political advisor; he's been my pastor." He wants us to believe that "All of the statements that have been the subject of controversy are ones that I vehemently condemn. They in no way reflect my attitudes and directly contradict my profound love for this country."

Does the Obamessiah think we are all as gullible as his naïve young supporters?

He expects us to believe that he attended Rev. Wright's church for over 20 years, and somehow missed every virulently anti-American, anti-white sermon and statement. He wants us to believe that the vile views which Wright thundered so loudly from the pulpit in the many audio and video clips that have filled the airwaves this week were somehow kept secret from him until very recently—despite the fact that he followed Wright's preaching closely enough

to adopt Wright's phrase "the audacity of hope" as the title of his own most recent book.

Jeremiah Wright is not bashful about his views. Now that they've been revealed for all the world to hear, Barack Obama has tried lamely to disavow them. But we know the truth: Senator Obama and his strident wife know how to state things a little more tactfully than Wright. They can say things in code, and sugar-coat them for the uninitiated. But Barack and Michelle are basically on the same page, politically, as their racist and disloyal pastor.

Quotes from Obama's pastor by Don John, 14 March 2008

Rev. Jeremiah Wright recently retired as pastor of Trinity United Church in Chicago, which Barack Obama and his wife Michelle have attended since 1985. Clergymen like Wright are race-baiting shepherds whose flocks consist only of "poor little victims." Grievance-mongers like Wright teach their credulous parishioners not to take any personal responsibility for anything, but instead to blame Whitey for any and every misfortune—no matter how self-inflicted it may be.

Bereft of moral compass, Wright looks at what America did to subdue fascist-imperialist Japan in World War Two (which saved a million innocent lives and freed millions of enslaved Asians), and equates that with the wanton murder of 3,000 Americans by Al Qaeda—which happens to be *another* group of "poor little victims" who take no responsibility for themselves and always blame Whitey for their own failings.

There can be no doubt that Wright "retired" under pressure from Barack Obama, who doesn't want Americans to know what he *really* believes UNTIL IT'S TOO LATE.

"The government gives them the drugs, builds bigger prisons, passes a three-strike law and then wants us to sing *God Bless America*. No, no, no. Not God Bless America. God damn America, that's in the Bible for killing innocent people. God damn America for treating our citizens as less than human. God damn America for as long as she acts like she is God and she is supreme." (2003)

"White America: U.S. of K.K.K.A."

"We bombed Hiroshima, we bombed Nagasaki, and we nuked far more than the thousands in New York and the Pentagon, and we never batted an eye. We have supported state terrorism against the Palestinians and black South Africans, and now we are indignant because the stuff we have done overseas is now brought right back into our own front yards? America's chickens are coming home to roost!" (2001)

"The European Jesus is the blesser of the slave trade, the defender of racism and apartheid."

"In this country, racism is as natural as motherhood, apple pie, and the Fourth of July."

video Rev. Jeremiah Wright, Obama's pastor for over 20 years, saying most of the above.

Middle Name Reality Check by Don John, 28 Feb 2008

Recently, radio host Willie Cunningham used Barack Obama's middle name three times while addressing a rally for John Sidney McCain. The wisdom of doing that is open to question. But the spectacle of McCain and others falling all over themselves to apologize—and to repudiate Cunningham—is ridiculous.

The middle names of many presidents and vice presidents are well known and often used: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John Nance Garner, Dwight David Eisenhower, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Lyndon Baines Johnson, Hubert Horatio Humphrey, Richard Milhaus Nixon. If there's something so wrong with Obama's middle name, *he should change it.*

When Republicans let Democrats and the mainstream media make all the rules, they always lose. That's one of the problems George Walker Bush has had in his presidency: he's too polite to people who don't deserve it. Too often, he allows them to frame the terms.

Remember when Ronald Wilson Reagan kept saying to James Earl Carter, "There you go again"? How about when

he walked out on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the Reykjavik summit? Rude, rude, rude. But a winning strategy. On both occasions, the leftists had it coming.

In any case, if Republicans occasionally use Obama's middle name against him, what votes will they lose? People who view African-Americans as perpetual victims never vote Republican anyway. And most Muslims, including white-hating racists like Louis Farrakhan, are already voting for the guy whose middle name is Hussein.

Water Balloons *by Kelan J. Vorbach, 18 Feb 2008*

Since John McCain virtually clinched the nomination, I've lobbed a few water balloons into the Republican Party. Lest anyone think I want the Democrat candidates to win, I want to share something I wrote a few weeks ago in response to a Republican email listing reasons not to vote for Obama.

Not to mention, Obama's a lefty.

It's amazing: people don't recognize the economic and social policy advocated by Obama, Clinton, and Edwards as Marxism.

Do not suppose I am using that term Marxism lightly. Let's put in context what they are advocating with National Health Care and the Nanny State. Individual freedom and capitalism, as we generally understand them today, began in Europe in the period after the Black Plague. (One might refer to this period as the High Middle Ages). Up until this period, people were valued based on who they were, their class, their family, their political connections. Most people were serfs, living as little more than slaves. The feudal lord gathered up the fruits of their labor and decided how those goods were to be distributed. As the plague killed roughly a third of the people in Europe, people who were able to produce goods and services were at a premium. Thus, society began to value people based on what they could and would produce rather than their position or caste. This movement developed successively into the Renaissance; the start of Venture Capitalism; Age of Reason; the establishment of individual nation-states based on constitutions written to guarantee individual rights; and the Industrial Revolution.

Around 1850, Marx and Engels stumbled onto the scene. Blind to the amazing advancements to the human condition, they saw only the disparity between rich and poor. Although even the poorest workers in countries that guaranteed individual freedom and rewarded production were far better off than 90% of the world's population had ever been, Marx and Engels saw the distribution system as unfair. Imagining themselves as ground-breaking political philosophers, they offered repackaged Feudalism. Of course, their package included the material prosperity produced by capitalism and freedom, which thousands of years of Feudalism were unable to develop. To put more lipstick on the pig, they included certain social sensibilities that were considered modern at the time.

Since then, the Soviet Union has risen and fallen. A generation of young people have no recollection of people trying to escape from behind the Iron Curtain, and the United States of America is the most prosperous civilization the world has ever known. In a strange and ironic twist, *obesity* is the number one medical problem among America's poor. Torturing reason, we define poor as the bottom 20% in our flourishing economy and then claim every day that there are more people living in poverty than ever before because our population increases as people clamor to get in. We have so much ability to advance our position in this society that 50% of the people below the poverty line ten years ago are above it today.

So, 150 years after Marx and Engels, the myopic vision of Obama, Clinton and Edwards sees only the negative. They offer us a Nanny State: repackaged Feudalism. To put lipstick on *their* pig, they claim their fatally flawed system will have all the goods that freedom and capitalism have produced; and (like Marx and Engels) they include certain social sensibilities that are considered modern today.

Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton and Jonathan Edwards are egocentric, elitist Marxists who have nothing to offer. That is why we shouldn't vote for them.

Pahlavi for President *by Don John, 6 February 2008*

Mitt Romney is still the best person in the presidential race. But now that more than half the states have held their primaries and caucuses, it's clear that not enough Americans are hearing and agreeing with his message. A major reason for this, though not the only one, is prejudice: the general public are prejudiced against Mormons, and the mainstream media are, as ever, prejudiced against conservatives. Sorry to sound like a victim-group liberal, but it's all true—

especially the prejudice part.

John McCain now has 697 delegates, far more than Mitt Romney (244) and Mike Huckabee (187) combined. That's still far short of the 1,191 needed for nomination, though. And theoretically, anything can happen in the remaining primaries.

McCain is nearly broke; and Romney, who has lots of money left, could produce some boffo TV ads and blanket the country with them. But political TV spots no longer have the impact they used to.

McCain could commit a major gaffe. But what "major gaffe" could exceed his Senatorial antics of recent years?

Romney and Huckabee could both stage great comebacks, and finish the primary season in a position where they could form an alliance and beat McCain. But a McCain-Huckabee alliance is far more likely.

And the nomination of McCain is likeliest of all. So it's time to take an honest inventory of what we're likely to be stuck with this fall.

John McCain is weak on economics...virtually illiterate, in fact. He doesn't understand (for instance) that the profit motive is what enables the constant development of new life-saving, life-improving drugs. If the government forbids people to make a profit developing drugs, they'll switch to other scientific research where they *are* allowed to make a profit.

He spouts good old authentic populist jibberish about "tax-cuts for the wealthy," in blissful ignorance of their economic benefit to *all* of America, and of this paradoxical fact: in 1981 the top 1% of income earners paid 17.58% of all federal income taxes; in 2005 they paid 39.38%—more than twice as much.

He's weak on immigration: still favoring amnesty for millions of invading, law-breaking foreign nationals.

He's weak on free speech: the so-called "campaign finance reform" which has hurt the GOP, but helped the Dems and their wealthy backers like George Soros and Teresa Heinz Kerry.

He believes in Gullible Warming, and is willing to waste billions on it, thereby crippling the world economy as well as our own, all for a bunch of junk "consensus" science.

McCain is weak on prisoner policy, supporting due-process rights for captured enemy combatants. In plain English, he'd like to allow enemies captured in combat to force the U.S. military to justify its actions before civil judges, who might well order the release of dozens, hundreds, or even thousands of individuals who have sworn to kill us. Such a policy has no precedent in world history—no, not even for genuine P.O.W.'s like McCain himself was.

He's weak in his blanket condemnation of waterboarding as torture.

He's weak as a GOP partisan. Some Democrats like Joe Lieberman may be good-faith allies on *some* issues. But people like Teddy Kennedy, Russ Feingold, and John Edwards are not. They are unmitigated leftists, and should be opposed at every turn. Instead, McCain gets in bed with them, and America gets ——.

HOWEVER: On all of the above issues, the vast majority of Democrats are even weaker and dumber than McCain is. He has the support, *mirabile dictu*, of serious conservatives like John Kyl, Sam Brownback, Jeff Flake, Phil Gramm, Jack Kemp, Ted Olson, Duncan Hunter (my own political computer-date), Rudy Giuliani, Richard Land, Nancy Reagan, Michael Medved, Victor Davis Hanson, Jeff Jacoby—and even Tom Coburn, who's a major fiscal hawk and was actually one of the heroes behind the historic defeat of the Bush-McCain-Kennedy "wide open borders" bill on June 28, 2007.

None of these people are perfect. Nor were Thomas Jefferson, Barry Goldwater, and Ronald Reagan.

Despite his wobbliness on prisoners, McCain is very strong on the war against jihadis—including serious containment of Iran. His Supreme Court nominees would be better (*much* better) than those of any Democrat president.

This is crucial: the next president will have the chance to name between 2 and 6 new justices. The egregious Ruth Bader Ginsburg's seat is likely to be one of those vacancies. If you'd like to see two to six more like her, just sit home this November and let the Dems take the White House. Yes, it is possible that McCain could nominate some bad judges. Even Reagan did that. But with a Democrat president, bad judges are *guaranteed*.

Throughout human history, good people have sometimes had to ally themselves with vile despots, in order to defeat even viler ones. America has done this from time to time, ever since FDR hooked up with Stalin to beat Hitler. Purists say it's wrong to support a "sonofabitch" despot just because he's "our sonofabitch." That's why Jimmy Carter withdrew support from Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, the Shah of Iran: no regime could possibly be worse than the Shah's. And how did *that* work out for you, Jimmah?

John McCain is indeed a son of a bitch...sort of like the Shah. But his Democrat opponents represent a far greater threat to freedom...very much like Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

So I believe that conservatives and other sensible Americans will have no choice but to vote for McCain in November. We can register our discontent, though, by sending most of our financial contributions directly to our favorite Congressional candidates, rather than to McCain's campaign, the Republican National Committee, the National Republican Congressional Committee, or the National Republican Senatorial Committee.

McCain will have won the nomination without money from us; he can surely make it the rest of the way. And hey:

if he somehow nominates a serious, loyal conservative for VP, that will give us *a little something extra* to hope for.

Whom Do You Trust? by Don John, 3 December 2007

Do you trust Democrats, elite college professors, and the mainstream media on immigration?

National defense?

International relations?

Economics?

Guantanamo?

Global warming?

National sovereignty?

The Patriot Act?

Social Security?

Free speech on the radio?

Waterboarding?

A constitutional right to abortion?

If you're a conservative, you probably don't trust them on *any* of those issues. How about history: for instance, the 1968 Tet Offensive, or America's abandonment of Vietnam in 1974-75? Don't trust 'em there, either, eh?

Well then *why on earth* would you trust Democrats, elite college professors, the mainstream media (and a bunch of checkered-pants country club RINOs) to tell you the true story of Senator Joseph McCarthy?

Liberals hated him passionately, and remain heavily invested in besmirching his name even now, a full 50 years after his death.

Their master narrative goes something like this. McCarthy was a paranoid hyper-patriot who imagined that Soviet spies were everywhere—even hiding under your bed. He played on the public's irrational fear of our erstwhile (World War II) allies. He faked and forged and misinterpreted evidence, brought wholly unsubstantiated charges against innocent people, and although he never proved his accusations, still ruined many of their lives. Assisted by henchmen like the homosexual Roy Cohn, McCarthy created a terrible climate of fear throughout the country, wherein people were terrified to express any liberal opinions, and even ratted on friends just to save themselves. Arthur Miller's play *The Crucible*, set in the witch trials of 1690s Salem, Massachusetts, was intended as an allegory of the whole sorry affair. Finally, a few other brave men like Edward R. Murrow and Joseph Welch stepped forward, stood up to Senator McCarthy, and brought the nation to its senses. What a tale of courage!

None of it is true. Some of it is purposely conflated with the proceedings of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), and the public relations worries of Hollywood studio moguls—none of which ever had *anything* to do with Joseph McCarthy. The rest is nothing but half-truths, moral inversions, and plain old spin.

Here are the salient facts of Joseph McCarthy's life. He was born in 1908 on a farm in Grand Chute, Wisconsin (near Appleton). He worked his way through to a law degree at Marquette University from 1930 to 1935, and was admitted to the bar in 1935. Originally a Democrat, he was elected Judge of Wisconsin's 10th Circuit Court in 1938. Although his status as a judge exempted him from military service, McCarthy volunteered for the Marine Corps in 1942, and served until April 1945. He fought in the South Pacific, flew more than 30 combat missions, and won the Distinguished Flying Cross.

He was elected to the U.S. Senate as a Republican in 1946, and again in 1952. From 1950 to 1954, he aggressively investigated and exposed numerous traitors (mostly Communists) with government connections. Wrongly accused (by cynical media and leftist politicians) of corruption, fabrication, and persecution, he was censured by the Senate in 1954 by a 67-22 vote, and his power came to an end. In 1957 he died of acute hepatitis (not alcoholism, a lie the liberals love), and was buried in Appleton.

Just because the young women of 1690s Salem weren't really witches, it doesn't follow that there weren't any American Communists in the 1940s and 1950s who were loyal to the USSR and ready to sell out the USA. There were plenty of them: not innocent idealists, but actual Soviet agents who had infiltrated the our government and military, and were reporting sensitive information to Moscow on a regular basis.

In 1995, when the VENONA transcripts were declassified, they revealed that at least 349 people in the U.S., many of them identified by McCarthy, had engaged in clandestine activities with Soviet intelligence agencies. Among them

were Mary Jane Keeney, Philip Keeney, Lauchlin Currie (who had been a special assistant to FDR), Virginius Frank Coe, William Ludwig Ullman, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, Harold Glasser, Allan Rosenberg, Cedric Belfrage, and four staff members of the LaFollette Civil Liberties Committee.

Some of the individuals who were involved in McCarthy's eventual demise were not spies. McCarthy never said they were. But though the things he did say about them were factual, the Senator was demonized, pilloried, and hounded out of Washington for telling the truth.

Captain Irving Peress, an Army dentist, took the Fifth Amendment twenty times under sustained questioning about his alleged recruiting military personnel to join the Communist Party. He also refused to answer questions on Defense Department forms concerning membership in "subversive organizations," and the Army Surgeon General had recommended his dismissal early in 1953. McCarthy was alarmed that Peress had not been discharged after that recommendation, but for some mysterious reason had been promoted to the rank of Major.

Brigadier General Ralph W. Zwicker, Irving Peress's commanding officer at Camp Kilmer NJ, was not accused of anything at all. But when Senator McCarthy asked him about Peress, Zwicker was evasive, hostile, and uncooperative. When Zwicker, in response to a hypothetical question, said that he would not remove from the military a general who originated the order for the honorable discharge of a Communist major, knowing that he was a Communist, McCarthy told Zwicker that he was not fit to wear the uniform of a general. A lot of people were really upset about the Senator's saying such a thing. Fifty-three years later, one still may well ask: Why?

Young Fred Fisher was indeed a member of the National Lawyers' Guild (NLG), a known Communist front. McCarthy would not have been wrong to reveal this. However, it was already a matter of public record: the *New York Times* had run a story about Fisher's NLG ties on April 16, 1954.

Way back then, facts didn't matter to liberals who were all upset that someone wanted to defend America. Some things never change.

The Real McCarthy Record

A longtime smear campaign has clouded the truth.

by James J. Drummey, 2 Sept 1996 (first published 11 May 1987)

N.B.: Mr. Drummey's article includes the true context of Joseph Welch's "Have you no sense of decency, sir" nonsense that leftists love to preen about. And, by the way, the National Lawyers Guild is STILL an anti-American organization today. The convicted terrorist-enabler [Lynne Stewart](#) was a prominent member. —Don John

Senator Joe McCarthy, Anti-Communist

"Neo-McCarthyism" versus a Communist Chinese World Order

by Andrew G. Bostom, 14 Dec 2018

Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life & Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator

Arthur Herman interviewed by Brian Lamb, 6 Feb 2000

A short, Communist history of 'McCarthyism'

by Diana West, 8 Oct 2018

VENONA Transcripts (KGB spies 1943-80)

Books about McCarthy

McCarthy and His Enemies, by William Buckley and Brent Bozell (1953)

Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator, by Arthur Herman (1999)

Treason: Liberal Treachery from the Cold War to the War on Terrorism, by Ann Coulter (2003)

Blacklisted by History: the Untold Story of Senator McCarthy, by [M. Stanton Evans](#) (2007)

Here are the 22 senators who voted against the condemnation of Joseph McCarthy. All were distinguished public servants, but the two most famous names are particularly worth noting.

Frank Barrett (Wyoming), Styles Bridges (New Hampshire), Ernest Brown (Nevada), John Marshall Butler (Maryland), Guy Cordon (Oregon), [Everett Dirksen](#) (Illinois), Henry Dworshak (Idaho), [Barry Goldwater](#) (Arizona), Bourke Hickenlooper (Iowa), Roman Hruska (Nebraska), William Jenner (Indiana), William Knowland (California), Thomas

Kuchel (California), William Langer (North Dakota), George Malone (Nevada), Edward Martin (Pennsylvania), Eugene Millikin (Colorado), Karl Mundt (South Dakota), William Purtell (Connecticut), Andrew Schoeppel (Kansas), Herman Welker (Idaho), and Milton Young (North Dakota). Malone, Jenner, and Welker attended McCarthy's funeral.

To Obama, on the mess in Iraq by Don John, 30 December 2006

Sent 2 Jan 2007 to: info@barackobama.com and <http://obama.senate.gov/contact/index.php>

RE: http://www.barackobama.com/action/escalation_is_not_the_answer/#more

Dear Senator Obama,

Rather than contact the president about "escalation" in Iraq, I am contacting you.

Yes, Iraq is a mess. But it's because we've attempted a noble mission of unprecedented proportions, while hampering ourselves with unprecedented restrictions. Our constant concern for innocent civilians has allowed the enemy to hide behind them in a way that could never be countenanced by normal humans with any moral standards.

The military is meant to break things and kill people. That's how we'll use it in the future: with punitive bombings and other aggressive actions against infrastructures and strategic points—without particular regard for the lives of enemy nationals. That's the normal course of modern warfare. It's how we fought World War II, for example.

Nobody likes a "mess." The past few years in Iraq and Afghanistan would have been a good deal less "messy" if we had slaughtered a million enemy nationals, left the populace utterly demoralized and defeated, and installed strongman dictators instead of "messy" elected, constitutional, representative governments.

But such actions would never have met with the approval of Democrats and other leftists. And because President Bush actually is (as he famously claimed) a uniter and not a divider, he has tried to fight a Politically Correct war in order to keep such Americans on the side of their country as it combats the menace of radical Islam.

President Bush has been a fool to think he could get sustained support for any use of America's military power from people like you, who believe that all truth is relative (except "Bush Lied," which is an absolute), all religions are backward (except socialism), all cultures are equal (except the Western one, which is a cancer), and all nations are equal (except apartheid Israel and criminal America).

As the patriot (if you'll pardon the expression) Patrick Henry said, "Pacifists are the most immoral of men."

And why is the impulse to seek peace at any price, and refuse to ever participate in war, immoral? Well, in this case, it's because the adherents of this impulse cynically hide behind the protection of the U.S. military, which is their only defense against Islamic forces whose stated goal is the imposition of repressive, intolerant, and draconian Sharia law over the entire planet.

Sincerely,

[Don John]

Gore Lied Us Into Global Warming! by Don John, 7 December 2006

After a huge chunk of an *Oprah Winfrey Show* was devoted to Al Gore promoting his film *An Inconvenient Truth*,

Oprah remarked that the most cogent facts were:

- (1) the cartoon of the swimming polar bear who couldn't find an ice floe.
- (2) the 120-degree Fahrenheit temperature reading in South Dakota.

To me, Mr. Gore's most cogent facts would appear to be

- (1) the big, hockey-stick-shaped graph of CO2 increases in the Antarctic ice cores.
- (2) the 928 peer-reviewed articles which ALL endorsed the consensus view on global warming.
- (3) the melting Snows of Kilimanjaro.
- (4) the dwindling glaciers.
- (5) the rising sea-levels.
- (6) something like 20 of the 21 highest-ever yearly temperatures have been in recent years.
- (7) his warning that we have only 10 years to fix things before global warming becomes irreversible.

However. . . .

An Inconvenient Truth portrays Antarctic ice cores with CO2 increases *leading* the temperature increases. But the temperature increases actually led the CO2 by 600 years. They caused the CO2 increases, not the other way around. Parts of Antarctica are indeed losing ice—and other parts are gaining ice because it's now warm enough to snow there. This has happened at regular intervals ever since the last Ice Age ended (circa 10,000 BC).
Unstoppable Global Warming Every 1500 Years, by Dr. Fred Singer (Univ. of Miami climatologist) and Dennis Avery (Hudson Institute)

The famous "928 peer-reviewed articles" came from a 2004 global warming study in *Science Magazine* by Naomi Oreskes, a science historian at UC San Diego. However, the British social scientist Benjamin Peiser checked her methodology and found that she'd omitted 90% of all papers dealing with the subject, and less than 2% of the climate studies that WERE in her survey endorsed the so-called "consensus view" that human activity spurs global warming.
http://www.realclearpolitics.com/Commentary/com-11_17_05_DS_pf.html

The ice atop Mt. Kilimanjaro has been melting for over a hundred years. That's because deforestation in the area in the late 1800s robbed the air of moisture, which means less snowfall. Neither local nor global warming is the culprit.
International Journal of Climatology article, 2004
Journal of Geophysical Research article, 2004
2004 study in the journal *Nature*

The "calving" of icebergs is a normal part of the growth of glaciers into the sea. *An Inconvenient Truth* tells us of some famous glaciers that have virtually disappeared. But it doesn't talk at all about the glaciers that are currently growing in a number of locales including New Zealand, Norway, and the United States. The Hubbard Glacier in Alaska's Tongass National Forest is growing so quickly that it's close to cutting off a major fjord.
U.S. Forest Service

"The survey that Gore cites [for his claim of the Arctic ice cap thinning since 1970] was a single transect across one part of the Arctic basin in the month of October during the 1960s when we were in the middle of the cooling period. The 1990 runs were done in the warmer month of September, using a wholly different technology."
Dr. Timothy Ball, climatology professor, University of Winnipeg (ret.)

Gore claims that sea level rise could drown the Pacific islands, Florida, major cities the world over, and the 9/11 Memorial in New York City. No mention is made of the fact that sea level has been rising at a rate of 1.8 mm per year for the past 8,000 years. "No significant acceleration in the rate of sea level rise during the 20th century has been detected."
http://www.ideasinactiontv.com/tcs_daily/2006/05/inconvenient-truths-indeed.html
United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2006
http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/013.htm

"No systematic changes in the frequency of tornadoes, thunder days, or hail events are evident in the limited areas analysed." "Changes globally in tropical and extra-tropical storm intensity and frequency are dominated by inter-decadal and multi-decadal variations, with no significant trends evident over the 20th century."
United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 2006
http://www.grida.no/climate/ipcc_tar/wg1/006.htm

Global average temperatures warmed from 1918 to 1940, cooled from 1940 to 1965, warmed again from 1970 to 1998, and actually cooled again (albeit very slightly) from 1998 to 2005. Emissions related to human activity increased at their

greatest rate in the 1940-1965 period—as temperatures were cooling! And what have we done since 1998? Could it be the Kyoto treaty that all those other countries signed? Not likely: European greenhouse gas emissions have increased since 2001, whereas America's emissions have fallen by nearly 1%.

Climate Research Unit, University of East Anglia

Prof. Robert Carter, Paleoclimate geologist, James Cook University (Australia)

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml?xml=/opinion/2006/04/09/do0907.xml&sSheet=/news/2006/04/09/ixworld.html>

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html)

[xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html)

Mr. Gore's 10-year warning sounds kind of familiar. Oh, yes, I remember now. Last year, Steven Guilbeault of Greenpeace said "Time is running out to deal with climate change. Ten years ago, we thought we had a lot of time, five years ago we thought we had a lot of time, but now science is telling us that we don't have a lot of time." Well, here are some Greenpeace Golden Oldies:

"Time is running out for the climate"—Chris Rose of Greenpeace, 1997

"Time running out for action on global warming, Greenpeace claims"—Irish Times, 1994

"Time is running out"—scientist Henry Kendall, speaking on behalf of Greenpeace, 1992.

Apparently, global warming hysterics like to recycle so much that they even recycle their direst predictions. Kind of reminds me of all Stalin's Five-Year Plans.

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html)

[xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/opinion/main.jhtml;jsessionid=00UYLLSIIRNG5QFIQMFCFGGAVCBQYIV0?xml=/opinion/2005/12/06/do0602.xml&sSheet=/opinion/2005/12/06/ixopinon.html)

So all 7 of these scary "facts" turn out to have been lies. A harsh judgment? Not by the standards of Mr. Gore and others on the Left. If there were never any WMD in Iraq, and Bush lied us into war, then clearly Mr. Gore can be said to have Lied Us Into Global Warming.

Some other points and quotes from noted scientists (as opposed to the thinktank straw-man that we saw on tape). . .

"The Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in December of 1997, giving the Clinton-Gore administration more than three years to present the Protocol to the United States Senate for ratification. Given Gore's position in the senate and his knowledge and passion for global warming, one must wonder why then Vice President Gore did not seize on what appears to have been an opportunity of a lifetime."

—Dr. Robert C. Balling Jr., Arizona State climatologist specializing in climate change and the greenhouse effect.

"The man is an embarrassment to U.S. science and its many fine practitioners, a lot of whom know (but feel unable to state publicly) that his propaganda crusade is mostly based on junk science."

—Prof. Robert Carter, Paleoclimate geologist, James Cook University, quoted in the Canadian Free Press, 12 June 06

"It's the money! Twenty-five billion dollars in government funding has been spent since 1990 to research global warming. If scientists and researchers were coming out releasing reports that global warming has little to do with man, and most to do with just how the planet works, there wouldn't be as much money to study it."

—Dr. Sallie Baliunas, Harvard astrophysicist.

And speaking of the money: the audience gasped when told that some anti-global warming scientists are funded by Exxon-Mobil. Well, the funding of Mr. Gore's friend Robert Correll (chairman of Arctic Climate Impact Assessment) by the leftist Packard Foundation makes ME gasp.

<http://www.junkscience.com/feb06.htm>

"So what, then, is one to make of this alleged debate? I would suggest at least three points.

"First, nonscientists generally do not want to bother with understanding the science. Claims of consensus relieve policy types, environmental advocates and politicians of any need to do so. Such claims also serve to intimidate the public and even scientists—especially those outside the area of climate dynamics. Secondly, given that the question of human attribution largely cannot be resolved, its use in promoting visions of disaster constitutes nothing so much as a bait-and-switch scam. That is an inauspicious beginning to what Mr. Gore claims is not a political issue but a "moral" crusade.

"Lastly, there is a clear attempt to establish truth not by scientific methods but by perpetual repetition. An earlier attempt at this was accompanied by tragedy. Perhaps Marx was right. This time around we may have farce—if we're lucky."

—Richard S. Lindzen, MIT (Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Science)

Rosie O'Donnell's Ignorant Multiculturalist Bleatings *by Don John, 14 September 2006*

BACKGROUND: A week earlier, on The View television show, Rosie O'Donnell caused a small sensation by equating radical Christians with radical Muslims. On the same show, she said something even more idiotic and sanctimonious: "You'll never bring peace at the hands of war."

<http://www.afa.net/Petitions/Issuedetail.asp?id=214>

Brian Frons, President, ABC Daytime
47 West 66th St.
New York, NY 10023-6298
Primary Phone: 212-456-7777
Fax: 212-456-1424
E-Mail: netaudr@abc.com

Dear President Frons,

Rosie O'Donnell's ignorant multiculturalist bleatings are a disgrace. And ABC's failure to distance itself from them, and reprimand Ms. O'Donnell, sends a clear message of anti-Christian prejudice.

There are "radicals" in many religions. But radical Christians don't advocate the killing or enslavement of every human being who doesn't believe as they do. Radical Christians don't advocate the utter subjugation, humiliation, and even sexual mutilation of women. Radical Christians don't believe that rape VICTIMS, homosexuals, and adulterers should be executed. Radical Christians don't advocate brutal, bloody forms of corporal punishment or execution by slow beheading.

All these things are advocated by radical Muslims, not radical Christians. And there are many more of the former than the latter.

The notion that "all cultures are equal and no culture is evil" isn't just irrational. It fosters a lazy-minded moral equivalence that is intellectually bankrupt. Your self-loathing willingness to believe the worst about Christianity—while turning a blind eye to the hideous excesses of Islam—is not only pathetic, but very dangerous.

Ms. O'Donnell should take a few moments alone and contemplate, as honestly as she can: (1) what would really happen to her if radical Christians took over America, and (2) what would really happen to her if radical Muslims took over America.... which is their stated goal.

Sincerely,

[Don John]

Letter to a Union Man *by Don John, 13 February 2006*

For a few years in my youth, I was pretty far to the Left: an SDS member...knew some dangerous people...did some dangerous things. What made me begin to move away from that was all the bashing of Western culture in general, and America in particular, by the likes of Herbert Marcuse, Noam Chomsky, and even Susan Sontag, who said "the white race is the cancer of human history."

I looked at the world with eyes wide open and unclouded by ideology, and had to say "Hey, despite its faults, this country is the greatest. Che Guevara was a wanker, and most of those revolutionary firebrands and Third World demagogues that my comrades idolize would be extremely unpleasant to live under."

But I was still pretty liberal until the remarkable presidency of Jimmy Carter, who witnessed on his watch (quoting Victor Davis Hanson): "the Iranian-hostage debacle, the disastrous rescue mission, the tragicomic odyssey of the terminally ill Shah; the first and last Western Olympic boycott; oil hikes even higher in real dollars than the 2005 spikes; Communist infiltration into Central America; the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; the Cambodian holocaust; a gloomy acceptance that perpetual parity with the Soviet Union was the hope of the day; the realism that cemented our ties with corrupt autocrats in the Middle East (Orwellian sales of F-15 warplanes to the Saudis); and the hard-to-achieve simultaneous high unemployment, high inflation, and high interest rates."

Right after the hostages were taken, an American diplomat asked, "Why doesn't this ever happen to the Soviets?" And a European diplomat answered, "Because God only knows what they would do." Then Andrei Gromyko said "If the students had pulled that stunt at the Soviet embassy, Tehran would have been a crater by lunchtime."

This made me realize that we can't always stand there piously and say "the most important thing is the safety of the hostages." No: to keep bad guys from messing with us, we have to (a) be unpredictable, and (b) kick some ass once in a while. And if some hostages die, at least we'll make the enemy pay a far heavier price, and they won't be taking any more hostages in the future.

So I was ready for Reagan, because that was his philosophy. And he won the Cold War with it. Two quotes from him:

"Of the four wars in my lifetime, none came about because the U.S. was too strong."
"Here's my strategy on the Cold War: We win, they lose."

I'm aware that Republicans are anti-union in many ways. And so as a union member, I should be a Democrat, if that's the main difference between the parties. But it certainly isn't. Since 1972, the Democratic party has gone steadily leftward, to the point where it would be virtually unrecognizable to FDR, Truman, and JFK.

"Continued dependence induces a spiritual disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit." — Franklin Delano Roosevelt, 1935

To modern Democrats, "social justice" requires not just equal opportunity, but equal outcomes. To them, more government is always the answer—despite the fact that 45 years of welfare has nearly destroyed the African-American family. What kind of outcome is that? To Democrats, more dollars for education are always the answer. But spending \$250,000 per classroom per year in public schools has earned our kids much lower worldwide rankings in 8th grade than they had in kindergarten. And the main reason for this waste is that teachers' unions won't allow the firing of incompetent teachers.

The party has become deeply dependent on political activist organizations who thrive on inventing Victim Groups, and then legislating Politically Correct restrictions on free speech and commerce. The highest-profile outfit is the ACLU, which always seems to come down on the opposite side from people like me. They want Nazis to march in Skokie. They want the words "under God" to be removed from the Pledge of Allegiance (they'd really like to remove the Allegiance, too). They want a teeny, tiny cross removed from the Los Angeles County seal. In fact, they oppose any connection between our public institutions and the Judeo-Christian God; but they have no problem with spending government money on works of "human waste art" like Andres Serrano's *Piss Christ* and Chris Ofili's *Holy Virgin Mary*.

The Democrats are anti-family. They've become the Pro-Abortion Party. Yes, they call it "a woman's right to choose," but it's actually "a woman's right to choose to kill her baby." Quite aside from any moral considerations, this policy is dysfunctional for a society. Some Western socialist countries (Spain, France, Italy, to name a few) are nowhere near replacement birthrate among ethnic natives. That's why they've had to take in so many Muslim immigrants to keep their welfare states solvent—and the countries have had lots of social problems, because neither the natives nor the immigrants see any point in the kind of Melting Pot assimilation that used to happen here in America. Instead, they've adopted something called multiculturalism—which is another name for cultural suicide.

"It would not matter if three-fourths of the human race perished. The important thing is that the remaining one-fourth be Communist." —Lenin

Democrats also support gay marriage. For 40 years, the West has led the world in tolerance of gays. But it's not a

question of tolerance; it's a matter of normalizing behaviors and relationships which, if granted legitimacy, will devastate the civilization which produced Michelangelo, Oscar Wilde, and Tchaikovsky. Perhaps leftists should ask their bosom friends in the "developing nations" what THEY think of gay marriage.

Marriage is for the procreation, protection, and rearing of children. Only heterosexual unions produce children. To normalize gay unions will foster polygamy, polyamory, and the delegitimation of marriage and kinship; in Scandinavia, it has already begun. This is a major leftist agenda—because if the family doesn't take care of children, then the state must.

Democrats now view war as strictly a police action, and preferably one in which the enemy has already been convicted *in absentia* with full due process of law. During the Afghan campaign in late 2001, Al Gore said something like "All this just to catch one man?" (meaning Osama). Clueless! September 11 was an act of war. And the point of war is to kill everyone who wants to kill us, until those who remain alive no longer want to kill us (e.g. Germany and Japan, 1945).

War "wins nothing, cures nothing, settles nothing." —Neville Chamberlain, 1938

I view the Iraq war as a bold and brilliant move: freeing 26 million people from the grip of a vicious regime, and occupying an oil-rich country, right in the heart of Islamofascist-land. The WMD haven't been found, it's true. But that doesn't mean they weren't there, or that they won't be found—perhaps in Syria. And Saddam had committed plenty of other crimes, all of which are demonstrably true and were clearly stated in Congress's "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002":

1. Supporting and harboring terrorist organizations, including Al-Qaida.
2. Continuing to engage in brutal repression of Iraq's civilian population, in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 688 (1991).
3. Refusing to release, repatriate, or account for non-Iraqi citizens wrongfully detained by Iraq, including an American serviceman.
4. Failing to return property wrongfully seized by Iraq from Kuwait.
5. Attempting in 1993 to assassinate former President Bush. (Sorry, but that's just as bad as if they'd tried to kill former President Carter.)
6. Firing on many thousands of occasions on United States and Coalition Armed Forces engaged in enforcing the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.
7. Threatening its neighbors or United Nations operations in Iraq in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 949 (1994).

Christopher Hitchens is a British-born Trotskyist, and until 9/11 was a superstar of the international Left. Suffice it to say that Gore Vidal had publicly named him heir apparent to his title as Leading Leftist Intellectual of the English-Speaking World. Because Hitchens saw what really happened on 9/11, and kept on saying what he saw, Vidal and his buddies don't speak to him any more. Hitchens still calls himself a Trotskyist, doesn't mind gay marriage, and does criticize Israel about some things. When Reagan died, he even wrote a really nasty piece which led me to e-mail his website asking "Whatever happened to *de mortuis nil nisi bonum*?" But he completely supports the war on terror. Here are some excerpts which outline his journey from anti-American Euroleftist in the 1970s to Bush supporter today.

FRONT PAGE MAGAZINE INTERVIEW, 10 DEC 2003:

"Watching the towers fall in New York, with civilians incinerated on the planes and in the buildings, I felt something that I couldn't analyze at first and didn't fully grasp... 'Here we are then,' I was thinking, 'in a war to the finish between everything I love and everything I hate. Fine. We will win and they will lose. A pity that we let them pick the time and place of the challenge, but we can and we will make up for that.'

"As to the Left I'll say briefly why this was the finish for me. Here is American society, attacked under open skies in

broad daylight by the most reactionary and vicious force in the contemporary world, a force which treats Afghans and Algerians and Egyptians far worse than it has yet been able to treat us. The vaunted CIA and FBI are asleep, at best. The working-class heroes move, without orders and at risk to their lives, to fill the moral and political vacuum. The moral idiots, meanwhile, like Falwell and Robertson and Rabbi Lapin, announce that this clerical aggression is a punishment for our secularism. And the governments of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, hitherto considered allies on our national security calculus, prove to be the most friendly to the Taliban and Al Qaida.

"Here was a time for the Left to demand a top-to-bottom housecleaning of the state and of our covert alliances, a full inquiry into the origins of the defeat, and a resolute declaration in favor of a fight to the end for secular and humanist values: a fight which would make friends of the democratic and secular forces in the Muslim world. And instead, the near-majority of Left intellectuals started sounding like Falwell, and bleating that the main problem was Bush's legitimacy. So I don't even muster a hollow laugh when this pathetic faction says that I, and not they, am in bed with the forces of reaction."

SLATE, 8 FEB 2004:

"I'm a single-issue person at present, and the single issue in case you are wondering is the tenacious and unapologetic defense of civilized societies against the intensifying menace of clerical barbarism. If in the smallest doubt about this, I would suggest a vote for the re-election of George Bush, precisely because he himself isn't prey to any doubt on the point. There are worse things than simple mindedness: pseudo-intellectuality, for example. Civil unions for homosexuals, or prescription-drug programs, are not even going to be in second or third place if we get this wrong. And presidents can't make much difference to the stock market or the employment rate or to income distribution. But they can and must uphold their oath to defend the country."

Many Democrats persist in supporting Marxist socioeconomic theories and practices—despite the repeated failures of such ideologies all over the world for 75 years. Republicans believe that capitalism is has been shown to be the best way to deliver the highest standard of living to the greatest number of people. To us, economics is not a zero-sum game: for there to be winners, there don't have to be losers. A rising tide lifts all boats. Just look at the United States over the past 75 years. Then look at the USSR. Wait, you can't: it's gone! But look at China: it didn't become prosperous until it became a lot less communist and a lot more capitalist. And the remaining miseries some people experience there are due to the communist and totalitarian parts, not the capitalist ones.

Many Democrats also seem to side with those who believe in moral equivalency. Cindy Sheehan, for example, says that because 30,000 civilians have died in Iraq, President Bush is 10 times as bad a terrorist as Osama bin Laden. They assert that no culture is superior to any other; but they really believe that the West is the worst. They say we have no right to judge; but they're always quick to judge Christians, Israelis, and Republicans. They believe that the Downtrodden can do no wrong—no matter how much wrong they do. Above all, they believe there's no such thing as objective truth; but they're always saying "Bush lied."

"There are no hard distinctions between what is real and what is unreal, nor between what is true and what is false. A thing is not necessarily either true or false; it can be both true and false." — Harold Pinter, December 2005 (Nobel Prize acceptance speech)

When a man like Pinter makes such an assertion we can only conclude that it's not Bush, but the Bush *haters*, who tell lies to fit their needs. Let me close with several more of my favorite quotations:

"Capitalism punishes failure, while government punishes success."
— Steve Chapman (by no means a Bush-lover) in the Chicago Tribune, 1 Dec 2005

"When one makes concession to one's enemies, one regrets it afterwards, and the fewer concessions one makes the safer one is likely to be." — Thucydides

"People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only because rough men stand ready to do violence on their behalf." — George Orwell

"Pacifists are the most immoral of men." — Patrick Henry

"Congressmen who willfully take actions during wartime that damage morale and undermine the military are saboteurs and should be arrested, exiled, or hanged." — Abraham Lincoln

Sincerely,

[Don John]

Blue Helmets, get in there! *by Don John, 29 Jan 2006*

Since it seems impossible to figure out a high-percentage solution on Iran, it may be time for a change of tactics. Our heroic missions in Iraq and Afghanistan have been widely criticized and nit-picked to death, by countries and organizations all over the world who would rather take endless pot-shots at America than fire a single round of hot lead at the real villains.

One definition of insanity is "doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different result." What do you think will happen if we step up to the plate and deal with Iran to the best of our ability?

Now is the time for us to say "Fine: you guys are so smart, YOU handle Iran. We'll be cheering for you all the way—at least until the moment that anything goes wrong. Then we'll begin calling you STUPID FASCIST IMPERIALIST MORON CHIMPS, okay? Because we admit that we're just too stupid to pass the Global Test. Come on, Kofi & Company, it's your turn. It'll be your fault if Bad Things happen because Iran gets nukes. So put on your famous blue helmets, and get in there. We know you can do it. Show us how the world should be run."

Of course, for the time being we wouldn't say it that way publicly. Instead, we'd just say that America is kind of busy right now (along with Britain and Australia), and we wish the rest of the free world the best of luck in reaching a genuine consensus and taking effective, concerted action on Iran.

I'm completely serious. We can always do what we have to do eventually. But right now it's time for all the empty suits to put up or shut up. They might just come begging on their knees.

Transparently Wicked *by Don John, 22 Dec 2005*

Last night I saw the hit musical *Wicked*. The sets were great. The lighting and effects were marvelous. The singing was very good indeed, and so was the acting.

It was a piece of crap.

The show has a transparent political-social-moral agenda... a trite and shallow one, at that. Good is evil. Evil is good. And "lying is just a different way of looking at things." They actually say that more than once. And they mean it.

The writers think they're being very subtle, but they're not. The clunking insertion, here and there, of just a few current-events references (like "regime change") makes it crystal-clear that their Wizard of Oz is a prototype for George W. Bush.

The government is illegitimate; it's not the elected representatives of the people, but just an evil usurper behind a curtain. Those who are "different," like the character Dr. Dillamond in *Wicked*, are demonized and ostracized—simply to create a phony threat and a false sense of superiority.

It's the same tired old leftist template. There's never any absolute truth. Everything is relative. Our political, social, and economic systems serve only to keep us enslaved and benighted. The government will stage a fake event whenever it needs to, in order to keep us under control.

Yes, I suppose. Just like they staged the Red Scare of the 1950s. Luckily, fine patriots like Edward R. Murrow and General Zwicker and Joseph Welch saw through that.

Just like they staged 9/11. Luckily, fine patriots like Noam Chomsky and Michael Moore and Gore Vidal saw through that.

God, what I wouldn't give to see Joseph McCarthy come back to life tomorrow morning!

Race Card, Victim Card *by Don John, 4 Sept 2005*

Last night a leftist acquaintance I've known for 27 years sent out a mass e-mail of Michael Moore's latest B.S., which [LGF called](#) "a sarcasm-laced laundry list of every spurious charge we've been hearing for the past five days."

I wrote the following, and hit [Reply All](#):

You people actually treat Bush like most people treat God. When something terrible happens, you think it was caused by Him. But when good things happen—like the sun rising in the morning or your very next breath—you forget to thank Him.

But then, most of you don't actually believe in God. If you did, you and your ACLU wouldn't be trying to expunge Him from every aspect of public life.

You people really act as if Bush is responsible for everything everywhere, as if there were no local government, no state government; as if New Orleans hadn't been sitting there on a flood plain for 300 years waiting for a millenium hurricane to happen.

And perhaps worst of all, when bad things happen to people whom the Democratic Party has crippled by making them so perpetually dependent on the state that they can't get off their asses and walk across a bridge, you people play the race card, the victim card, and whatever other cards you people have in your hands.

It's pathetic.

Michael Moore equates Bush with Hitler, and head-chopping Islamofascists with the Minutemen. If he's your guru, you people simply cannot be taken seriously about anything.

[Don John]

Up Next: Teddy Roosevelt to Blame for San Francisco Earthquake *by Danielle Crittenden 1 Sept 2005*

History, News, Patriotism *by Don John, 17 May 2005*

I've got a couple of friends who voted for Bush, but who sometimes backslide into old pre-9/11 habits like listening to NPR and reading the New York Times. I tell them it'll rot their brains. Recently, one of them wrote to ask why people get all worked up about historical revisionism, and questioned whether different news sources really make a difference. He asserted that "people are able to make up their own minds" despite the relentless liberal tide of the mainstream media. And he also feels uncomfortable with judging other people's patriotism. Here's what I wrote to him....

1. What some people are saying about things America did 30, 50, or 100 years ago is very important, because it can have a profound effect on the way America is viewed today—especially by its own citizens. One example: because of what they're taught in schools, a lot of kids today think that we're the only country that ever had slavery, and that it somehow ended by magic instead of through the efforts of a Republican president and the thousands of white people who died in the Civil War. If we give up on judging the truths of history, then charlatans get to print any old B.S. and have it taught in schools.

What happened to history?

Twisted History

"Never Forget: They Kept Lots of Slaves"

The latest maneuver in the culture wars, and how it is distorting our thinking about the Founding Fathers.

No Gun Ri: A Military History of the Korean War Incident

A Patriot's History of the United States

The Pilgrim Story: Vital Insights And Lessons For Today

2. Where the other guy gets his news from is very important, too. One example: Dan Rather and Mary Mapes just got a Peabody Award for their reporting on the "torture" at Abu Ghraib...despite the fact that they're the same "journalists" who, later in 2004, forged National Guard documents in an attempt to bring down the president.

Political Bias? What Political Bias?

Rather accepts media award with nod to allies

Misinformation at the Times

Media Research Center

3. We are all Americans, indeed, and there's no question that the vast majority of Democrats love this country as much as you and I do. However...there are some people who like to consider themselves "above it all," and think of themselves as Citizens of the World. That's a very noble and touchy-feely feeling. But the World doesn't give them a wonderful society and culture in which to live, and it doesn't protect them from those who would kill or enslave them. The United States of America does. And if their primary allegiance is to The World instead of to America, then they are indeed unpatriotic.

4. As to Jane Fonda, in particular: her actions were an embarrassment to most of the Leftists I knew and associated with. In those days, we stopped short of hating America itself. WAY short. Matter of fact, we didn't really hate anybody: not LBJ, not Daley, not Nixon, not the military brass. Not the way people hate Bush today.

When people started to take intellectuals like Herbert Marcuse and Noam Chomsky seriously, I had to take a hard look at my country and my culture. Though I felt that the Vietnam War was waged stupidly, I had to admit that the United States is a great country, and has a very high batting average when it comes to right-vs-wrong in its history.

As more and more leftists became more and more anti-American, I became less and less of a leftist. And when Ford replaced Nixon, I began to feel like it was OK to be involved in regular politics again, instead of Quixotic and dilettantish "revolution."

Even if the story about Jane Fonda and the slips of paper is a fabrication, the fact remains that she consorted with the North Vietnamese and allowed herself to be used as a propaganda tool against her country. I have never hated her, but I respect the right of any and all Vietnam veterans to do so. And she isn't a "great" anything, except perhaps a fool.

Papal Election by Don John, 20 April 2005

So...the conservatives "win" again. And this time, they refuse to even release the voting figures! Yet another obvious case of right-wingers stealing an election by disenfranchising the liberal voters, just like Florida in 2000, Ohio in 2004, and the 2004 Washington governor's race. No—wait a minute—they didn't succeed in stealing that last one. We liberals did.

But anyway...how many homeless cardinals got to cast a vote? How many felons? How many drug addicts?

You say there are no such cardinals? Well, what about single-parent cardinals, battered cardinals, or pimp cardinals?

No Muslim cardinals either? No Unitarian cardinals? No Hindus? How about undocumented alien cardinals? Not even one transgendered cardinal?

The lack of inclusiveness is shocking! Nearly all the potential liberals were disenfranchised. We must report this to Harriet Tubman Jones (D-Ohio) and Barbara Boxer (D-Moonbat). How can a liberal ever become pope if we don't have a church that "looks like America," or at least Detroit?

You say the U.S. government has no jurisdiction over the Roman Catholic Church? That can be easily remedied. We'll just take it to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals or some other transnationalist progressive venue. Our fine liberal judges have been able to discover things in the Constitution that no one else ever found there—like the right to privacy, the right to abortion on demand, and the wall of separation between church and state.

And with our judges now boning up on international law, it's gonna be great. When Pope Benedict goes to his heavenly reward, get ready for **Pope Marcy Kaptur the First!**

Liberal Newsletter by Don John, 9 January 2005

The tsunami relief efforts have turned into a hopeless quagmire. It's time to get out of Indonesia NOW. It is a completely stingy, unauthorized, and illegal invasion for the financial benefit of Dumbya's cronies like Halliburton-Richardburton and Bechtel-Mattel. No one wants us there. Massive Death By Natural Disaster is a traditional feature of the indigenous culture. How dare we presume to inflict the poisoned fruits of our Dead White Male society upon their noble, intuitive, in-tune-with-nature way of life? We should just give Kofi Annan all our money, and then kill ourselves.

The "murder" conviction of Andrea Yates has been overturned. Hooray! An important blow has been struck for A Woman's Right To Choose. Children can now be aborted any time from conception to age 7. Thanks to the efforts of people like Andrea Yates and her brave lawyers, we hope some day to extend this to the attainment of puberty—at which point any surviving children will have earned the right to conceive and abort children of their own. This is the greatest day in American justice since Roe v Wade, or maybe even the Miranda decision!

On January 9, Michael Moore was given a People's Choice Award for *Fahrenheit 911*. However, there is overwhelming evidence of widespread vote fraud, including the disenfranchisement of countless millions. I stood in line for over 6 hours, and then gave up because I had to go save some whales and help with day-care for the spotted owls. Will Barbara Boxer and Harriet Tubman Jones shed a tear for the millions of victims like me who

are always Discriminated Against In This Society? Some day the whole country will be run like the state of Washington, where—unlike Florida and Ohio—countless counts, recounts, and re-re-recounts are allowed until enough votes are "discovered" to put the right (Left) people in office.

Rightwing HeteroFascist NeoChristianJew Conspiracy Update: As soon as that stupid Texan bastard is sworn in for a second term, they're going to admit what we've known all along....that the 2000 election was illegitimate. This will set the stage for a legal case to allow him to seek a third term in 2008! Maybe we should consider moving overseas after all, like we "threatened." Or at least to Massachusetts. Nah, the governor's a Republican. But we could go and stand side by side, shoulder to shoulder, arm in arm, with our Palestinian sisters and brothers. Just like St. Pancake.

JPEGs attached:

Barbara Boxer's tear

Kerry with Palestinians

Whitman and Carter at Arafat's grave

Rachel Corrie burning American flag

To a "Bush Lied" friend by Don John, 29 July 2004

I appreciate your position, and respect your opinion. But I still don't see where GWB lied. The "sixteen words" in the 2003 State of the Union address were called into question later that year by Joseph Wilson's Niger yellowcake story. But that story has been utterly discredited by the Butler Report and the Senate report, making a mockery of Wilson's "Politics of Truth."

As for other WMD, why would one assume that they'd all be found in a big warehouse, stacked in rows clearly labeled "WMD," waiting for us to catalog? Significant quantities of WMD components could be contained in 6 or 8 remote trucks. So we may be looking for 6 or 8 remote trucks, which may be in 6 or 8 different places, including deep underground, in a country the size of California. And there's no guarantee that some (or all) of these trucks weren't secretly moved to Syria or elsewhere for safekeeping.

On the overall issue of war, I just don't have any problem with fighting a war when we have been attacked. Since 9/11, a state of war has existed between the United States and people-who-hate-us.

When such people attack us, such people will suffer consequences. Some of them may not be the ones that actually attacked us; but as long as they're people who hate my country, killing them is OK with me, as a cautionary example for other would-be attackers. Anyone who liked what happened on 9/11 is eligible.

And this is unlike the Cold War situation in a very important respect: we couldn't appease or negotiate with the Islamic terrorists even if we wanted to. (Of course, there are some on the Left who want to.)

Underlying a lot of antiwar sentiment seems to be a notion that there's something wrong with America's past foreign policy, and Israel's legitimacy. To quote Oliver Stone, "The Arabs have a point."

I reject that notion. No nation is perfect; but I believe that America is the greatest country in the world, and has behaved far better than the jealous, spiteful, dysfunctional America-haters would behave if they had our power and we had theirs. Do you really think guys like Nasser and Arafat and bin Laden could own an atomic arsenal for 50 years without using it?

As Mark Steyn wrote (July 7, 2002):

America is also a historical anomaly: the first non-imperial superpower. It has no colonies and no desire for any.

For almost 60 years, it's paid for the defence of the West virtually single-handed while creating and supporting structures—the UN, NATO, G8—that exist only to allow its "allies" to pretend they're on an equal footing.

Those "allies" are actually dependencies. Because the US provides generous military defense guarantees, the European governments have been free to fritter away their revenues on national health care and lavish welfare and all the other entitlements that progressives berate America for not providing to its own citizens. The non-arrogance of Washington is unparalleled in human history: it's American muscle that tames Bosnia but it's the laughably pompous Euro-politicians who get to swank around playing Viceroy.

Maybe that's what really annoys some foreigners: we're not only bigger, richer, and more powerful, but also nicer than they are.

An Honest Look at Saddam's Pre-War Connections *by Don John, 2 June 2004*

WMD may come and go. But connections don't change so easily. Some people, for instance, insist that France and America are still allied to each other. And yet those same people insist that Saddam and Osama never were.

I can understand their nostalgia for the French-American alliance which helped Joseph Stalin in his hour of need—even though that alliance barely outlived Hitler. But what "everybody knows" about Iraq and Al Qaida is wrong.

Leave aside Abu Abbas, who (while traveling on an Iraqi passport) murdered the wheelchair-bound Leon Klinghoffer during the 1985 hijacking of the Achille Lauro cruise ship. He was captured near Baghdad on April 15, 2003.

Leave aside Abdul Rahman Yasin, one of the 1993 World Trade Center bombers, who was picked up by the FBI, questioned, and incredibly enough released pending further interrogation as a "cooperative witness." He went straight to Amman and thence to Baghdad, where he remained under Saddam Hussein's protection until 2003.

And leave aside the March 2002 public ceremony in which Saddam Hussein contributed roughly \$500,000 to terrorists in the West Bank, paying \$25,000 to the families of suicide bombers and \$10,000 to those whose family members were killed in other clashes with the Israeli army.

Three clear and uncontested examples of Iraq's connection to vile terrorists bent on murdering Americans and Israelis. But in some people's minds, they don't justify firing a single shot. "No blood for oil, if you want peace work for justice, don't squander the good will, blah blah blah blah blah." So, as I said, leave those examples aside. They don't contain Osama or Al Qaida.

In the spring of 1998—well before the U.S. embassy bombings in East Africa—the Clinton administration indicted Osama bin Laden. The indictment read unequivocally: *"Al Qaida reached an understanding with the government of Iraq that Al Qaida would not work against that government and that on particular projects, specifically including weapons development, Al Qaida would work cooperatively with the Government of Iraq."*

Newsweek magazine ran an article in its January 11, 1999, issue headed "Saddam + Bin Laden?" "Here's what is known so far," it read: "Saddam Hussein, who has a long record of supporting terrorism, is trying to rebuild his intelligence network overseas—assets that would allow him to establish a terrorism network. U.S. sources say he is reaching out to Islamic terrorists, including some who may be linked to Osama bin Laden, the wealthy Saudi exile accused of masterminding the bombing of two U.S. embassies in Africa last summer."

Four days later, on January 15, 1999, ABC News reported that three intelligence agencies believed that Saddam had offered asylum to bin Laden. *"Intelligence sources say bin Laden's long relationship with the Iraqis began as he helped Sudan's fundamentalist government in their efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. . . . ABC*

News has learned that in December, an Iraqi intelligence chief named Faruq Hijazi, now Iraq's ambassador to Turkey, made a secret trip to Afghanistan to meet with bin Laden. Three intelligence agencies tell ABC News they cannot be certain what was discussed, but almost certainly, they say, bin Laden has been told he would be welcome in Baghdad."

That same month NPR reporter Mike Shuster interviewed Vincent Cannistraro, former head of the CIA's counterterrorism center, and offered this report. *"Iraq's contacts with bin Laden go back some years, to at least 1994, when, according to one U.S. government source, Hijazi met him when bin Laden lived in Sudan. According to Cannistraro, Iraq invited bin Laden to live in Baghdad to be nearer to potential targets of terrorist attack in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. . . . Some experts believe bin Laden might be tempted to live in Iraq because of his reported desire to obtain chemical or biological weapons. CIA Director George Tenet referred to that in recent testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee when he said bin Laden was planning additional attacks on American targets."*

By mid-February 1999, journalists did not even feel the need to qualify these claims of an Iraq/Al Qaida relationship. An Associated Press dispatch that ran in the *Washington Post* ended this way: "The Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has offered asylum to bin Laden, who openly supports Iraq against Western powers."

Hmmm. . . . Clinton, Newsweek, ABC, NPR, Associated Press, Washington Post.

Were they lying then, or are they lying now? And why?

18 Things That Noam Chomsky, Ward Churchill & Co. Believe—And Conservatives Don't
by Don John, 7 May 2004 (to a Leftist friend)

We're probably never going to agree, because our assumptions are polar opposites. Nearly all of Bush's more intellectual opponents seem to agree with the following eighteen statements:

The Western culture in which we live has no special claim upon our loyalty.

In fact, Western culture is corrupt in many ways, and perhaps should be dismantled.

The West, and the USA in particular, enjoys its ascendancy chiefly because of its exploitation of the Third World.

If non-Westerners were in the ascendant, they'd be much more humane, enlightened, and merciful than we have been.

"The white race is the cancer of human history."— Susan Sontag, 1966

The Muslims have legitimate grievances against us.

The United Nations is still legitimate.

Israel is not legitimate.

It is more enlightened to be a citizen of "the world" than of one's own nation.

There's an economic system that has worked better than capitalism.

Economics is a zero-sum game: for there to be winners, there have to be losers.

It's more important to be "liked" than respected ("We squandered the good will.").

Negotiations and treaties can be backed by something besides power and the will to use it.

Peaceful appeasement of implacable enemies is better than killing them dead.

War "wins nothing, cures nothing, settles nothing."—Neville Chamberlain, 1938

There was no link between Saddam Hussein and international terrorists.

We have no right to judge.

The Downtrodden can do no wrong—no matter how much wrong they do.

As you may have guessed, I disagree strongly with each of those eighteen statements. Many years ago, when I was a leftist, I believed about half of them. Those beliefs slowly began to fall away in 1969, when I was appalled at the anti-cultural assertions of Herbert Marcuse. By 1979, when the "hostage crisis" enabled Jimmy Carter to display his abysmal impotence for all the world to see, my belief in the Left was nil.

Oh, the Human Rights Abuses! by Don John, 14 March 2004

RE: "My Hell In Camp X-Ray," by Rosa Prince and Gary Jones, 13 March 2004

<http://www.countercurrents.org/hr-jones130304.htm>

Oh, the Human Rights Abuses! Oh, the terrible tortures visited on these poor, innocent Muslim lads! They were just sitting there in Afghanistan with their Al Qaida rifles across their laps, praying the rosary (or whatever they actually do "pray" in their benighted, superstitious blood-cult).

What will Amnesty International say? What will John Kerry say? What will Kofi Annan say? What will Michael Moore and Ed Asner and David Mamet say? What will Peter Jennings and Dan Rather and Tom Brokaw say? What will NPR say? What will Maureen Dowd and Molly Ivins and Katie Couric say? What will the BBC say? What will Nelson Mandela and Kim Jong-il and Jacques Chirac say?

What would Daniel Pearl have said? What would the Madrid victims have said? What would the 9/11 victims have said? What would all the terror victims in Israel have said? What would ANY of them have said if they were alive today instead of having been murdered by sub-human filth like this lying turd?

Since they're dead, I'll say it for them: GOD BLESS GUANTANAMO!

As for me, today I am particularly proud to be an American.

The Gullible '40s by Don John, 14 June 2003

Americans were sure gullible in the 1940s. Some torture chambers, mass graves, and tale-telling survivors were enough to convince them that regime change in Germany had been justified. Hitler was never even found! He was just a phantom created by a conspiracy of evil Jews!

And even if Hitler did exist, there was never any proof that Germany posed an imminent threat to the USA. We had no business going over there and siding with those wicked, Bismarck-sinking British. They were just like the Israelis are today, pretending to be a small nation fighting to preserve its very existence, as a cover for aggression and greed.

The lying Roosevelt administration should have been investigated and impeached. Instead, Americans blindly followed FDR into a bloody conflict overseas. Everyone supported the war effort. Hollywood made pro-war films. Some entertainers and athletes even served with great honor in the armed forces.

What a bunch of dupes and saps! Their hard work and sacrifice only led to the illegal conquest and long-term occupation of a sovereign nation. Such an injustice could never have happened if the UN, the ACLU, Marcy Kaptur, Natalie Maines, and Michael Moore had been around. Thank God (if you'll pardon the expression) they're here today to show us what's right.

A Mathematical Certainty by Don John, 12 Sept 2001

For our own safety, we need to establish it as a mathematical certainty that when something bad is done to the United States, something many times worse will happen as a result. When you commit a terrorist act in Israel, they bulldoze your house. When you commit a terrorist attack in the U.S., we will bulldoze your country. 3,000 innocent people killed? 300,000 in return.

When the Iranians took U.S. citizens hostage in Tehran in 1979, some people asked "Why doesn't anything like that ever happen to the Soviets?" The best answer at the time came from an unnamed diplomat quoted by George Will: "Because heaven only knows what they would do." Mr. Will went on to point out that for America to show a bit of Soviet-style unpredictability and ruthlessness would go a long way toward deterring future terrorist acts.

And yet here we are, a generation later, still acting like Jimmy Carter:

Hand-wringing, soul-searching, and agonizing.

Forming committees.

Closing all sorts of barns whose horses have long since fled (e.g., revising airport procedures in ways that would not have prevented anything that occurred on September 11).

Pretending this was an attack on NATO, which it clearly was not.

Asking permission to use Pakistani airspace.

Making plans to send ground troops to fight guerrillas on the other side of the globe, yet again.

In other words, we're playing by the wrong rules....doing what other nations think we should do instead of what we know is right for us.

All the sympathy from overseas is very touching. And the offers of support are very nice. But this was an attack on America; and America can respond much more efficiently alone.

When we handle things ourselves, we don't need to dance all kinds of procedural dances and get all kinds of permission from groups of foreigners who may have quite different agendas from our own. We don't need their help, and we don't need their permission. We don't even need their respect, *per se*. What we really need, for our own safety, is their fear.

Other countries need to be terrified—no, petrified—at the very thought of offending the United States. We need to

establish it as a mathematical certainty that when something bad is done to us, something many times worse will be done in return.

The terrorists sought no permissions, and recognized no civilians. Neither should we. Kabul, Kandahar, Tehran, and Baghdad should be levelled immediately by bombs and missiles. We may choose to warn them to evacuate; but there may not be many people worth saving anyway, and "Allah" will surely sort them out.

Even if the Afghans give us Osama bin Laden and his men, an example needs to be made. Nukes? Mountains!

The Japanese got over the two nukes we dropped on them in 1945. They realized they'd been bad, and now they've been behaving themselves, and loving us, for years. I bet the Moslems could do the same, if only they were encouraged to try.

These Men I Knew

Who were these men I knew. That I met as strangers and taught what is true.
Laying weeks in a Ranger Grave.
Muddy.
Scared.
Wet.
Lonely.
Huddling for warmth.
Survival doesn't heed the machismo in us.

You could hear the quiet chattering of each other's teeth over the squawk of the field radio. Paralyzed with cramps so painful in the ribs from shaking with chills. I have to sleep and you stay watch. I will tell you when time is up.

Tomorrow we pull out and hump fifty clicks to an attack, Our feet will bleed and our skin will chafe from the dirt on our bodies. The bugs have taken residence in our skin and it burns and itches. Some of us have dysentery and cut holes in our pants so we can relieve ourselves without missing a beat. Haven't had a warm meal in weeks. We look into each other's gaunt faces and sunken eyes and drive on. Keep that rifle clean because that will save your life.

Where else in my life did I see the best and worst of humanity in the same place? Where else in my life did I have to push the envelope on my body and mind so hard for so many months?

It was when I was a Soldier. And I don't need to look for heroes anymore. I have already met them.

The lines above were written by a soldier who served in the Rapid Deployment 7th Infantry Division (LIGHT) in Central and South America, 1987-1990.